

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

WATER RESOURCES WHITE PAPER

Prepared for consideration by the Delta Stewardship Council

December 8, 2010

Not reviewed by or approved by the
Delta Stewardship Council

Send comments to deltaplancomment@deltacouncil.ca.gov.

All comments received are posted to the Delta Stewardship Council web site:
<http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/>

1

Executive Summary

2 Water supply in California is dependent upon geography, climate, upstream patterns of use and return
3 flows, and facilities to store and convey water resources. Total precipitation in California results in water
4 flows that can range from less than 150,000,000 to more than 350,000,000 acre-feet per year (Department
5 of Water Resources [DWR], 2009). Most of the precipitation occurs between November and April, with
6 50 to 60 percent of the precipitation occurring in the northern and Central Valley— the Delta watershed.
7 In drier years as water demands increase, flows to the Delta decrease and demand for exports from the
8 Delta increases.

9 Since the beginning of European settlement of California the late 1700s, communities and agricultural
10 areas constructed dams and canals to convey water from major rivers to the new communities, farms, and
11 ranches. In the early and mid-1800s, local irrigation projects were constructed to support these beneficial
12 uses. In the late 1800s, two innovations led to the expansion of irrigated agricultural acreage. First, the
13 new transcontinental railroads supported expanding markets for California crops and easier migration.
14 Second, gasoline engines were adapted to drive pumps, allowing deep groundwater wells. As the demand
15 for irrigated agriculture grew, large diversions and conveyances were constructed. Some of the earliest
16 diversions occurred in the Tulare Lake Region on the Kaweah, Kern, Kings, and Tule rivers. Several
17 events further drove water supply development: numerous droughts in the late 1880s, continued
18 expansion of agricultural markets that led to major groundwater overdraft in portions of the Central
19 Valley and unreliable water supplies, and projections for continued growth in the San Francisco Bay Area
20 and Southern California. In response, eight major water facilities were constructed in California: San
21 Francisco Public Utilities Commission's Hetch Hetchy Project, Los Angeles' Owens Aqueduct, Imperial
22 Irrigation District's All American Canal, East Bay Municipal Utility District's Mokelumne Aqueduct,
23 Los Angeles' Mono Lake Aqueduct, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's Colorado River
24 Aqueduct, the Bureau of Reclamation's Central Valley Project (CVP), and the State Water Project
25 (SWP). In 2005, these major water projects provided water throughout most of the state, serving more
26 than 34 million people and over 4 million irrigated acres (3 million acres by CVP, 600,000 acres by SWP,
27 and 500,000 acres by Imperial Irrigation District).

28 As these and other smaller water resources projects became fully operational, plans continued to be
29 developed for additional expansion of projects to further reduce groundwater overdrafts. These projects,
30 such as Mid-Valley Canal, were not completed because reliable water supplies were lacking.

31 Numerous litigations and regulations have changed water facilities operations to protect all watershed
32 beneficial uses, including use of diverted water within the watershed and within the export service area by
33 municipal, industrial, agricultural, and tribal users; aquatic and terrestrial habitats; recreation; and
34 navigation. All of these beneficial uses require the availability of reliable water supplies with appropriate

1 water quality. Continued water diversion in historical patterns and periodic droughts will not allow for
2 balanced and reliable water supplies with appropriate water quality for all beneficial uses.

3 Since the historic drought of 1976 and 1977, many municipalities and agricultural areas have
4 implemented major water use efficiency measures to allow continued growth without additional water
5 supplies. However, continued occurrence of droughts and restrictions on diversions of water to protect
6 aquatic habitat and other water users (in the Delta, Owens Lake, Mono Lake, Pardee and Camanche
7 reservoirs into the Mokelumne Aqueduct, and Colorado River) have reduced water availability to major
8 municipal and agricultural areas of California. Some areas that are reliant upon imported CVP and SWP
9 water supplies and precipitation in surrounding mountains have found it difficult to slow or reverse the
10 continuing groundwater overdraft. For example, the Tulare Lake Region has experienced groundwater
11 overdraft since the 1880s. During wet years, local runoff and primary use of imported CVP and SWP
12 water allows groundwater elevations to rise. However, this groundwater replenishment cannot keep pace
13 with normal and dry year use, so groundwater elevations continue to decline. In the past 20 years as the
14 CVP and SWP systems were fully constructed and Delta exports were reduced to protect aquatic and
15 terrestrial habitat, CVP and SWP exports to the Tulare Lake Region have declined from their levels in the
16 1960s through 1980s, resulting in greater reliance on local supplies. The combination of these conditions
17 has further exacerbated groundwater overdraft. A water emergency has been issued for the Central Coast
18 basin in Southern California due to declining water levels that are near historic lows in some areas.

19 During the past few years, all regions of the Central Valley and areas of California that use water
20 exported from the Delta watershed have developed programs to reduce the consumptive use of water,
21 reduce overall water diversions, and improve water quality and aquatic and terrestrial conditions in the
22 Delta watershed. However, the available water supply and water quality is not sufficient for all the
23 beneficial uses. The availability of water supply could be further reduced as sea level rise extends the
24 reach of salt water further into the Delta and reduces the availability of water supplies with appropriate
25 water quality for municipal and agricultural users. Climate change could reduce snowpack in the
26 mountains, which would change the availability and management of water supplies in complex ways. Air
27 temperature could also be affected by climate change, potentially leading to increased consumptive use by
28 riparian and wetland vegetation as well as water demand for agricultural crops throughout the Central
29 Valley. All of these future scenarios would further reduce the availability of reliable water supplies for all
30 beneficial uses.

31 This white paper is intended to describe the development of facilities and jurisdictional requirements over
32 the past 150 years that have addressed beneficial uses, potential and real conflicts between those uses, and
33 future risks. This white paper provides a summary of historical and existing conditions, but does not
34 provide specific details such as operational criteria for water systems that divert water from the Delta
35 watersheds. This white paper does not address methods to reduce the risks or reduce existing or potential
36 adverse conditions in the Delta. Additional information will be provided in the Existing Conditions and
37 Affected Environment sections of the EIR, including:

- 38 ♦ Surface water flows and water quality characteristics
- 39 ♦ Groundwater use and quality
- 40 ♦ Facilities used by the SWP, CVP, and other major water systems
- 41 ♦ Historical and existing water use, and a comparison of water use and water supplies

42 The draft water resources section of Existing Conditions will be presented to the Council in February
43 2011.

1	Contents	
2	Section	Page
3	Executive Summary	ES-1
4	Section 1 Introduction	1-1
5	Purpose and Use of this White Paper.....	1-2
6	Statutory Requirements.....	1-2
7	Section 2 Water Use in California	2-1
8	Background.....	2-1
9	Precipitation and Runoff	2-2
10	Population	2-6
11	Urban Water Use.....	2-8
12	Case Study: EBMUD Water Use.....	2-10
13	Case Study: Water Use in Los Angeles	2-10
14	Agricultural Water Use	2-11
15	Water to Meet Environmental Requirements.....	2-14
16	Total Water Use in California.....	2-17
17	Section 3 Water Supply Development	3-1
18	Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta.....	3-1
19	Delta Water Quality	3-2
20	Surface Water	3-5
21	Surface Water Storage	3-5
22	Major Interbasin Transfers.....	3-6
23	Groundwater	3-12
24	Case Study: Tulare Lake Overdraft	3-16
25	Case Study: Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Management	3-17
26	Case Study: Central Basin Management.....	3-19
27	Water Recycling.....	3-20
28	Case Study: Central Valley.....	3-21
29	Case Study: San Francisco Bay Area.....	3-21
30	Case Study: Southern California.....	3-22
31	Desalination	3-23
32	Seawater Desalination.....	3-23
33	Groundwater Desalination	3-24
34	Section 4 Projected Future Risks due to Climate Change and Sea Level Rise	4-1
35	Effects of Climate Change and Sea Level Rise	4-1
36	Climate Variability and Climate Change	4-2
37	Mechanics of Climate Change	4-2
38	Observed Trends and Future Projections of California’s Climate	4-3
39	Section 5 References	5-1
40	Appendix A California Water Chronology	A-1
41	Appendix B Major Dams	B-1
42		
43		

1 **Tables**

2 2-1 Department of Fish and Game List of Streams for Instream Flow Studies 2-16

3 3-1 Major CVP Development Milestones 3-10

4 3-2 List of Title XVI Projects in the San Francisco Bay Area 3-21

5 3-3 List of Potential Recycled Water Projects in Southern California 3-22

6 3-4 Proposed Seawater Desalinations Plants in California 3-23

7 3-5 Amount of Existing and Planned Groundwater Desalting in Southern California 3-25

8

9 **Figures**

10 2-1 Delta Watershed 2-2

11 2-2 Average Annual Precipitation in California 2-3

12 2-3 Variability in Annual Precipitation in California (Jul- Nov) 2-4

13 2-4 Sacramento Four Rivers Unimpaired Runoff, 1906-2008 2-5

14 2-5 San Joaquin Four Rivers Unimpaired Runoff, 1906-2008 2-5

15 2-6 California Population 2-6

16 2-7 California Population by County 2-7

17 2-8 Urban Water Use in California 2-8

18 2-9 California Urban Water Use and Population, 1965-2005 2-9

19 2-10 East Bay Municipal Utilities District Urban Water Use (per capita), 1917-2009 2-10

20 2-11 Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Urban Water Use (per capita), 1940-2009 2-11

21 2-12 Development of Agriculture and Municipal Water Supplies in California 2-12

22 2-13 Agricultural Water Use and Irrigated Acres in California 2-13

23 2-14 Total Water Use in California 2-17

24 2-15 Total Water Use in California 2-18

25 3-1 Water Movement through the Delta 3-1

26 3-2 Delta Exports and Outflows 3-2

27 3-3 Historical Salinity Intrusion in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta 3-4

28 3-4 Development of Surface Water Storage in California 3-6

29 3-5 Existing San Francisco Bay Area Water Supply Facilities 3-7

30 3-6 CVP and SWP Facilities 3-9

31 3-7 Colorado River Supply and Demand 3-12

32 3-8 Groundwater Use in California 3-14

33 3-9 Groundwater Basins in California 3-15

34 3-10 Groundwater Levels in the Central Valley, 1962-2003 3-17

35 3-11 Groundwater Levels in the Santa Clara Basin 3-18

1	3-12	Average Groundwater Elevation in Key Central Basin Wells.....	3-20
2	3-13	Existing Recycled Water Use Types in Southern California Region	3-22
3	3-14	Groundwater Desalters in Southern California.....	3-26
4	4-1	Trend of Carbon Dioxide Accumulation in Earth's Atmosphere.....	4-3
5	4-2	Historical Observed California Mean Annual Temperature Departure	4-4
6	4-3	Simulated Historical and Future Annual Temperature Projections for the Sacramento Region...4-4	
7	4-4	Historical Global Mean Sea Level and Future Projections based on Global Mean	
8		Temperature Projections	4-6
9			

Section 1

Introduction

1
2

3 In November 2009, the California Legislature enacted SBX7 1 (Act), one of several bills passed at this
4 time related to water supply reliability, ecosystem health, and the Delta. The Act became effective on
5 February 3, 2010.

6 In the Act, the Legislature declared that the Delta (which the Act specifies to include the Sacramento–San
7 Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh) is a critically important natural resource for California and the nation. It
8 serves Californians concurrently as the hub of the California water system and as the most valuable
9 estuary and wetland ecosystem on the west coasts of North America and South America. The Legislature
10 also declared that the Delta watershed and California’s water infrastructure are in crisis, that existing
11 Delta policies are not sustainable, and that resolution of the crisis requires fundamental reorganization of
12 the State’s management of Delta watershed resources.

13 The Legislature required development of the Delta Plan to meet the coequal goals and all of the inherent
14 subgoals defined by statute. The plan must define an integrated and legally enforceable set of policies,
15 strategies, and actions that will serve as a basis for future findings of consistency by state and local
16 agencies with regard to their Delta-related projects, and for subsequent evaluation of those findings by the
17 Council on appeal, as provided in statute and Council regulation. The coequal goals are defined by Water
18 Code (Wat. Code) section 85054:

19 *'Coequal goals' means the two goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and*
20 *protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The coequal goals shall be achieved in*
21 *a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and*
22 *agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place.*

23 Formed by the confluence of the state’s two longest rivers—the Sacramento and the San Joaquin—the
24 Delta is one of the most valuable and unique natural resources in the state and nation. Over the past
25 120 years, demands for water and land resources have become more competitive among ecosystem
26 resources, agricultural users, municipal and industrial users, power generators, flood management
27 operations in the watershed, and salmon fishing operations along the Pacific Coast. Despite the Delta’s
28 importance, the challenges of effectively addressing water resources, water quality, and other competing
29 Delta beneficial uses have led to increased conflicts over time.

30 As an initial step in the development of the Delta Plan, white papers are being developed to summarize
31 the following information:

SECTION 1
INTRODUCTION

- 1 ♦ Historical activities that have contributed to existing conditions and current uses of Delta
- 2 resources
- 3 ♦ Jurisdictional responsibilities;
- 4 ♦ Current conditions related to uses of Delta resources
- 5 ♦ Future issues related to Delta resources

6 The white papers are not intended to describe the existing and projected conditions in detail. The more
7 detailed discussions of existing and projected conditions will be presented in the Delta Plan
8 Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Draft versions of the EIR chapters related to the existing and
9 projected future conditions without implementation of the Act will be provided in early 2011 for review
10 by the Delta Stewardship Council and the public.

11 Purpose and Use of this White Paper

12 This white paper is intended to describe the development of facilities and jurisdictional requirements over
13 the past 150 years that have addressed beneficial uses, potential and real conflicts between those uses, and
14 future risks. This white paper provides a summary of historical and existing conditions, but does not
15 provide specific details such as operational criteria for water systems that divert water from the Delta
16 watersheds. This white paper does not address methods to reduce the risks or reduce existing or potential
17 adverse conditions in the Delta. Additional information will be provided in the Existing Conditions and
18 Affected Environment sections of the EIR, including:

- 19 ♦ Surface water flows and water quality characteristics
- 20 ♦ Groundwater use and quality
- 21 ♦ Facilities used by the SWP, CVP, and other major water systems
- 22 ♦ Historical and existing water use, and a comparison of water use and water supplies

23 The draft water resources section of Existing Conditions will be presented to the Council in early 2011.

24 Statutory Requirements

25 The Act (Wat. Code section 85020) stated that the policy of the State of California is to achieve the
26 following objectives that the Legislature declares are inherent in the coequal goals for management of the
27 Delta:

- 28 (a) Manage the Delta's water and environmental resources and the water resources of the state
29 over the long term.
- 30 (b) Protect and enhance the unique cultural, recreational, and agricultural values of the California
31 Delta as an evolving place.
- 32 (c) Restore the Delta ecosystem, including its fisheries and wildlife, as the heart of a healthy
33 estuary and wetland ecosystem.
- 34 (d) Promote statewide water conservation, water use efficiency, and sustainable water use.
- 35 (e) Improve water quality to protect human health and the environment consistent with achieving
36 water quality objectives in the Delta.
- 37 (f) Improve the water conveyance system and expand statewide water storage.

1 (g) Reduce risks to people, property, and state interests in the Delta by effective emergency
2 preparedness, appropriate land uses, and investments in flood protection.

3 (h) Establish a new governance structure with the authority, responsibility, accountability,
4 scientific support, and adequate and secure funding to achieve these objectives.

5 For this effort, the Delta Plan will address areas that provide water to the Delta and areas that use water
6 from the Delta, including the Delta watershed, because water management activities in these areas affect
7 or could affect Delta water resources and water quality. The paper discusses natural sources of water, how
8 water is used in the state, and the development of water supply by maximizing local supplies, developing
9 interbasin transfers, implementing water conservation, and desalination of water. The paper also includes
10 a discussion of how climate change will impact Delta water supplies.

Section 2

Water Use in California

1
2

3 This section of the white paper will explain how and where water is used in California. Water use in
4 California is described using three categories;

- 5 (1) Water for urban (commercial, industrial, and residential) use
- 6 (2) Water for agricultural use
- 7 (3) Water used to sustain environmental needs (described in the California Water Plan as
8 environmental use).


9 This white paper makes frequent use of statewide and regional water supply and use data published in the
10 2009 California Water Plan Update (DWR, 2009), which are based on water balances for the years 1998-
11 2005. The data do not reflect impacts on water supply and water use that result from the 2007-2009 drought
12 or recent court decisions and changes to biological opinions, which have reduced the amount of water
13 available for export.

14 Background

15 Water use in California evolved with the development of water supplies throughout the state. The invention of
16 the motorized pump led to intensive use of groundwater for irrigation in the early 1900s, driving the growth
17 of agriculture in some areas of the Central Valley. As major water supply projects were developed to offset
18 overuse of groundwater in some areas, additional water supplies became available for more water-scarce
19 areas, matching growth in urban areas and moving water into other areas to support irrigation.

20 Because a large percentage of California's water runoff naturally flows out through the Delta, the Delta
21 watershed has played a significant role in the development of water supplies, and has also been significantly
22 affected by that development. The Delta Plan will address areas that provide water to the Delta and areas that
23 use water from the Delta, including the Delta watershed, as shown in Figure 2-1. Including areas of California
24 reliant on Delta water in the Delta planning area is important because water management activities in these
25 areas affect or could affect Delta water resources and water quality.

Figure 2-1
Areas that Provide Water to the Delta and Use Water from the Delta



1 Water use is impacted by water availability and varies based on precipitation, available runoff, and water
2 demand. Wet years (i.e., higher rainfall) result in lower water demand while drier years (i.e., less rainfall
3 than average) have a higher water demand. Demands are primarily driven by agricultural irrigation needs
4 and urban demands, and recently more water is being allocated to support the environment.


5 Precipitation and Runoff

6 Precipitation is the primary source of water in California but varies seasonally, geographically, and
7 annually. Precipitation produces water supplies ranging from less than 150 million to more than

1 350 million acre-feet per year (DWR, 2009). Precipitation in California occurs primarily between
 2 November and April, and most precipitation occurs in the mountains of eastern and northern California as
 3 seen in Figure 2-2. The variability of precipitation results in a mismatch between water availability and
 4 water needs.


5 Precipitation varies widely on an annual basis with cycles of higher than average and lower than average
 6 (droughts) rates as seen in Figure 2-2. This figure shows major droughts in the state including the
 7 droughts of 1912-13, 1918-20, 1923-24, 1929-34, 1947-50, 1959-61, 1976-77, 1987-92, and 2007-09
 8 (DWR, 2010a) as well as the wetter than normal years. The unpredictability and variations in
 9 precipitation that occur in California make relying on precipitation as well as the resulting runoff for
 10 water supply impractical.

Figure 2-2
 Average Annual Precipitation in California
 Source: USGS, 2010



11
 12


Figure 2-3
Variability in Annual Precipitation in California (Jul- Nov)
Source: *Western Regional Climate Center, 2009*



1 In the Delta watershed and use areas, the most significant source of water is runoff from the Sacramento
 2 and San Joaquin rivers and their tributaries. These rivers outflow to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
 3 and Suisun Marsh (Delta), which form a natural floodplain that drains approximately 40 percent of the
 4 state (DWR, 2009). Precipitation and runoff in the Delta region are the primary sources for water in the
 5 state.

6 Precipitation in the coastal watersheds and in the lower elevations of the Delta watershed occurs primarily
 7 as rainfall or snow that melts quickly. Runoff from a rainfall event starts during the event and continues
 8 for several days following larger rainfall events. Snowmelt from the mountains in the higher elevations of
 9 the Delta watershed occurs in March through June in the northern portions of the Central Valley (i.e.,
 10 Sacramento Rivers and its tributaries) and April through July in the central and southern portions of the
 11 Central Valley (i.e., San Joaquin River and tributaries). Runoff from the snowpack in the Delta
 12 watersheds could be 5 to 15 percent of the total runoff into the Delta. Figures 2-4 and 2-5 show the
 13 variability in annual runoff as well as highlight dry years on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and
 14 their major tributaries. The variability between high runoff years (e.g., over 35 million acre-feet on the
 15 Sacramento River) and dry years (e.g., approximately 5 million acre-feet per year on the Sacramento
 16 River) illustrates the problem of relying on unimpaired runoff for a consistent water supply. For this
 17 reason, major water supply projects have been developed in the state to capture, store, and convey water.
 18 These projects will be described in Section 3.


Figure 2-4
Sacramento Four Rivers Unimpaired Runoff, 1906-2008
Source: DWR, 2009



The Sacramento Four Rivers are: Sacramento River above Bend Bridge, near Red Bluff; Feather River inflow to Lake Oroville; Yuba River at Smartville; American River inflow to Folsom Lake

1

Figure 2-5
San Joaquin Four Rivers Unimpaired Runoff, 1906-2008
Source: DWR, 2009



The San Joaquin Four Rivers are: Stanislaus River inflow to New Melones Reservoir, Tuolumne River inflow to New Don Pedro Reservoir, Merced River inflow to New Exchequer Reservoir, San Joaquin River inflow to Millerton Reservoir.

2

3

1 Population

2 Water use is commonly discussed on a per capita basis; therefore, understanding the population
3 distribution in the state is important. In 2009, California's population was estimated to be approximately
4 36.5 million as shown in Figure 2-6. The Department of Finance (DOF) estimates that population in
5 California will continue to grow to approximately 60 million by 2050 (DWR, 2009). Population growth
6 has slowed from a high of 2 percent between 2000 and 2001 to less than 1 percent between 2008 and
7 2009 (DOF, 2009).

8 Figure 2-7 shows the distribution of the state's population by county. Population in the state is highest in
9 southern California as well as the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento areas. Los Angeles County has the
10 largest population in the state. The state's nine largest counties are Los Angeles, San Diego, Orange,
11 Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Clara, Alameda, Sacramento, and Contra Costa. These counties
12 compose over 70 percent of the population of California and all rely on Delta water for supply. Water
13 from the Delta or its tributaries supplies all of the counties within the state that have populations in excess
14 of 500,000. The population of these areas is also growing; between 2000 and 2009, the largest population
15 gains in the state were in Los Angeles, San Diego, Orange, Riverside, and Santa Clara counties.

Figure 2-6
California Population
Source: DOF, 2009





Figure 2-7
 California Population by County
 Source: CalEMA, 2010

1
 2


California Population by County



1 Urban Water Use


2 Statewide, urban water use, per capita, averaged 192 gallons per capita day (gpcd) in 2005. The lowest
3 per capita water usage in the state is in the Southern California and San Francisco Bay Areas, California’s
4 most populous regions, as shown in Figure 2-8. Per capita usage is lowest along the Pacific Coast and
5 highest in the interior regions of the state, particularly the Tulare Lake, South Lahontan, and Colorado
6 River regions, where low precipitation and higher temperatures increase the amount of water required to
7 support irrigated landscaping.

Figure 2-8
Urban Water Use in California
Source: DWR, 2009



1 Since 1980 the population in California has increased by more than 13 million while per capita use has
 2 decreased by over 23 gallons per capita day (gpcd) as shown in Figure 2-9. Implementation of water use
 3 efficiency measures (water conservation) has led to these reductions. Some urban areas have been more
 4 successful in implementing these measures, as case studies illustrate below.

Figure 2-9
 California Urban Water Use and Population, 1965-2005
 Source: DWR, 1968, 1973, 1983, 1994; DWR et al., 2010




5 As urban areas in California continue to grow, in addition to water supply development, improved water
 6 efficiency (water conservation) will be required to continue to reduce per capita water use and meet water
 7 demands. Water efficiency measures implemented in California are based on Best Management Practices
 8 (BMPs) set-up by the California Urban Water Conservation Council as outlined in Table 2-1. These
 9 BMPs have historically been implemented by water agencies on a voluntary basis; however, some of
 10 these are now mandatory due to recent state legislation and water code changes. These changes have
 11 included requirements for metering, landscape irrigation ordinances, high efficiency appliances, and a
 12 required 20 percent water savings by 2020 in California.

13 In the future, the most significant water use reductions could come from the implementation of outdoor
 14 landscape and irrigation efficiency measures. Outdoor use comprises up to 70 percent of urban household
 15 water use (SAWPA, 2009). Installation of “Smart” irrigation controllers, turf reduction programs, and
 16 planting of drought tolerant plants are all effective measures to reduce outdoor use. Another significant
 17 source of water future water savings could come from requirements for high efficiency appliance and
 18 fixtures as toilets and clothes washers account for almost half of indoor urban household water use
 19 (SAWPA, 2009).

1 Case Study: EBMUD Water Use

2 Water use records for the East Bay Municipal Utilities District (EBMUD) demonstrate the per capita
 3 water use trends common in California cities over the last century. Increases in per capita water use
 4 through the 1970s were driven by advances in technology and overall living standards. Indoor plumbing,
 5 appliances such as dishwashers and washing machines, backyard swimming pools, and larger yards in
 6 suburban areas all contributed to increases in per capita water use. The overall water use trends for the
 7 EBMUD mirror these developments, as shown in Figure 2-10. The sharp decline in water use in 1977 was
 8 a result of water conservation and other water management actions that were put in place during the 1976-
 9 1977 drought. Water use also dropped during the 1987-1992 drought due to water management actions. In
 10 recent years, water use rates have declined due to implementation of tiered rate structuring, designed to
 11 encourage water conservation during the drought conditions experienced during 2007-2009.

Figure 2-10
 East Bay Municipal Utilities District
 Urban Water Use (per capita), 1917-2009
 Source: DWR, 1965, 1968, 1975, 1983, 1994, 2010b




12

13 Case Study: Water Use in Los Angeles

14 The City of Los Angeles began conserving water over 100 years ago, and water use records demonstrate
 15 the effectiveness of these efforts despite advances in living standards. Water conservation began in Los
 16 Angeles in the 1890s when William Mulholland led efforts in 1889 to install meters in the city of Los
 17 Angeles, decreasing per capita water use from 306 to 200 gallons per day (LADWP, 2010). Since that
 18 time, water conservation has been an integral part of water management for the city. According to a
 19 National Water Research Institute (NWRI) study, the population of Los Angeles grew 33 percent in the
 20 30 years from 1975 to 2005 without an increase in total water use. During the 1990s alone, Los Angeles
 21 County added 1 million residents without increasing total water use (NWRI, 2007). The City of Los
 22 Angeles Integrated Plan for the Wastewater Program estimated that water use averaged 178 gpcd from
 23 1971 to 1990, as illustrated by Figure 2-11, and since then has decreased to 147 gpcd due to water
 24 conservation efforts. The city estimates that future water conservation measures can decrease per capita
 25 water demand by 2 percent to 144 gpcd by the year 2050 (City of Los Angeles, 2000).

Figure 2-11
 Los Angeles Department of Water and
 Power Urban Water Use (per capita), 1940-1990
 Source: DWR, 1968, 1975, 1983, 1994




1

2 Agricultural Water Use

3 California is one of the most productive agricultural regions in the world. There are over 88,000 farms in
 4 the state that generate over \$100 billion in economic activity related to agriculture (DWR, 2009).
 5 California agriculture is dependent on market demands and water availability and is not generally
 6 subsistence farming (DWR, 2009). Agriculture in California has developed in conjunction with major
 7 water resources projects. This increase was most significant in the Central Valley where the State Water
 8 Project and Central Valley Project enabled farming to expand. This is evident in Figure 2-12 where the
 9 yellow (1912), green (between 1912 and 1972) and blue (1972) shading shows the massive expansion of
 10 land put into production between 1912 and 1972 (Governor's Office of Planning and Research, 1978).
 11 Irrigated acreage statewide increased by more than 400 percent between the 1850s and 1990s (Olmstead
 12 and Rhode, 2004).

¹Figure 2-12
Development of Agriculture and Municipal Water Supplies in California
Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Research, 1978




1 Since the 1970s, agricultural water usage has varied between 38 million acre feet and 42 million acre feet
 2 per year statewide due to decreasing crop acreage, crop changes, water management, and better irrigation
 3 systems. For the last 20 years, this usage has been at the lower end of the range, as is shown in Figure 2-
 4 13. Between 1972 and 2002, the most significant change in water use occurred from changes in crop
 5 planting and water management, including (DWR, 2009):

- 6 ♦ A reduction from 67 to 42 percent in the amount of field crop planted
- 7 ♦ A reduction of 31 percent in the amount of surface irrigation
- 8 ♦ An increase from 6 to 16 percent in vineyard production
- 9 ♦ An increase from 15 to 31 percent in orchard production
- 10 ♦ A 33 percent increase in low-volume (drip) irrigation

11 Also, land conversion from agricultural to urban use, following , or ecosystem restoration has occurred in
 12 Southern California (over 119,000 acres) and portions of the Central Valley (631,000 acres), further
 13 reducing agricultural water use.

Figure 2-13
 Agricultural Water Use and Irrigated Acreage in California
 Source: DWR, 2009; DWR and CDFA, 2008



14

1 Water to Meet Environmental Requirements

2 In the California Water Plan, environmental water use includes instream flows, Wild and Scenic River
3 flows, required Delta outflow, and flows to state and federal wildlife refuges and other managed wetlands.
4 The Water Plan used the “environmental use” category to account for these flows in the water balance.
5 Some of this environmental water is reused by agricultural and urban water users downstream.

6 Water supplies in California have not always been dedicated to environmental uses. Over time, California
7 has lost over 90 percent of its natural wetlands, and natural flow patterns in a majority of the state’s rivers
8 were regulated for flood control or water supply. Ecosystems in many areas of the state have declined due
9 to invasive species, water quality impairments, watershed operations, lack of suitable habitat, and other
10 issues. As Californians identified environmental needs, regulators and water managers responded. For
11 example, in 1993, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) was passed, which dedicated a
12 portion of the yield of the CVP to protect, restore, and enhance fish and wildlife habitats in the Central
13 Valley and Trinity River Basins. A portion of the water project yield was then allocated to environmental
14 uses instead of delivering this water to agricultural and urban uses. A number of other flow and water
15 quality standards have also been set, including seasonal instream flow requirements to support migrating
16 fish and water quality targets to support fish life cycles.

17 Recent Bay-Delta flow requirements are contained in the 2006 Bay-Delta Plan and in Decision 1641 (D-
18 1641). In these plans, Delta outflow requirements generally take two basic forms based on water year type
19 and season:

- 20 ♦ Specific numerical Delta outflow requirements
- 21 ♦ Position of “X2”, an expression of a distance from the Golden Gate Bridge to a particular salinity
22 condition¹

23 Following implementation of D-1641, salmonid and Delta smelt populations in the Delta watershed
24 continued to decline. These declines have led to issuance of biological opinions starting in the early
25 1990s. The requirements also have been modified by judicial decisions and additional restrictions.
26 Recently two biological opinions were issued that provided for improved habitat conditions in the Delta
27 and the Delta watershed.

- 28 ♦ On December 15, 2008, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service issued a biological opinion
29 on the Long-Term Operational Criteria and Plan (OCAP) for coordination of the CVP and SWP.
30 The Reasonable and Prudent Alternative (RPA) applies to delta smelt and focuses primarily on
31 managing flow regimes to reduce entrainment of delta smelt, the extent of suitable water
32 conditions in the Delta, and on habitat restoration.
- 33 ♦ On June 4, 2009, the National Marine Fisheries Service issued its Biological and Conference
34 Opinion on the OCAP, which provides RPA actions to protect winter-run and spring-run Chinook
35 salmon, Central Valley steelhead, green sturgeon, and killer whales from water project effects in
36 the Delta and in upstream areas. The RPA addresses actions related to flow and temperature
37 management, gravel augmentation, fish passage and reintroduction, gate operations and
38 installation, fish screen funding, floodplain and habitat restoration, hatchery management, export
39 restrictions, CVP and SWP fish collection facility modifications, adaptive management,
40 monitoring and reporting, and other actions.

41 Both opinions are the subject of ongoing litigation, which creates uncertainty about their implementation
42 and about the reliability of water supplies from the Delta.

¹ The horizontal distance in kilometers up the axis of the estuary from the Golden Gate Bridge to where the tidally averaged near-bottom salinity is 2 practical saline units (psu).

1 In 2009, the Delta Reform Act required the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to develop
2 flow criteria for the Delta ecosystem and the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) to identify quantifiable
3 biological objectives and flow criteria for at-risk species in the Delta. These reports were required in part
4 to inform the planning processes of the Delta Plan and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP).

5 ♦ In August 2010, the SWRCB completed a report identifying flow criteria for the Delta ecosystem.
6 The report includes the volume, timing, and quality of flow for the protection of public trust
7 resources under different existing hydrologic conditions. Although narrow in scope, the report
8 contains a summary of the specific flow needs for certain species based on the most recent and
9 available science. The report concluded that there is sufficient scientific information to support
10 the need for increased flows to protect public trust resources.

11 ♦ In September 2010, DFG completed a draft report identifying quantifiable biological objectives
12 and flow criteria for aquatic and terrestrial species of concern dependent on the Delta. To date,
13 DFG has identified 21 streams that need instream flow objectives set and another 22 streams that
14 need to be investigated in the future. These identified streams are listed in Table 2-3. A number of
15 these stream segments are located within the Delta watershed, and meeting these objectives could
16 impact water availability.

17 The results of these flow criteria studies are to be used to inform ongoing programs, including
18 development of the Delta Plan. The flow criteria cannot be used solely by the SWRCB to develop overall
19 flow criteria for Delta and the tributaries without consideration for flow needs for other beneficial uses,
20 including water supplies and recreation.

21

1

Table 2-1
Department of Fish and Game List of Streams for Instream Flow Studies

Streams That Require Objectives Now		Streams Where Future Studies Are Needed	
Stream	County	Stream	County
Carmel River	Monterey	Butte Creek	Butte
Redwood Creek	Marin	Toulumne River (below La Grange Dam)	Stanislaus
Brush Creek	Mendocino	San Gregorio Creek (lower)	San Mateo
Lower American River	Sacramento	North Fork of Mavarro River	Mendocino
Lagunitas Creek	Marin	Big Sur River	Monterey
Lake Tahoe Basin	Multiple	Santa Maria River	Santa Barbara
North Fork Feather River	Multiple	Redwood Creek (tributary to Maacama)	Sonoma
Upper West Fork San Gabriel River	Los Angeles	Bear River (Below Camp Far West)	Placer and Nevada
Yuba River	Yuba	Shasta River	Siskiyou
Rush Creek	Mono	Carmel River	Monterey
Lower Mokelumne Rive	San Joaquin	Santa Margarita River	Riverside
Parker Creek	Mono	Merced River (below Crocker-Huffman Dam)	Merced
South Parker Creek	Mono	Redwood Creek (tributary to Napa River)	Napa
Walker Creek	Mono	Scott River	Siskiyou
Upper Owens River	Mono	Mattole River (near Whiethorn)	Humboldt
Lee Vining Creek	Mono	Dry Creek (tributary to Napa River)	Napa
Merced River	Merced	Deer Creek (tributary to Yuba River)	Nevada
Scott Creek	Santa Cruz	Mojave River	Riverside
Mill Creek	Mono	Carpentaria Creek	Santa Barbara
Truckee River Basin	Multiple	Santa Ana River	Riverside and San Bernardino
Battle Creek	Shasta and Tehama	Middle Fork Feather River	Plumas
		Dos Pueblos Creek	Santa Barbara

2

3

1 Total Water Use in California

2 A majority of the water used in California is within the Delta watershed and areas that use water exported
 3 from the Delta, as shown in Figure 2-14. Southern California has the largest population as well as urban
 4 use in the state. Agricultural use is highest in the Sacramento River, San Joaquin, and Tulare Lake areas.
 5 Flow restrictions to meet environmental requirements are highest in the North Coast, Sacramento River,
 6 San Joaquin, and Tulare Lake areas. Figure 2-15 shows the changes in water use distribution due to
 7 climate changes based on a wet (1998), normal (2000), and dry year (2001). Urban (2 percent change) and
 8 agricultural (11 percent change) use increases and environmental water (13 percent change) decreases in
 9 drier years. Environmental (28 percent decrease) and agricultural (23 percent increase) use have the
 10 largest swing between wet and dry years.

11 **Figure 2-14**
 Total Water Use in California
 Source: DWR, 2009





Figure 2-15
Total Water Use in California
Source: DWR, 2005



1
2

1
2

Section 3 Water Supply Development


3 This section of the white paper will discuss water supply development and management in California to
 4 meet changing water needs. Water resources were developed by first using local water resources.
 5 Development included groundwater pumping, local stream runoff and river diversions, and local
 6 reservoirs. These resources were adequate to allow population growth until the 1920s and 1930s when
 7 groundwater overdrafting and water scarcity challenged the water-poor areas of California. Major water
 8 supply projects were developed, including reservoirs constructed to impound stream and flood flows as
 9 well as aqueducts and canals to move water to areas where water was insufficient to meet demands. In the
 10 1970s and 1980s, water conservation and water recycling were implemented in some areas of the state to
 11 fully utilize existing water resources. Groundwater
 12 recharge and conjunctive use projects also were
 13 implemented to replenish and manage groundwater
 14 resources. Brackish or saline water supplies
 15 (including groundwater, surface water, and seawater)
 16 have also been developed to help meet water
 17 demands. Appendix A summarizes major events in
 18 water development in California. The following
 19 section will provide an overview of how Delta water
 20 is used and its role California water development.

21 Sacramento – San Joaquin 22 Delta

23 The Delta is at the center of water in California.
 24 Water from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers
 25 flows into the Delta. Runoff into the Delta averages
 26 about 21 million acre-feet per year, which is 42
 27 percent of the surface water in California (DWR,
 28 2009). This is the reason a majority of the state relies
 29 on the Delta for water.

30 Figure 3-1 shows water movement into and out of the
 31 Delta. The natural Delta system consists of water
 32 inflows from upstream tributaries and outflow to the
 33 Suisun and San Francisco Bay. Over time this pattern


Figure 3-1
Water Movement through the Delta
Source: LAO, 2008



1 has been changed by exporting water to areas where local supplies cannot support existing water needs.
 2 Water is moved from the water-rich Delta to other areas of the state that may not be adequately supported
 3 by local supplies. These areas include densely populated areas (i.e., San Francisco and southern
 4 California) and agricultural areas (i.e., San Joaquin Valley and Tulare Lake). The next subsections of this
 5 white paper will discuss major water projects that have been developed to move Delta water to users.

6 Figure 3-2 shows the amount of water that is exported and flows annually from the Delta. Water from the
 7 Delta watershed is used by in-Delta and upstream diverters, provided to meet flow requirements for
 8 ecosystem health and to prevent salinity intrusion, and exported to southern and central California to
 9 supply urban and agricultural uses. This runoff supplies one-quarter of the state’s urban water supply and
 10 is a major source to two-thirds of California’s population (DWR, 2009). Runoff to the Delta also supplies
 11 water to over 700 million acres of irrigated land (Reclamation, 2009b). Figure 3-2 also shows the
 12 variability in Delta exports based on water availability in the system. The reduction of flow from the
 13 droughts of 1959-61, 1976-77, 1987-92, and 2007-09 (DWR, 2010) has impacted water availability from
 14 the Delta. These flow reductions impact water supply available for urban and agricultural uses.

Figure 3-2
Delta Exports and Outflows
Source: DWR, 2009; DWR’s Dayflow Model



15

16 Delta Water Quality

17 Water quality in the Delta, especially salinity, is impacted by climatic conditions (freshwater inflows and
 18 drought cycles), upstream and in-Delta uses, tidal influences, and in-Delta and export diversions and
 19 operations. Water quality is better in the north Delta than in the central and southern Delta. Specific water
 20 quality issues within the Delta include salinity, Total Organic Carbon (TOC), turbidity, bromide,
 21 pesticides, mercury pathogens, ammonia, and dissolved oxygen. Salinity has been the most important of
 22 these concerns because it can impair the use of water by municipal, industrial, and agricultural users and
 23 aquatic organisms. Specific factors that may cause salinity to exceed water quality objectives in the Delta
 24 include:

- 1 ♦ Seawater intrusion from the Pacific Ocean and San Francisco Bay during high tides and relatively
2 low fresh water outflows in the western Delta
- 3 ♦ Salts from San Joaquin River outflows originating in agricultural return flows and from
4 municipalities as well as other sources in the southern Delta
- 5 ♦ In-Delta irrigation return flows that result in localized increases in salinity in dead-end sloughs
6 and low-capacity channels (null zones) at Old River between Sugar Cut and the CVP intake,
7 Middle River between Victoria canal and Old River, and the San Joaquin River between the head
8 of Old River and the City of Stockton (SWRCB, 2010)

9 Salinity in the western Delta depends on freshwater inflows from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers,
10 wind movement from the Golden Gate, and daily tidal actions. Early reports from a Spanish expedition in
11 1775 and a United States expedition in 1841 indicated that fresh water was located near the confluence of
12 the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, possibly near New York Slough (approximately near the
13 Pittsburg-Antioch city border). Antioch established a freshwater intake in the 1860s on the San Joaquin
14 River near the present State Highway 12 Bridge. Numerous cities and industries between Crockett and
15 Antioch established freshwater intakes in the late 1800s. However, some of these intakes were abandoned
16 due to high salinity and water pollution from upstream wastewater discharges, including the City of
17 Pittsburg intake that was replaced with groundwater wells in the early 1920s. However, there were
18 indications that brackish water occurred near the confluence of the two rivers during dry periods (DWR,
19 1931). The California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corporation hauled water to the Crockett plant from
20 the Delta until 1920 when water was hauled from Marin County. The summary of the records from the
21 refinery indicate that freshwater was obtained near the river confluence in most years except during late
22 summer or droughts between 1908 and 1920. The summary of the records indicate that Suisun Bay was
23 characterized as fresh in most years between 1908 and 1929 except during droughts.


24 Records indicated that the combined Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers average annual flow between
25 1871 and 1929 was about 31,000,000 acre-feet per year (DWR, 1931). However, the average from 1909
26 to 1929 was 24,000,000 acre-feet per year and the average between 1919 and 1929 was 19,000,000 acre-
27 feet per year. The reduction in flow was partially caused by reduction in average rainfall from numerous
28 wet years between 1871 to 1917 as compared to the dry years in the 1918 through 1929 period, which
29 included the beginning of the longest drought of historical record in California (1927-1934). The inflows
30 also were reduced due to increased irrigation in the upper watersheds. By 1929, over 1,317,000 acres
31 were irrigated in the watershed and between 1915 and 1920 the irrigated acreage increased by 67,000
32 acres per year due to the development of rice that used water between April and October when the salt
33 water intrusion was the most severe. During this same period, reservoir capacity in the watershed
34 increased from 350,000 acre-feet in 1910 to more than 4,000,000 acre-feet in 1929. Historic salinity
35 intrusion in the Delta is shown in Figure 3-3.

36 The state initiated the first Delta salinity investigation in 1916. The City of Antioch filed a lawsuit in
37 1920 against water users in the upper watershed based upon reduction in water quality of their water right.
38 The State Supreme Court ruled against the City of Antioch because the court indicated that the water right
39 on the San Joaquin River was for diversion and could not be used to require upstream diverters to leave
40 enough water in the river to reduce salt water intrusion below the point of diversion. However, the
41 litigation brought attention to the Delta salinity issue and further investigations were completed in the
42 1920s, 1930s, 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. In the 1950s and 1960s, the state investigated establishment of
43 salt water barriers on the Sacramento River near Steamboat Slough and Walnut Grove, on Cache and
44 Lindsay sloughs, and possibly barriers on the San Joaquin River near Paradise Cut (DWR, 1957).

45 Following completion of the SWP, DWR signed agreements with North Delta Water Agency, City of
46 Antioch, and Byron-Bethany Irrigation District to maintain freshwater salinity concentrations in the western
47 and northern Delta under specific provisions. Since 1967, the salinity limitations have been met except for

- 1 the agreement with the City of Antioch. When salinity at the Antioch water supply intake is too high, the
- 2 city purchases water from Contra Costa Water District that uses upstream water intakes and the DWR
- 3 partially reimburses the city for these purchases.

Figure 3-3
Historical Salinity Intrusion in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
Source: Jackson and Patterson, 1977



4

1 Salinity has continued to increase over the past 100 years as additional water has been diverted upstream of
2 the Delta and within the Delta. DWR and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) model projections
3 indicate that salinity intrusion will continue to increase with sea level rise. Currently, the SWRCB is
4 working to update salinity requirements in the San Joaquin Valley. The focus of this effort is to reduce
5 salinity inflows into the Delta as well as protect south Delta agricultural uses. Salinity from the San Joaquin
6 River occurs due to upstream water development (i.e., reduced flows), agricultural land use, irrigation
7 return flows, and wastewater discharges (Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2003).
8 Upstream water development including dams, canals, reservoirs, and diversions reduce the historic flow in
9 the river. This also is impacted by seasonal inflows of agricultural return flows, which increase salinity in
10 the river. Agricultural practices, subsurface accretions from groundwater, and imported water are sources of
11 salinity. Salinity will continue to be an issue in the future and could result in the need for additional changes
12 in CVP and SWP operations for ecosystem needs as well as construction of treatment plants to reduce
13 concentrations for water users.

14 Surface Water

15 Surface water has been used to meet water demands in California since it was first settled. Initially local
16 water supplies were developed by diverting flow and damming rivers. This was sufficient to meet
17 demands until the 1920s and 1930s when demand for irrigated crops and migration into southern
18 California increased following completion of the transcontinental railroad. Between the 1920s and 1970s,
19 a number of regional and statewide interbasin transfers were developed to meet expanding water needs in
20 the state as population and agriculture expanded. These transfers included reservoirs as well as major
21 aqueduct or canal systems. The Toulumne and Mokelumne Aqueducts, Central Valley Project, State
22 Water Project, Los Angeles Aqueduct, and Colorado River Aqueduct were all developed during this
23 timeframe.

24 Surface Water Storage


25 Local water supplies have been developed on a majority of rivers in California by diverting or impounding
26 water. There is some evidence that Native Americans modified overflow basins on a local basis in the
27 Owens and Imperial valleys to expand areas that naturally flooded for the purpose of expanding areas with
28 useful native vegetation (OPR, 1979 - California Water Plan). Spanish missionaries and settlers built the
29 Zanja Madre to convey water from the Porciuncula River to the Pueblo de Los Angeles and adjacent
30 irrigated lands in the 1770s. During the same time, a 12-foot-high dam and a 245-foot-high dam were
31 constructed on the San Diego River along with over 6 miles of canals to convey water to Mission San
32 Diego. In southern California agencies developed water on the Los Angeles, San Gabriel, Santa Ana, San
33 Dieguito, Sweetwater, and Otay Rivers and their tributaries. Along the Central Coast, water supply was
34 developed on the Pajaro, Santa Maria, and Santa Ynez rivers and their tributaries. In northern California,
35 local water supply was developed on the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and Coyote, Putah, San
36 Antonio, and San Leandro creeks.

37 Reservoirs and dams have been constructed since the late 1800s by local, state, federal, and private
38 entities, such as power companies, for water impoundment, flood control, and hydroelectric power
39 generation. Figure 3-4 shows the growth in reservoir capacity across the state over time. A majority of
40 these reservoirs were developed after the 1920s as part of regional or statewide interbasin transfer
41 projects. There are approximately 1,400 dams in the state of California, 85 percent of which are regulated
42 by the State of California and the remainder by the federal government. Of the 1,400 dams, 913 have a
43 storage capacity less than 1,000 acre-feet, 328 have capacity between 1,000 and 9,000 acre-feet, and
44 approximately 204 have a capacity more than 10,000 acre-feet.

45 In the Delta watershed and use areas, there are over 178 major dams (i.e., capacity over 10,000 acre-feet)
46 with a total capacity of over 37 million acre-feet. Over half of this capacity is stored in the ten largest

1 reservoirs (Shasta, Oroville, Trinity, New Melones, B.F. Sisk, Don Pedro, Monticello, Lake Almanor,
2 New Exchequer, and Pine Flat). Lake Shasta and Lake Oroville are the two largest reservoirs with
3 capacities of 4,552,000 and 3,537,577 acre-feet, respectively. A listing of dams with storage capacities
4 greater than 10,000 acre-feet that serve water users from the Delta watershed is presented in Table B-1 in
5 Appendix B DWR, 2010c).

Figure 3-4
Development of Surface Water Storage in California
Source: Division of Safety of Dams



6
7 **Major Interbasin Transfers**

8 A number of major interbasin transfer projects have been developed since the 1920s in California. These
9 were constructed to convey water from the higher elevations to irrigated lands and communities in the
10 Central Valley and coastal areas of central and southern California. These projects consisted of major
11 reservoirs and aqueduct systems and were designed as a permanent solution to water supply issues in
12 California. In recent years due to ecosystem requirements, biological opinions, court decisions and
13 droughts, these transfers have been reduced, which impacted water supply availability in areas reliant on
14 transferred water. Major interbasin transfer projects discussed in this white paper include:

- 15 ♦ Mokelumne/Tuolumne Transfers, including the Mokelumne and Hetch Hetchy Aqueducts
16 ♦ Central Valley Project and State Water Project
17 ♦ Southern California Aqueducts, including the Los Angeles and Colorado River Aqueducts

18 **Mokelumne/Tuolumne Transfers**

19 One of the first projects to import water from a non-adjacent watershed was the City of San Francisco's
20 Hetch Hetchy project. Following the discovery of gold, San Francisco's population grew from 400
21 residents in 1848 to over 150,000 in the 1870s. Private water companies developed water rights in areas
22 near the city. The cost of water increased as conveyance and storage systems were expanded. By 1900,
23 local water supplies were fully developed, and a portion of the water supply was imported by barges from
24 Marin County (Hudley, 2001). As the price of water service increased, the city initiated studies in 1882 to

1 consider developing the Hetch Hetchy project. In 1890, Congress included Hetch Hetchy and Yosemite
 2 valleys in the newly established Yosemite National Park. In 1903, the city applied to the federal Interior
 3 Department to develop water storage in Hetch Hetchy Valley. The permit was denied in 1903 and 1905.
 4 In 1913, the federal government adopted the Raker Act, which allowed construction of the Hetch Hetchy
 5 project on federal land. The project was completed by 1934.

6 A similar project was developed by East Bay Municipal Utility District, which was formed in 1923 to
 7 serve the eastern portions of the San Francisco Bay Area near the City of Oakland. Water storage was
 8 developed on the Mokelumne River. The Pardee Dam and Mokelumne Aqueduct were completed in
 9 1929. Figure 3- 5 provides a system map of the Hetch Hetchy and Mokelumne Aqueducts.

Figure 3-5
 Existing San Francisco Bay Area Water Supply Facilities
 Source: BAWAC, 2006a



1 ***Central Valley Project and State Water Project***

2 During the 1920s, the California state legislature commissioned a series of investigations to further
3 evaluate the Marshall Plan and other concepts to reduce salinity intrusion in the Delta and provide water
4 to areas of the San Joaquin Valley with extreme groundwater overdraft. Most of the alternatives included
5 construction of reservoirs in Northern California and conveyance to the Delta and San Joaquin Valley
6 water users in isolated canals, or by using Delta channels with a cross-Delta channel that would convey
7 water from the Sacramento River near Walnut Grove to the San Joaquin River. In 1930, DWR Bulletin
8 No. 25, “Report to the Legislature of 1931 on State Water Plan,” outlined a statewide water plan that
9 included conservation and water resources facilities development and utilization. The legislature approved
10 the plan in 1941 as the State Water Plan, which included a description of facilities that would eventually
11 be constructed as part of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP). Figure 3-6
12 shows a map of the CVP and SWP systems.

13 **Central Valley Project**

14 The CVP is the largest surface water storage and delivery system in California, with a geographic scope
15 covering 35 of the state’s 58 counties. The project includes 20 reservoirs, with a combined storage
16 capacity of approximately 11 million acre-feet; 8 power plants and 2 pumping-generating plants, with a
17 combined capacity of approximately 2 million kilowatts; and approximately 500 miles of major canals
18 and aqueducts. Figure 3-6 shows the locations of CVP facilities, rivers that are controlled or affected by
19 the operation of CVP facilities, and the CVP service area.

20 The CVP delivers water in accordance with requirements of water right settlement and exchange contracts
21 with the CVP, water rights agreements with the CVP, water quality requirements established by the
22 SWRCB, refuge water supplies and fish and wildlife requirements in accordance with the Central Valley
23 Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) (Public Law 102-575), and water service contractors in the Central
24 Valley, Santa Clara Valley, and the San Francisco Bay Area. Fish and wildlife requirements were initially
25 added to the CVP purposes in 1954 when Congress adopted the Grassland Development Act to cooperate
26 with the state to supply water to Grasslands Resource Conservation District for waterfowl cooperation. In
27 1958, Congress adopted the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to integrate U.S. Fish and Wildlife
28 Service (USFWS) conservation programs with federal water resources facilities, to authorize facilities to
29 mitigate CVP-induced damages to fish and wildlife resources, and to require consultation for CVP
30 facilities with USFWS. Table 3-1 provides a timeline of major CVP development milestone.

31 **State Water Project**

32 The State Water Project is the largest state-built, multi-purpose, user-financed water project in the
33 country. The project includes 20 reservoirs, with a combined storage capacity of approximately 5.8
34 million acre-feet; 6 power plants and 4 pumping-generating plants, with a combined capacity of
35 approximately 2.6 million kilowatts, and approximately 700 miles of major canals and aqueducts. Figure
36 3-6 shows the locations of SWP facilities.

37 In 1947, the state began an investigation to consider the next phases of the California Water Plan to meet
38 the state’s anticipated water needs through development of the SWP and to control salinity intrusion in
39 the Delta. In 1953, the state adopted the Abshire-Kelly Salinity Control Barrier Act to evaluate placement
40 of a saltwater barrier near Suisun Bay to protect Delta water users and allow transfer of freshwater from
41 the Sacramento Valley to the San Joaquin Valley. This plan was not adopted primarily because of costs
42 and technical considerations.

Figure 3-6
 CVP and SWP Facilities
 Source: DWR, 2009



1 **Table 3-1**
2 **Major CVP Development Milestones**

1933	Central Valley Planning Act	Authorization for Sale of \$170 million in Bonds for the construction of Shasta Dam and power plants on the Sacramento River; Friant Dam on the San Joaquin River; power transmission facilities from the Shasta Dam to Tracy; and the Contra Costa, Madera, and Friant-Kern canals
1930-1940s	Great Depression	
1935	Rivers and Harbors Act of 1935	Congress appropriated \$20 million in Emergency Relief Appropriation Funds and authorized construction of the CVP by the USACE.
1937	Reauthorization of Rivers and Harbors Act	Construction and operation of the CVP was assigned to Reclamation, and the CVP became subject to reclamation law
1937	Construction of Contra Costa Canal	
1938	Construction of Shasta Dam begins	
1944	Shasta Dam Construction Completed	
	Flood Control Act	Authorization for construction of New Melones Dam and Reservoir on the Stanislaus River by the USACE to alleviate serious flooding problems along the Stanislaus and lower San Joaquin rivers
1945-1949	Friant Dam, and the Madera, Friant-Kern, and Contra Costa canals Construction Completed	
1949	American River Act	Authorized the American River Division of the CVP and provided for the construction of Folsom and Nimbus dams, lakes, and power plants
1950	Reauthorization of American River Act	Reauthorize the entire CVP to include the Sacramento River Division, which includes facilities to divert and deliver water from the Sacramento River to lands in the western Sacramento Valley by the Tehama Colusa Canal
1951	Cross Channel, Tracy Pumping Plant, and Delta-Mendota Canal Construction Completed	Delivery of water to the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors
1955	Trinity River Division authorized	Authorized storage of water in the Trinity River Basin, transfer of stored water to the Sacramento River Basin, and generation hydroelectric energy
1960	San Luis Unit Authorized	
1961	Federal State Agreement on San Luis Unit construction	
1962	Flood Control Act Reauthorized	New Melones Dam and Reservoir incorporated into CVP Eastside Operations
1965	Auburn-Folsom South Unit Authorized	Authorized to increase the water supply available for irrigation and other beneficial uses in the Central Valley
1967	San Felipe Division Authorized	Authorized to provide water supplies to portions of the Santa Clara and Pajaro valleys from the San Luis Reservoir
1975	Cross Valley Canal Construction Completed	Deliver CVP water to users in the Tulare Lake Region
1979	New Melones Reservoir Construction Completed	

3

1 In 1957, DWR's Bulletin No. 3 was published to define the need for the SWP and the facilities to convey
2 water from the Sacramento Valley to water-short areas of California. The report identified that there was
3 urgency to expand the statewide water facilities due to projected population growth to support a balanced
4 economy, major industrial growth, an agricultural industry that supported 6,875,000 acres of irrigated
5 agriculture (approximately 25 percent of all agricultural acreage in the United States), and flood control in
6 Northern California. The study identified a seasonal deficiency of 2,675,000 acre-feet of water in 1950
7 that had been met with groundwater pumping primarily from overdrafted aquifers.

8 In 1960, California voters authorized the Burns-Porter Act to construct the initial projects of the SWP,
9 including Oroville Dam and Lake Oroville on the Feather River, the San Luis Dam and Reservoir to be
10 jointly constructed and operated with Reclamation, the North and South Bay aqueducts, and the
11 California Aqueduct, leading to the SWP as it exists today.


12 ***Southern California Aqueducts***

13 The City of Los Angeles diverted water from the Los Angeles River into a system of zanjas (canals),
14 which provided adequate water supply for a population of 9,000 in the 1870s (Mulholland, 2000). These
15 local sources were expanded with new reservoirs and development of groundwater and artesian springs to
16 meet the increasing population of 100,000 by the early 1900s. To meet the projected growth, the city
17 constructed the Los Angeles Owens Aqueduct to Owens Lake in 1913. The aqueduct was extended to
18 Mono Lake in 1941. A second Los Angeles Aqueduct was constructed in the 1960s to perfect (claim) the
19 water rights from Mono Lake and the Owens Valley. In 1983 due to concerns over ecosystem impacts due
20 to water diversion from Mono Lake, the National Audubon Society v. LADWP court decision created the
21 Public Trust doctrine, which allowed the RWQCB to amend and reduce LADWP's existing water rights
22 appropriation in the Owens Valley, which it did in 1994. Since that time, water from the Los Angeles
23 Aqueduct averages between 106,000 acre-feet (dry years) and 256,000 acre-feet (wet year).

24 Southern California also developed water supplies from the Colorado River. Colorado River water had
25 been delivered to the Imperial Valley since the 1870s. Imperial Irrigation District was organized in 1911
26 to further develop water diversion from the Colorado River. By the 1920s, substantial water was diverted
27 by numerous states in the Colorado River watershed, and supplies were not sufficient in drier years. In
28 1922, the Colorado River Compact was signed to allocate water between the seven Colorado River Basin
29 states. In 1928, Congress adopted the Boulder Canyon Project Act to construct Hoover Dam and the All
30 American Canal, which would deliver up to 4.4 million acre-feet per year of water to California. The
31 California Seven Party Agreement of 1931 allocated the Colorado River water supply within California,
32 including the provision of water supplies to Imperial Irrigation District and San Diego. The City and
33 County of San Diego allocation was transferred to Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
34 (Metropolitan) when San Diego joined the regional agency. Construction on the Colorado River Aqueduct
35 was completed in 1941. A Supreme Court Decision (Arizona v. California) in 1963 cut water supplies
36 from the Colorado River in half reducing imported water supplies to the State. This decision limited
37 California rights on the Colorado to 4.4 million acre-feet plus half the surplus water. The Quantification
38 Settlement Agreement (QSA) was reached in 2003, which quantifies the priority of rights on the lower
39 Colorado River as well as establishes a transfer of water conserved from lining the All American Canal
40 from Imperial ID (IID) to San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA). Water supply reliability
41 continues to be a concern in the Colorado River Basin as water use is increasing while Colorado River
42 flows are generally decreasing (on a ten-year average). Figure 3-7 shows that the long-term trend of water
43 use surpassing flows in the river (as shown on Figure 3-7.)

44 Figure 3-6 shows the location of both the Los Angeles and Colorado River Aqueducts.

Figure 3-7
Colorado River Supply and Demand
Source: Reclamation, 2010



1

2 Groundwater

3 California uses 20 percent of groundwater extracted in the United States (DWR, 2003). Groundwater
 4 provides, on average, about 30 percent of the State’s water supply for urban and agricultural uses.
 5 Approximately half of all Californians depend on groundwater for part of their water supply. In dry years,
 6 groundwater provides over 60 percent of the water supply in some regions of California. Significant
 7 groundwater use occurs in the San Joaquin, Tulare Lake, Sacramento Valley, Central Coast, and South
 8 Coast regions of California. Over a third of groundwater use in California occurs in the Tulare Lake
 9 Basin. Figure 3-8 provides a summary of the groundwater use in each hydrologic region of the state.

10 Groundwater has never been managed by the State; management has been considered a local
 11 responsibility by the State legislature (DWR, 2003). Management of groundwater is addressed locally
 12 through local ordinances, authority granted under the Water Code, or through adjudication. There are 515
 13 delineated groundwater basins in California but only 22 basins are adjudicated, as shown in Figure 3-9.
 14 Adjudication of groundwater basins usually occurs when basin demand exceeds supply and the court must
 15 decide how much groundwater can be extracted from a basin.


16 Groundwater was an attractive water supply for early settlers of California due to its widespread
 17 availability. Artesian wells were initially used in the San Joaquin Valley, Los Angeles area, and San
 18 Francisco Bay Area to provide irrigation water in areas not located near major surface water. Individuals
 19 and families could simply dig a well or spring and develop a convenient source of water to support

1 domestic use as well as other activities such as mining or agriculture. The development of groundwater
2 supplies expanded during the early 1900s due to the availability of gasoline engines, electric power, and
3 centrifugal pumps, which enabled people to pump larger quantities of water from wells.

4 During the 1920s, the development of deep-well turbine pumps and the availability of electricity in rural
5 areas further increased the use of groundwater for irrigating agriculture. The use of pumps enabled
6 farmers to irrigate large areas of land with low capital costs, resulting in a significant expansion of
7 agriculture. Deep well pumps also allowed municipalities to provide dependable supplies in areas with
8 minimal stream flow during the dry season. In the San Joaquin Valley, over 500 artesian wells and almost
9 600 electric- or gas-driven wells existed in 1906. By 1920, there were over 11,000 electric or gas-driven
10 wells in the San Joaquin Valley. Groundwater overdrafts occurred rapidly in areas with low recharge
11 rates.

12 Groundwater overdraft occurs when the water pumped exceeds the amount of water that naturally
13 recharges the basin. In an overdrafted basin, groundwater levels decline and never fully recover, even
14 during wet years. The consequences of overdraft include increased extraction costs, land subsidence, and
15 water quality degradation. A comprehensive assessment of groundwater overdraft in California has not
16 been completed since the publication of the 1980 edition of DWR's Bulletin 118 but, DWR estimates that
17 statewide groundwater overdraft is somewhere between one and two million acre feet per year. A
18 significant amount of this overdraft occurs in the Central Valley, particularly in the Tulare Lake Basin.
19 Groundwater overdraft and management is discussed in the following sections using three case studies
20 (Tulare Lake Overdraft, Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Management, and Central Basin Management).

Figure 3-8
Groundwater Use in California
Source: DWR, 2009



1

1. Total Water Use is defined as the sum of water uses for agricultural, urban, and managed wetlands.

Figure 3-9
Groundwater Basins in California



WSCO CA ADJUDICATED GW BASINS.MXD KWILSON4 12/1/2010 13:36:04

1 Case Study: Tulare Lake Overdraft

2 In the mid-1800s, most of the agricultural production in the San Joaquin Valley was related to grain and
3 cattle production on overflow lands. Irrigated agriculture grew from less than 200,000 acres in 1880 to
4 about 2,500,000 acres in 1960. Surface water was primarily used in this area from the 1860s until the
5 1927-1934 drought. Reliance on groundwater during that and subsequent dry years caused a substantial
6 decline in groundwater elevations.


7 Studies were initiated in the late 1800s and early 1900s to identify methods to reduce groundwater
8 overdrafts in the Fresno and Tulare basin areas of the San Joaquin Valley. In the late 1940s and early
9 1950s, the Friant-Kern facilities were completed to provide imported water to this area from the San
10 Joaquin River. However, groundwater pumping continued to provide a major portion of water supplies in
11 the area along the eastern San Joaquin Valley from the Mokelumne River to the Tehachapi Mountains. By
12 1960, there were about 40,000 wells in this area and groundwater elevations in much of the southern San
13 Joaquin Valley had declined 50 to more than 200 feet between the spring of 1947 and the spring of 1957
14 (Reclamation, 1966). The decline in groundwater elevations was moderated in portions of this area
15 following implementation of the Friant-Kern Canal. However, much of this area was not included in the
16 CVP service area.

17 The 1956 Bulletin No. 3 (DWR, 1957) reported that about 8,250,000 acre-feet of groundwater was
18 withdrawn in 1954 in the San Joaquin Valley, or 66 percent of the total groundwater used in the state.
19 That report indicated that the ultimate water demand in the San Joaquin Valley of 16,310,000 acre-feet
20 per year would require up to 8,330,000 acre-feet per year of imported water and development of
21 7,980,000 acre-feet per year from regional surface water and groundwater supplies. The revised 1957
22 Bulletin No. 3 (DWR, 1957) identified the San Joaquin Valley groundwater overdraft as 1,900,000 acre-
23 feet per year following the importation of 1,365,000 acre-feet per year from the CVP. This report
24 recommended that up to 7,800,000 acre-feet per year of imported water be provided to the San Joaquin
25 Valley with expanded local surface water and groundwater storage of up to 7,700,000 acre-feet per year
26 to meet the ultimate water demand of 15,500,000 acre-feet per year. The SWP was subsequently
27 developed in the late 1960s to provide up to 1,182,700 acre-feet per year of imported water. However, the
28 amount available on a long-term average annual basis is much less than the total contracted amount.

29 Several other studies were completed by Reclamation in the 1960s and 1970s that identified the need for
30 additional projects to supply water to the Central Valley; however, these projects were not developed and
31 groundwater overdraft has continued to increase, especially in the Tulare Lake basin. DWR estimated that
32 the groundwater overdraft increased from 763,000 acre-feet per year in 1975 (Bulletin 118-80) to over
33 1,000,000 acre-feet per year in 2005 (Bulletin 160-2009). Recently, the USGS, working with DWR,
34 compiled geological, water elevation, and well data throughout the valley and prepared a model to
35 simulate the groundwater conditions in the Central Valley.

36 The USGS study indicates that the substantial reduction in groundwater storage in the Tulare Lake
37 Region has occurred for several reasons. First, the Tulare Lake Region water demand has exceeded the
38 water supplies in the basin for more than 120 years. During wet years, additional water has been available
39 from runoff in the region and from the CVP and SWP exports to either directly increase groundwater
40 storage in several groundwater banks or allow the groundwater to recharge by reducing pumping and
41 relying upon the CVP and SWP supplies. During these years, groundwater storage has increased or
42 stabilized, as shown in Figure 3-10. However, over the long-term water demands in this region are greater
43 than the allocated water supplies from local runoff and groundwater recharge and CVP and SWP exports.

Figure 3-10
 Groundwater Levels in the Central Valley, 1962-2003
 Source: USGS, 2009




1

2 Case Study: Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Management

3 Groundwater supplies about half the water used in Santa Clara County. Groundwater levels in the Santa
 4 Clara basin have been declining since the 1900s and the area has experienced subsidence of over 13 feet
 5 and seawater intrusion at river mouths near the San Francisco Bay (DWR, 2003; SCVWD, 2001) as
 6 shown in Figure 3-11. Recharge in this basin occurs naturally along streambeds and artificially in
 7 instream and offstream managed basins. Storage capacity in the basin is 350,000 acre-feet. The Santa
 8 Clara Valley Water District has developed a groundwater management plan to address declining water
 9 levels, which includes groundwater monitoring, water conservation, and groundwater recharge. The
 10 SCVWD operates 18 major recharge systems covering an area of 390 acres and recharging 157,000 acre-
 11 feet annually. As seen in Figure 3-11, SCVWD management has been successful in preventing subsidence
 12 and recharging groundwater.

Figure 3-11
Groundwater Levels in the Santa Clara Basin
Source: SCVWD, 2010



1

1 Case Study: Central Basin Management

2 The Central Basin serves water to over 4 million people in 43 cities in southeast Los Angeles County. The
3 Central Basin along with the West Coast Basin comprise the Los Angeles Coastal Plain Basins. These
4 basins are managed by the Water Replenishment District of Southern California. Together these basins
5 cover approximately 420 square miles and store up to 20 million acre-feet. In the 1960s, groundwater
6 pumping exceeded 290,000 acre-feet per year in the Central Basin and 94,000 acre-feet per year in the
7 West Coast Basin. This was double the safe yield of the basin (173,400 acre-feet per year for Los Angeles
8 Coastal Plain Basins) as determined by DWR. DWR set an allowable pumping limit of 217,367 acre-feet
9 per year in the Central Basin and 64,468 acre-feet per year in the West Coast Basin.


10 The overpumping in the basins resulted in lost groundwater from storage as well as seawater intrusion in
11 the coastal edges of the aquifers. The DWR allowed pumping rate is higher than the natural recharge
12 available to the basins so SWP and recycled water are used to artificially recharge the basins. If this
13 recharge water is not available the groundwater basins are in annual overdraft. The SWP water supplied
14 for recharge is “surplus Tier 1” water from Metropolitan Water District, which is only available when
15 excess supply exists. This surplus water is typically available in seven out of ten years; however, this may
16 change in the future with increasing water demands and decreasing SWP supplies.

17 During the last ten years, there have been two years where storage was gained and eight years where
18 storage was lost. The average loss from storage has been 17,100 acre-feet per year or a total of
19 171,000 acre-feet. This loss of storage has occurred due to lack of replenishment water and dry water
20 years. This has resulted in historic lows for groundwater in the southern portion of the Central Basin and
21 average elevations in the Central Basin being near the 32 year lows as shown in Figure 3-12.

22 Metropolitan also has a conjunctive use agreement with city of Long Beach to store up to 13,000 acre-feet
23 and another agreement with Lakewood to store an additional 3,600 acre-feet. The 13,000 acre-foot
24 account was filled in 2003 and 50 percent of the 3,600 acre-foot account was filled in 2006 and 2007.
25 Metropolitan has called more than half of this water from storage. This has exacerbated the issue of
26 declining groundwater levels in the southern portion of the aquifer.

27 In November of 2010, the Water Replenishment District, who manages the basin, declared a water
28 emergency due to the declining groundwater levels. This declaration limits groundwater extraction from
29 the basin to protect the basin from further overdraft.

Figure 3-12
Average Groundwater Elevation in Key Central Basin Wells
Source: WRD, 2010



1

2 Water Recycling

3 Water recycling has been used in California since the early 1900s to augment water supplies in areas
 4 where water is scarce. Water recycling reuses an existing water source in the region for landscape
 5 irrigation, agricultural irrigation, commercial use, groundwater recharge or other miscellaneous uses. The
 6 amount of recycled water available is limited by water use and wastewater production. Therefore, if water
 7 use declines and less wastewater is produced then less recycled water would be available. Since 1970
 8 there has been a threefold increase in the amount of water recycling. In 2002, DWR estimated that
 9 between 450,000 and 580,000 acre-feet of recycled water was used in California. Recycled water is used
 10 primarily to irrigate landscapes (21 percent), irrigate agriculture (46 percent), and recharge groundwater
 11 (14 percent). This is expected to increase to between 1.85 and 2.25 million acre-feet by 2030 (DWR,
 12 2009).

13 Recycled water projects are typically developed as part of new developments (i.e., dual plumbing, where
 14 separate piping systems for both potable and recycled water are implemented) or retrofit of existing
 15 potable users. Dual plumbing is implemented in many parts of the state for new development to help meet
 16 water needs and makes construction of recycled water systems cost effective. Implementation of recycled
 17 water projects in established areas is costly and challenging due to existing infrastructure and disruption
 18 of the public. Due to the costs associated with retrofit projects, a majority of these projects are developed
 19 to serve large users (usually industrial or groundwater recharge basins) with smaller irrigation projects
 20 connected along the planned pipeline route. Maximizing reuse will require significant investment and

1 identification of large users. The following subsections will provide three case studies (Central Valley,
2 San Francisco Bay Area, and Sothern California) illustrating how water is reused in California as well as
3 issues facing the use of recycled water projects.

4 Case Study: Central Valley

5 The City of Bakersfield has reused wastewater since 1912 to irrigate crops (Asano, 1998). The city
6 continues this practice today by using recycled water for agricultural and urban irrigation as well as
7 groundwater recharge. The city is one of the largest producers of recycled water in the state. By 2025
8 recycled water use is projected to be 20,000 acre-feet per year. Recycled water use in Fresno-Clovis area
9 consists of secondary treatment of 80 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater and disposal in
10 evaporation ponds. Water in the evaporation ponds results in incidental recharge of the groundwater
11 basin. Farmers in the region also divert approximately 7,400 acre-feet per year of water from the ponds
12 for irrigation. Total recycled water produced by this effort is approximately 65,300 acre-feet per year
13 (Fresno, 2008). In addition, the North Fresno Recycled Water Project is projected to supply between 750
14 and 1,000 acre-feet per year for gold course irrigation. In most of the communities, water is recycled for
15 use by irrigators. Agricultural tailwater return systems are also used to recover and reuse water. These
16 return systems collect runoff and transport it to the main irrigation system. Recycled water also is used to
17 supply water to the Kern National Wildlife Refuge. Using recycled water to replace potable water uses
18 extends existing supplies but cannot fully address water supply needs in the Central Valley.

19 Case Study: San Francisco Bay Area

20 Water recycling was first used in the San Francisco Bay Area in 1932 when wastewater was used to
21 irrigate landscape in Golden Gate Park. However, widespread water recycling did not occur until the late
22 1980s. The East Bay Municipal Utility District currently serves the most recycled water. In 2005,
23 approximately 30,000 acre-feet per year of recycled water was produced for urban and agricultural
24 irrigation, industrial/commercial needs, and environmental restoration. Recycled water produced could
25 expand up to 125,000 acre-feet per year in 2010. Funding and institutional issues limit the amount of
26 water recycling in the Bay Area (BAWAC, 2009c). Agencies in the San Francisco Bay area have been
27 working together to gain state and federal support for water recycling projects since the late 1990s. The
28 Bay Area Regional Recycling Program was developed as part of this effort. To date, Bay Area agencies
29 have received over \$21 million in funding for water recycling projects as part of the Bureau of
30 Reclamation's Water Recycling and Reuse Program, Title XVI. However, this funding is only a portion
31 of the \$104 million needed for project development, as shown in Table 3-2. Identifying funding sources is
32 important to expanding water recycling in the San Francisco Bay Area.

33 Table 3-2

34 List of Title XVI Projects in the San Francisco Bay Area

Project	Funded under Title XVI	Total Project Cost
Pacifica Recycled Water Project - Pipeline, North Coast County Water District	\$2,203,750	\$8,815,000
San Jose Water Reclamation and Reuse Project Phase 1C, South Bay Water Recycling	\$6,460,000	\$25,830,000
South Bay Advanced Recycled Water Treatment Facility, Santa Clara Valley Water District	\$8,250,000	\$52,655,000
South Santa Clara County Recycled Water Master Plan Implementation, Santa Clara Valley Water District	\$4,350,000	\$17,116,000
Total	\$21,263,750	\$104,416,000


Source: Reclamation, 2010a

1 Case Study: Southern California

2 Recycled water has been used since 1906 in Oxnard and 1932 in the city of Pomona for irrigation
3 (Reclamation, 2006). Large-scale water reuse in the region began in the early 1960s with artificial
4 recharge of groundwater at Whittier Narrows and urban irrigation and industrial use within Irvine Ranch
5 Water District’s service area. Currently, over 400,000 acre-feet per year of recycled water has been
6 developed in Southern California (Reclamation, 2009) for groundwater recharge/seawater intrusion,
7 industrial uses, and irrigation (urban and agricultural), as shown in Figure 3-13.

8 Currently, there are over \$550 million in planned projects in Southern California that have been identified
9 and funded under Reclamation’s Title XVI (Reclamation, 2010a). In addition to the Title XVI projects,
10 there are several large-scale water recycling projects under development by local agencies, listed in Table
11 3-3. A majority of these projects are groundwater recharge projects, but the city of San Diego is
12 investigating an indirect potable reservoir augmentation project.

13 **Figure 3-13**
14 **Existing Recycled Water Use Types in Southern California Region**
15 *Source: DWR, 2009*



16
17

18 **Table 3-3**
19 **List of Potential Recycled Water Projects in Southern California**

Project Name	Description
Groundwater Reliability Improvement Program	Increase reuse at San Jose Creek WRP to include 46,000 acre-feet per year for groundwater recharge in the Central and Main San Gabriel groundwater basins by 2020
East Valley Recharge Project	Produce 33,000 acre-feet per year of advanced treated water at Donald C. Tillman WRP for recharge in San Fernando Basin
Leo J. Vander Lans Plant Expansion	Expansion of advanced treatment to supply additional 3,000 to 5,000 acre-feet per year of water to Alamitos Seawater Intrusion Barrier
City of Escondido Advanced Tertiary Treatment Project	Reuse for groundwater recharge or instream use of 6 to 8 mgd
City of San Diego Indirect Potable Reuse Project	Advanced treatment of North City WRP flows for indirect potable reuse. Demonstration project is 1 mgd
CVWD Non-potable Water Supply System	Blend of over 50,000 acre-feet per year of recycled water and canal water for irrigation at 50 golf courses

Source: Reclamation, 2009

1 Desalination

2 Desalination includes treatment of seawater and brackish water sources for water supply needs. In
3 California, desalination began in the 1960s but there has been a rapid increase in the number of facilities
4 developed in the past ten years. This rapid expansion is due to advancements in membrane treatment,
5 increases in potable water costs, and reduction in desalination costs. Today, 20 groundwater desalination
6 plants and 6 seawater desalination plants are in operation producing over 84,000 acre-feet of water
7 annually. Groundwater desalting has advanced more than seawater desalination because salinity levels are
8 magnitudes lower in groundwater (i.e., TDS of seawater is typically 30,000-40,000 milligrams per liter
9 [mg/l] while brackish groundwater has a TDS of 1,000 to 10,000 mg/L).

10 Seawater Desalination

11 Currently, the only existing seawater desalination plant in areas that export water from the Delta
12 watershed is owned by the city of Santa Barbara. This plant was constructed in 1991 to 1992 by the City
13 of Santa Barbara, Goleta Water District, and Montecito Water District as an emergency water supply in
14 response to the severe drought lasting from 1986 to 1991. The latter two agencies are no longer
15 participants in the desalination plant, which is currently decommissioned due to ample quantities of less
16 expensive supplies. The desalination facility can, however, be brought into operation within 6 to
17 12 months if needed during drought or water shortage conditions. Just over half of the prefiltration
18 capacity and reverse osmosis treatment modules were sold, leaving sufficient capacity to meet the City's
19 anticipated need for approximately 3,000 acre-feet per year of production in future droughts. There are
20 several seawater desalination plants proposed as shown on Table 3-4. Seawater desalination is planned for
21 communities along the California coast from San Francisco to San Diego. To date, over 270,000 acre-feet
22 of water production has been proposed.

23 **Table 3-4**
24 **Proposed Seawater Desalinations Plants in California**

Project	Agency	Project Size (acre-feet per year)	Project Status
Bay Area Regional Desalination Project	CCWD, EBMUD, SCVWD, and SFPUC	22,400-79520	Pilot study concluded, member agencies contract under negotiation
Marin County Seawater Desalination Project	Marin Municipal Water District	5,600-16,800	Pilot Study and EIR complete; on-hold
Long Beach Seawater Desalination Project	Long Beach	10,000	Pilot study1
Los Angeles Seawater Desalination Project	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	28,000	On hold
South Orange Coastal Ocean Desalination Project	Municipal Water District of Orange County	16,000-28,000	Pilot study1
Carlsbad Seawater Desalination Project	San Diego County Water Authority	56,000	Construction
West Basin Seawater Desalination Project	West Basin Municipal Water District	20,000	Pilot study1
Huntington Beach Seawater Desalination Project	Municipal Water District of Orange County	56,000	Certified Final EIR; CDP/permits still pending
Camp Pendleton Seawater Desalination Project	San Diego County Water Authority	56,000 to 168,000	Planning; Advisory RFP Issued

Project	Agency	Project Size (acre-feet per year)	Project Status
Rosarito Beach Seawater Desalination Feasibility Study ²	San Diego County Water Authority	28,000 to 56,000	Feasibility study
Total		270,000 to 422,000	

Notes:

¹ Full scale feasibility and design studies are underway at these locations.

² Includes water for service outside of southern California region.

1 Groundwater Desalination

2 Groundwater is an important source of water supply in California; however, some of the groundwater
3 basins are brackish or have other water quality issues that require additional treatment prior to use.
4 Groundwater quality is degraded through increased salinity and other constituents introduced by
5 agricultural and municipal activities, past industrial/commercial activities, seawater intrusion, or from
6 naturally existing conditions. Treatment of brackish groundwater is currently occurring in the San
7 Francisco Bay and southern California areas.

8 Treatment of brackish groundwater is allowing previously unused groundwater to be used as a potable
9 water source in the San Francisco Bay area and southern California. In 2003, the first groundwater
10 desalination plant went into production in Northern California. The 5-mgd Alameda County Water
11 District Newark Desalination Facility removes salts and other constituents from the Niles Cone
12 Groundwater Basin groundwater (part of the Santa Clara basin) for supply as potable water. This plant
13 uses reverse osmosis process and discharges brine to a flood control channel. In 2009 the Zone 7 Water
14 Agency began operation of the Mocho Groundwater Demineralization Plant. This plant produces 6.1 mgd
15 of potable water for blending with other water supply sources. The Mocho Groundwater Demineralization
16 Plant uses reverse osmosis to remove salinity and hardness from the Livermore-Amador Valley's
17 groundwater basin and discharges brine to the Dublin San Ramon Sanitation District brine sewer line.

18 Brackish groundwater in Southern California exists primarily in San Diego, areas of the Inland Empire,
19 and coastal areas of Los Angeles and Orange Counties. Development of this water may be limited
20 because of availability of brine disposal systems, treatment costs, and declining groundwater elevations.
21 For example, the Santa Ana Regional Interceptor is experiencing capacity limitations that may impede
22 future brackish desalination. 28 groundwater desalter and ion exchange facilities are either planned or in
23 operation to reclaim brackish (total dissolved solids > 1,000 mg/L) or poor quality groundwater, as shown
24 on Figure 3-14. These facilities as well as several industrial facilities and other groundwater remediation
25 sites utilize brine pipelines or sewers for waste disposal. Table 3-5 summarizes the location and
26 production capacities of these desalting facilities. Groundwater desalter projects are planned in the Inland
27 Empire and Ventura County areas. These projects would desalt degraded groundwater for supply to
28 irrigation uses. For example, the Los Posas Basin or Moorpark Desalter is a planned 5-mgd desalter to
29 reclaim brackish groundwater for agricultural uses in Ventura County. These groundwater supplies are
30 limited by water available for conjunctive use (i.e., groundwater recharge) and overdraft.

31


1 **Table 3-5**
 2 **Amount of Existing and Planned Groundwater Desalting in Southern California**

Local Area	Planning Year 2010			Planning Year 2035		
	Capacity (mgd)	Maximum Daily Flow (mgd)	Average Daily Flow (mgd)	Capacity (mgd)	Maximum Daily Flow (mgd)	Average Daily Flow (mgd)
Ventura County	11.50	11.50	11.50	39.63	39.63	39.63
Los Angeles County	36.14	36.14	31.14	38.64	38.64	38.64
Inland Empire	30.96	30.96	30.20	78.01	78.01	77.41
Orange County*	20.43	19.43	19.43	86.64	85.64	82.40
San Diego County	21.20	21.20	19.95	49.85	49.85	46.05
Total	120.23	119.23	112.22	292.77	291.77	284.13

Source: Reclamation, 2009

*Data includes South Orange County Coastal Ocean Desalination Project in 2035.

Figure 3-14
Groundwater Desalters in Southern California
Source: DWR, 2009



1
2
3

Section 4 Projected Future Risks due to Climate Change and Sea Level Rise

4 There are many risks to future Delta water supplies. One of the most critical risks to water resources is
5 related to projected climate change and sea level rise.

6

Effects of Climate Change and Sea Level Rise

7 A growing body of evidence indicates that Earth's atmosphere is warming. Records show that surface
8 temperatures have risen about 0.7°C (33.3°F) since the early twentieth century and that 0.5°C (32.9°F) of
9 this increase has occurred since 1978 (National Academies of Sciences [NAS] 2006 summary, U.S.
10 Global Change Research Program [USGRP] 2001). Observed changes in oceans, snow and ice cover, and
11 ecosystems are consistent with this warming trend (NAS 2006; Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
12 Change [IPCC] 2001, 2007). The temperature of Earth's atmosphere is directly related to the
13 concentration of atmospheric greenhouse gases. Growing scientific consensus suggests that climate
14 change will be inevitable as the result of increased concentrations of greenhouse gases and related
15 temperature increases (IPCC, 2001, 2007; Kiparsky and Gleick, 2003).

16 Earth's climate has exhibited variability and has changed over time. The extremes of the 100,000-year
17 ice-age cycles and "mega-droughts" have been well documented. The period of the last 10,000 years has
18 been generally warm and stable, and the last millennium, over which current societies have developed,
19 has been one of the most stable climatological periods observed (California Environmental Protection
20 Agency [CalEPA], 2006). Observations in the twentieth century indicate rapid climate change (IPCC
21 2001, 2007; NAS, 2006). The National Academy of Sciences (2006) recently supported the conclusion
22 that it is likely that the past few decades exhibited higher global mean surface temperatures than during
23 any comparable period of the preceding four centuries. Additionally, 11 years between 1995 and 2006
24 rank among the 12 warmest years in the instrumentation record (1850–2006) for global surface
25 temperature (IPCC, 2007).

26

1 Climate Variability and Climate Change

2 In common terms, “climate” is the “average weather” conditions over some extended period. The IPCC
3 (2001) provides a more rigorous definition of climate as the “statistical description in terms of the mean
4 and variability of relevant parameters over a period of time ranging from months to thousands or millions
5 of years.” Parameters measured are most often surface variables such as temperature, precipitation, and
6 wind. Data are typically averaged in 30-year periods as defined by the World Meteorological
7 Organization.

8 “Climate change” is the shift in the average weather, or trend, that a region experiences. This change may
9 result from natural processes, or from anthropogenic factors that affect the composition of the
10 atmosphere. Consequently, climate change cannot be represented by single annual events nor individual
11 anomalies. For example, a single large flood event or particularly hot summer is not an indication of
12 climate change, whereas a series of floods or warm years that statistically change the average
13 precipitation or temperature over time may indicate climate change.

14 “Climate variability” refers to the deviation from the average climate. For example, an individual year
15 that is drier or hotter than average would indicate variability, but may not indicate a shift in the trend as
16 would be defined as climate change.


17 Mechanics of Climate Change

18 The temperature on Earth is regulated by a system commonly described as exhibiting the “greenhouse
19 effect.” The greenhouse effect is a natural phenomenon in which atmospheric gases—primarily water
20 vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone—allow solar radiation to pass through the
21 atmosphere and warm Earth’s surface. As Earth’s surface warms, infrared radiation is emitted back to the
22 atmosphere. Greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere absorb some of this radiation and re-emit it
23 back to Earth, causing the surface to gain more heat (NAS, 2006). Changes in atmospheric gases can
24 result in changes in Earth’s temperature, thereby influencing climate.

25 Changes in the atmospheric abundance of GHGs, as well as modifications to the land surface, alter the
26 energy balance of the climate system. GHGs are contributed to the atmosphere by both natural and
27 human-created sources. Evidence suggests that the rates of contribution of GHGs to the atmosphere were
28 in balance with mechanisms for their removal before the early 1800s (North et al., 1995). Data on
29 atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration indicate a cyclical pattern. The concentration of carbon dioxide
30 in the atmosphere has risen about 30 percent since the late 1800s and is now higher than it has been in at
31 least the last 400,000 years, as shown in Figure 4-1 (USGRP, 2001). Although the causes of increasing
32 concentrations of carbon dioxide are still subject to some debate, the climate effects and implications for
33 water resource planning remain. Rising concentrations of carbon dioxide and other GHGs are intensifying
34 Earth’s natural greenhouse effect. Global projections of population growth and assumptions about energy
35 use indicate that the carbon dioxide concentration will continue to rise, likely reaching between two and
36 three times its late-nineteenth-century level by 2100 (USGRP, 2001).

37

1 **Figure 4-1**
2 **Trend of Carbon Dioxide Accumulation in Earth's Atmosphere**
3 *Source: NAS, 2006*




4
5
6 **Observed Trends and Future Projections of California's Climate**
7 Climate changes have been observed related to changes in temperature, precipitation, and sea level rise, as
8 summarized below.

9 **Temperature**


10 Observed climate and hydrologic records indicate that more substantial warming has occurred since the
11 1970s and that this is likely a response to the increases in GHG increases during this time, as shown in
12 Figure 4-2. Historical simulations with global climate models exhibit a similar response, providing a basis
13 for our understanding of causal mechanisms. The current suite of global climate models, when simulated
14 under future GHG emission scenarios and current atmospheric GHGs, exhibit warming—globally and
15 regionally over California—as shown in Figure 4-3. In the early part of the twenty-first century, the
16 amount of warming produced by the higher-emission scenario is not very different from the lower-
17 emission scenario, but becomes increasingly larger through the middle and especially the latter part of the
18 century. Six global climate models selected by the California Climate Action Team (CAT) for its 2009
19 scenarios project indicate a mid-century temperature increase of about 1°C to 3°C (1.8°F to 5.4°F) and an
20 end-of-century increase from about 2°C to 5°C (3.6°F to 9°F). The upper part of this range is a
21 considerably greater warming rate than the historical rates estimated from observed temperature records
22 in California (Bonfils et al., 2008).

23

- 1 Figure 4-2
- 2 Historical Observed California Mean Annual Temperature Departure
- 3 Source: *Western Regional Climate Center, 2009*



- 4
- 5 Figure 4-3
- 6 Simulated Historical and Future Annual Temperature Projections for the Sacramento Region
- 7 Source: *Cayan et al, 2009*



8

1 ***Precipitation***

2 Precipitation in most of California is dominated by extreme variability over seasonal, annual, and decade
 3 time scales, as shown in Figure 2-2. The global climate model simulations of historical climate capture
 4 the historical *range* of variability reasonably well (Cayan et al., 2009). However, historical *trends* are not
 5 well captured in these models. Projections of future precipitation are much more uncertain than those for
 6 temperature. Although it is difficult to discern strong trends from the full range of climate projections, the
 7 six global climate models that were selected for the California study demonstrate a drying trend in the
 8 twenty-first century. The precipitation projection uncertainty is largest in the northern part of the state,
 9 and a stronger tendency toward drying is indicated in the southern part of the state. However, even for
 10 hydrologic model simulations with mean precipitation virtually unchanged, there were large impacts on
 11 snowpack accumulation, runoff, and soil moisture.

12 ***Sea Level Rise***

13 Global and regional sea levels have been increasing steadily over the past century and are expected to
 14 continue to increase throughout this century. Recent work by Stefan Ramsdorf (an IPCC coauthor)
 15 suggests that the sea level rise may be substantially greater than the IPCC projections. In the CAT 2009
 16 most recent assessment, sea level rise projections were derived based on empirical relationships between
 17 global mean surface air temperature and global mean sea level as described by Ramsdorf (2007). This
 18 method better reproduces historical sea levels but generally produces larger estimates of sea level rise
 19 than those indicated by the IPCC (2007) and other recent estimates. However, the method described by
 20 Ramsdorf is consistent with the methods used in the recent summary recommendation on sea level rise
 21 from the CALFED Independent Science Board (Healy, 2007). When evaluating all global air temperature
 22 projections and factoring for the range of uncertainty, up to 140 cm (55 inches) of sea level rise is
 23 projected for the end of the century, as shown in Figure 4-4. From the scenarios selected for CAT report,
 24 sea level rise by 2050 is projected to be 30 cm (12 inches) to 45 cm (18 inches) and up to 55 inches by
 25 2100.

26 ***Recent State and Federal Approaches for Incorporating Climate Change in California***


27 General consensus has been reached on some aspects of regional climate change projections (direction of
 28 temperature and sea level rise), but other aspects are not well understood (precipitation trends in
 29 California).

30 Future climate change projections are made primarily on the basis of global climate model simulations
 31 under a range of future emission scenarios. Currently, approximately 20 major global climate models are
 32 supported by national institutions worldwide. Global climate models have improved significantly in
 33 recent years, but the models continue to have substantial uncertainty, especially for regional conditions.

34 The coarse scale of global models requires results to be “downscaled” (applied to a region or watershed).
 35 Whether through dynamic or statistical methods, downscaling adds another source of uncertainty to
 36 projections. In addition, the range of projections, especially beyond 2030, is governed by assumed future
 37 global emissions. The IPCC (2001, 2007) has developed a range of possible future GHG emission
 38 scenarios based on assumptions of fossil fuel use, regional political and social conditions, technologies,
 39 population, and governance and associated emissions that could occur in the future.

40 Approaches to predicting climate change have been developed by the California Climate Action Team,
 41 the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, the U.S. Department of the Interior,
 42 USEPA, and USACE. These approaches will be considered in more detail during the preparation of the
 43 Delta Plan.

1 **Figure 4-4**
2 **Historical Global Mean Sea Level and Future Projections based on Global Mean Temperature Projections**
3 *Source: Ramsdorf 2007*



4
5

Section 5 References

- 1
- 2
- 3 Asano, Takashi. 1998. Water Reclamation and Reuse.
- 4 Bay Area Water Agencies Coalition (BAWAC). 2006a. San Francisco Bay Area Regional Integrated
5 Management Plan.
- 6 Bonfils, Céline, and Coauthors, 2008. Detection and Attribution of Temperature Changes in the
7 Mountainous Western United States. *Journal of Climate*, 21, 6404–6424.
- 8 California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA). 2010. 2010 California State Hazard Mitigation
9 Plan.
- 10 California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2006. Climate Action Team Report to Governor
11 Schwarzenegger and the Legislature. March.
- 12 Cayan et al. 2009. Climate Change Scenarios and Sea Level Rise Estimates for the California 2008
13 Climate Change Scenarios Assessment.
- 14 City of Fresno. 2008. Urban Water Management Plan.
- 15 City of Los Angeles. 2000. Integrated Plan for the Wastewater Program: Tools Technical Memorandum.
- 16 Department of Finance (DOF). 2009. California County Population Estimates and Components of Change
17 by Year, July 1, 2000-2009.
- 18 California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 1931. Variation and control of salinity in 4
19 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and upper San Francisco Bay. DWR Bulletin No. 27.
- 20 DWR. 1957. Interim Report to the California State Legislature on the Salinity Control Barrier
21 Investigation. DWR Bulletin No. 60
- 22 DWR. 1957. The California Water Plan. DWR Bulletin No. 3
- 23 DWR. 1968. Municipal and Industrial Water Use. DWR Bulletin No. 166-1.
- 24 DWR. 1974. Bulletin No. 118-3: Evaluation of Ground Water Resources: Sacramento County.
- 25 DWR. 1975. Urban Water Use in California. DWR Bulletin No. 166-2.
- 26 DWR. 1983. Urban Water Use in California. DWR Bulletin No. 166-3.

SECTION 5
REFERENCES

- 1 DWR. 1994. Urban Water Use in California. DWR Bulletin No. 166-4.
- 2 DWR. 2003. California's Groundwater Update 2003. DWR Bulletin No. 118
- 3 DWR. 2005. California Water Plan 2005 Update. DWR Bulletin 160-05.
- 4 DWR. 2009. California Water Plan 2009 Update. DWR Bulletin 160-09.
- 5 DWR. 2010a. Public Review Draft California Drought Contingency Plan.
- 6 DWR. 2010b. DWR Public Water Systems Survey.
- 7 DWR, State Water Resources Control Board, Calfed Bay-Delta Authority, California Energy
8 Commission, California Department of Public Health, California Public Utilities Commission,
9 and California Air Resources Board. 2010. 20x2020 Water Conservation Plan. February.
- 10 DWR and CDFG, 2008. Current Water Use Efficiency Policy and Programs and Estimate of Urban and
11 Agricultural Water Use. Prepared for the Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force.
- 12 DWR Division of Safety of Dams. 2010c. Website:
13 <http://www.water.ca.gov/damsafety/damlisting/index.cfm>. Accessed 2010.
- 14 Governor's Office of Planning and Research, in cooperation with DWR. 1978. California Water Atlas.
- 15 Hudley, Norris. 2001. The Great Thirst – Californians and Water: A History Revised edition.
- 16 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2001. Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis.
17 Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel
18 on Climate Change.
- 19 IPCC. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the
20 Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D.
21 Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)].
22 Cambridge University Press.
- 23 Jackson, W. Turrentine, and Paterson, Alan M. 1977. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta: The Evolution
24 and Implementation of Water Policy: An Historical Perspective
- 25 Kiparsky, M and Gleick, PH. 2003. Climate Change and California Water Resources: A Survey and
26 Summary of the Literature.
- 27 Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP). 2010. History of LADWP – William
28 Mulholland website. <http://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/cms/ladwp001562.jsp>
- 29 Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). 2008. California Water: An LAO Primer.
- 30 Mulholland, Catherine. 2000. William Mulholland and the Rise of Los Angeles.
- 31 North, G. R., K.-Y. Kim, S. P. Shen, and J. W. Hardin. 1995. Detection of forced climate signals. Part I:
32 filter theory, Journal of Climate, 6, 401-408.
- 33 Olmstead, Alan L and Rhode, Paul W. 2004. *The Evolution of California Agriculture, 1850-2000*,
34 California Agriculture: Dimensions and Issues.
- 35 Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2009. Indicators of Climate Change in
36 California.

- 1 National Academy of Sciences (NAS). 2006. Surface Temperature Reconstructions for the Last 2,000
2 Years. National Academies Press.
- 3 National Water Research Institute (NWRI). 2007. An NWRI White Paper: Water 2010, A Near Sighted
4 Program of Water Resource Management Improvements for the Western United States.
- 5 Ramsdorf, S. 2007. A semi-empirical approach to projecting future sea level. Science, vol 315. January.
- 6 United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). 1966. Central Valley
7 Project East Side Division, Initial Phase; A Report on the Feasibility of Water Supply
8 Development.
- 9 Reclamation. 2006. Southern California Water Recycling Projects Initiative.
- 10 Reclamation. 2009. Southern California Regional Brine Management Study.
- 11 Reclamation. 2010a. Reclamation's Title XVI Website. [http://recovery.doi.gov/press/bureaus/bureau-of-](http://recovery.doi.gov/press/bureaus/bureau-of-reclamation/title-xvi-projects/Project)
12 [reclamation/title-xvi-projects/Project](http://recovery.doi.gov/press/bureaus/bureau-of-reclamation/title-xvi-projects/Project)
- 13 Reclamation. 2010b. Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study: Public Outreach Meeting.
- 14 Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (SAWPA). 2009. Santa Ana Integrated Watershed Plan.
- 15 United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2010. California Geography, Geology, Hazards, and Natural
16 History Information. <http://education.usgs.gov/california/resources.html>
- 17 USGS. 2009. Groundwater Availability of the Central Valley Aquifer, California, Professional Paper
18 1766.
- 19 U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGRP), National Assessment Synthesis Team. 2001. Climate
20 Change Impacts on the United States, Potential Consequences of Climate Variability and Change.
- 21 Water Replenishment District (WRD). 2010. Agenda Package for the Special Meeting of the Board of
22 Directors of the Water Replenishment District of Southern California on November 19, 2010.
- 23 Western Regional Climate Center. 2009. <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/> Website accessed August
24 14, 2009.
25
26

Appendix A

California Water Chronology

1
2

- 3 1769 First permanent Spanish settlements; water rights established.
- 4 1848 Gold discovered on the American River.
- 5 Treaty of Guadalupe signed, California ceded from Mexico, California republic established.
- 6 1849 First major levee constructed in Delta on Grand Island.
- 7 1850 California granted statehood.
- 8 Congress adopts Arkansas Swamp Act to sell floodplain land to developers who would construct
9 levees and drainage systems.
- 10 1852 Wheaton Mining Dam constructed at La Grange on the Tuolumne River.
- 11 1852 Hydraulic mining activities begin.
- 12 1854 Large irrigation facilities constructed to divert Merced River water.
- 13 1859-1865 Large irrigation facilities constructed to divert Tule River water.
- 14 1868 California Legislature adopts Green Act, allowing formation of reclamation districts with taxing
15 authority.
- 16 1870s-1880s Diversions and canals constructed to convey water from Kings, San Joaquin, Kern, and
17 Merced rivers.
- 18 1870 State Fish Commission created to enforce catch restrictions and require fish ladders for all
19 physical obstructions.
- 20 1871 Mendota Dam (Weir) constructed.
- 21 1880s Tulare Lake water quality extremely poor due to return flows and unsuitable for irrigation or
22 potable water supplies.
- 23 Large salmon canneries in operation on Sacramento River.
- 24 1880 First flood control plan for the Sacramento Valley developed by State Engineer William
25 Hammond Hall.

- 1 California Legislature approves Drainage Act to provide flood control in Central Valley.
- 2 1884 Federal circuit court decision in *Woodruff v. North Bloomfield* requires termination of hydraulic
3 mining debris discharges into California rivers.
- 4 1886 California Supreme Court decision in *Lux v. Haggin* reaffirms legal preeminence of riparian
5 rights, upheld again 40 years later.
- 6 1892 Conservationist John Muir founds Sierra Club.
- 7 Congress establishes California Debris Commission to remove mining debris from rivers and
8 navigable waters.
- 9 1893 Modesto Irrigation District and Turlock Irrigation District constructed La Grange Dam on
10 Tuolumne River.
- 11 1895 Debris dams constructed along Sacramento River tributaries, including the American and Yuba
12 rivers.
- 13 1900 Bear River Dam completed.
- 14 1901 First California deliveries from the Colorado River made to farmland in the Imperial Valley.
- 15 1902 US Bureau of Reclamation established by the Reclamation Act of 1902.
- 16 Union Dam completed on North Fork Stanislaus River.
- 17 1905 First bond issue for the city of Los Angeles' Owens Valley project; second bond issue in 1907
18 approved for actual construction.
- 19 Colorado River flooding diverts the river into Imperial Valley, forming the Salton Sea.
- 20 1908 City of San Francisco's filings for Hetch Hetchy project approved.
- 21 1912 Goodwin Dam completed on Stanislaus River.
- 22 1913 Los Angeles Aqueduct begins service.
- 23 California Legislature passes Raker Act, allowing San Francisco to divert water from Tuolumne
24 River.
- 25 Almanor Dam completed on North Fork Feather River.
- 26 1914 Sacramento River Flood Control Project levees constructed to minimize flooding due to increased
27 elevation of riverbed caused by mining debris.
- 28 1915 Oakdale Irrigation District and South San Joaquin Irrigation District begin diversions from
29 Stanislaus River.
- 30 1916 Main Strawberry Dam completed on South Fork Stanislaus River.
- 31 1919 Merced Irrigation District constructs Exchequer Dam and Power Plant on Merced River.
- 32 1920 Col. Robert B. Marshall of the US Geological Survey proposes statewide plan for water
33 conveyance and storage.
- 34 1922 Colorado River Compact appropriates 7.5 million acre-feet per year to each of the river's two
35 basins.

- 1 1923 Hetch Hetchy Valley flooded to produce water supply for San Francisco despite years of protest
2 by John Muir and other conservationists.
- 3 Modesto Irrigation District and Turlock Irrigation District construct Don Pedro Reservoir on
4 Tuolumne River.
- 5 East Bay Municipal Utility District formed.
- 6 1924 Melones Dam constructed on Stanislaus River.
7 (Old) Bullards Bar Dam completed on Yuba River.
- 8 1925 Calaveras Dam completed on Calaveras River.
- 9 1927 Lake Briton Dam and Pit River No. 3 and No. 4 dams completed on Pit River.
- 10 1928 Congress passes Boulder Canyon Act, authorizing construction of Boulder (Hoover) Dam and
11 other Colorado River facilities.
- 12 Federal government assumes most costs of the Sacramento Valley Flood Control System with
13 passage of the Rivers and Harbors Act.
- 14 California Constitution amended to require that all water use be “reasonable and beneficial.”
- 15 St. Francis Dam collapses, flooding the Santa Clarita Valley, killing more than 450 people.
- 16 Worst drought of the 20th century begins; ends in 1934, establishing benchmark for water project
17 storage and transfer capacity of all major water projects.
- 18 1929 Pardee Dam and Mokelumne Aqueduct completed on Mokelumne River.
- 19 1930 Lyons Dam completed on South Fork Stanislaus River.
- 20 1930s Fertilizers and vector poisons introduced on farmlands.
- 21 1931 State Water Plan published, outlining utilization of water resources on a statewide basis.
- 22 The federal government and California State Water Resources Commission (Hoover-Young
23 Commission) recommend that the federal government construct the Central Valley Project and
24 that the state operate the facilities.
- 25 County of Origin Law passed, guaranteeing counties the right to reclaim water from an exporter if
26 it is needed in the area of origin.
- 27 Salt Springs Dam completed on North Fork Mokelumne River.
- 28 1933 Central Valley Project Act passed.
- 29 State of California authorizes bonds for \$170 million for the Central Valley Project (Shasta Dam
30 and Power Plant, Friant Dam and Power Plant, Contra Costa Canal, Madera Canal, Friant Kern
31 Canal, other dams and pumps on the San Joaquin River, transmission lines from Shasta to
32 Antioch, and a pump between the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers.
- 33 1934 Construction starts on All-American Canal in the Imperial Valley (first deliveries in 1941) and on
34 Parker Dam on the Colorado River.
- 35 San Francisco constructs Hetch Hetchy Aqueduct from Tuolumne River.

APPENDIX A
CALIFORNIA WATER CHRONOLOGY

- 1 1937 Rivers and Harbors Act authorizes construction of initial Central Valley Project features by US
2 Army Corps of Engineers.
- 3 1940 Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's Colorado River Aqueduct completed; first
4 deliveries in 1941.
- 5 Congress reauthorizes the Central Valley Project, restates the purposes of the project, and allows
6 for construction of local distribution systems as part of Central Valley Project construction
7 projects.
- 8 Water diversions begin at Contra Costa Canal from the Delta (first CVP diversion).
- 9 1944 Mexican-US Treaty guarantees Mexico 1.5 million acre-feet per year from Colorado River.
10 Shasta Dam completed and water diversions begin on Sacramento River.
- 11 1945 State Water Resources Control Board created.
- 12 1947 Friant Dam completed on San Joaquin River.
- 13 1949 Friant Kern Canal completed.
- 14 1950 Keswick Dam completed on Sacramento River.
15 Anderson-Cottonwood diversions begin.
- 16 1951 State authorizes the Feather River Project Act (later to become the State Water Project).
17 Delta Cross Channel, Delta-Mendota Canal, and Tracy Pumping Plant completed.
18 First deliveries from Shasta Dam to the San Joaquin Valley.
- 19 1954 Pine Flat Dam completed on Kings River.
20 Isabella Dam completed on Kern River.
- 21 1955 Flood in the Sacramento Valley kills 38 people.
22 Nimbus Dam and Power Plant completed on American River.
- 23 1956 Folsom Dam completed on American River.
- 24 1957 California Water Plan (Bulletin 3) published.
25 Beardsley and Donnell dams completed on Middle Fork Stanislaus River.
26 Tulloch Dam completed on Stanislaus River.
27 Tracy fish collection facility completed.
- 28 1959 Delta Protection Act resolves some issues of legal boundaries, salinity control and water export.
29 Putah South Canal diversions begin.
- 30 1960 Burns-Porter Act ratified by voters; \$1.75 million bond issue to assist statewide water
31 development.
- 32 1961 California Department of Water Resources establishes Interagency Delta Committee to evaluate
33 solutions to Delta problems.
- 34 Success Dam completed on Tule River.

- 1 1962 Terminus Dam completed on Kaweah River.
- 2 South Bay Aqueduct completed.
- 3 1963 *Arizona v. California* lawsuit decided by US Supreme Court, allocating 2.8 million acre-feet of
- 4 Colorado River water per year to Arizona.
- 5 Whiskeytown Dam completed.
- 6 New Hogan Dam completed on Calaveras River.
- 7 Camanche Dam completed on Mokelumne River.
- 8 Lewiston Dam, Carr Power Plant, and Clear Creek Tunnel completed.
- 9 1964 Partially completed Oroville Dam helps save Sacramento Valley from flooding.
- 10 Trinity Dam completed on Trinity River.
- 11 Red Bluff Diversion Dam completed on Sacramento River.
- 12 1966 Construction begins on New Melones Dam on the Stanislaus River after 20 years of controversy
- 13 over the reservoir's size and environmental impacts; completed in 1978.
- 14 1967 State Water Project Delta Pumps and California Aqueduct completed.
- 15 Oroville Dam completed on Feather River.
- 16 San Luis Canal and Dam completed.
- 17 New Exchequer Dam completed on Merced River.
- 18 California State Water Resources Control Board adopts Water Quality Control Plan for
- 19 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta pursuant to Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965.
- 20 1968 Congress authorizes Central Arizona Project to deliver 1.5 million acre-feet of Colorado River
- 21 water a year to Arizona.
- 22 Congress passes Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
- 23 1969 New Bullards Bar Dam completed on Yuba River.
- 24 1970 Passage of the National Environmental Quality Act, California Environmental Quality Act and
- 25 California Endangered Species Act.
- 26 New Don Pedro Dam completed on Tuolumne River.
- 27 1971 California State Water Resources Control Board adopts Water Rights Decision 1379 establishing
- 28 Delta water quality standards.
- 29 Tehama-Colusa Canal and Pumping Plant completed.
- 30 Tehama-Colusa Canal Fish Facility completed.
- 31 1972 California Legislature passes Wild and Scenic Rivers Act preserving the North Coast's remaining
- 32 free-flowing rivers from development.
- 33 Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) passed.
- 34 1973 First State Water Project deliveries to Southern California.

- 1 1974 Congress passes Safe Drinking Water Act.
- 2 1976-1977 Drought
- 3 1978 State Water Board issues Water Rights Decision 1485 setting Delta water quality standards.
- 4 New Melones Dam completed on Stanislaus River.
- 5 1980 State-designated wild and scenic rivers placed under federal Act's protection.
- 6 1982 Proposition 9, the Peripheral Canal package, overwhelmingly defeated in statewide vote.
- 7 Reclamation Reform Act raises from 160 acres to 960 acres the amount of land a farmer can own
- 8 and still receive low-cost federal water.
- 9 1983 California Supreme Court in *National Audubon Society v. Superior Court* rules that the public
- 10 trust doctrine applies to Los Angeles' diversion from tributary streams of Mono Lake.
- 11 Dead and deformed waterfowl discovered at Kesterson Reservoir, pointing to problems of
- 12 selenium-tainted agricultural drainage water.
- 13 1986 Ruling by State Court of Appeals (*Racanelli* Decision) directs the State Water Board to consider
- 14 all beneficial uses, including instream needs, of Delta water when setting water quality standards.
- 15 Passage of Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act (Proposition 65) prohibiting
- 16 discharge of toxic chemicals into state waters.
- 17 Coordinated Operation Agreement for Central Valley Project and State Water Project operations
- 18 in the Delta signed.
- 19 1987 State Water Board's Bay-Delta Proceedings begin to revise D-1485 water quality standards.
- 20 State Water Project's North Bay Aqueduct completed.
- 21 1989 In a separate challenge to Los Angeles' Mono Basin water rights, an appellate court holds that
- 22 fish are a public trust resource in *California Trout v. State Water Resources Control Board*.
- 23 Metropolitan Water District and Imperial Irrigation District agree that Metropolitan Water
- 24 District will pay for agricultural water conservation projects and receive the water conserved.
- 25 1991 MOU signed to implement urban water conservation programs.
- 26 Inyo County and Los Angeles agree to jointly manage Owens Valley water, ending 19 years of
- 27 litigation.
- 28 West Coast's first municipal sea water desalination plant opens on Catalina Island.
- 29 1992 Congress approves landmark Central Valley Project Improvement Act.
- 30 1993 Federal court rules in *Natural Resource Defense Council v. Patterson* that the Central Valley
- 31 Project must conform with State law requiring release of flows for fishery preservation below
- 32 dams.
- 33 Central Arizona Project declared complete by the federal government.
- 34 1994 State Water Board amends Los Angeles' water rights licenses to Mono Lake.
- 35 Bay-Delta Accord sets interim Delta water quality.
- 36 CALFED Bay-Delta Program planning initiated.

- 1 1995 State Water Board adopts new water quality plan for the Delta and begins hearings on water
2 rights.
- 3 1997 New Year's storms cause state's second most devastating flood of the century.
4 State Water Project's Santa Barbara Aqueduct completed.
- 5 1999 Sacramento splittail minnow and spring-run Chinook salmon added to federal endangered species
6 list.
7 Diamond Valley Reservoir completed.
- 8 2000 CALFED Record of Decision signed by state and federal agencies.
- 9 2002 Voters approve Proposition 50, a \$3.44 billion bond issue to fund improvements in water quality
10 and reliability.
- 11 2003 Interior Secretary orders California's Colorado River allocation limited to 4.4 million acre-feet;
12 water users sign Quantification Settlement Agreement.
13 State Water Project contractors, DWR and environmental groups settle lawsuit over the Monterey
14 Amendment. State Water Project, Central Valley Project and respective contractors reach
15 tentative agreement on "Napa Proposal" water-sharing plan.
16 DWR issues draft EIR on increasing pumping level out of Delta to 8,500 cubic feet per second.
17 US Fish and Wildlife Service removes Sacramento splittail from federal Endangered Species Act
18 list of threatened species.
- 19 2004 State Water Board initiates review of 1995 Water Quality Control Plan.
20 Congress approves long-awaited legislation to re-authorize CALFED.
- 21 2005 Scientific surveys of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and Suisun Marsh reveal ongoing,
22 sweeping population crash of native pelagic fish.
23 Legislation directs DWR to evaluate the future of the Delta.
- 24 2006 Coalition of fishing groups sues DWR, alleging the agency never obtained proper legal authority
25 to take endangered fish while exporting water.
- 26 2007 State Water Project pumping operations shut down to protect endangered delta smelt (Wanger
27 Decision).
28 DWR estimates that Delta levees are vulnerable to massive failure if major earthquake occurs.
29 Seven Colorado River states agree to new drought rules and shortage criteria.
30 Governor Schwarzenegger appoints independent Delta Vision "Blue Ribbon" Task Force.
31 Delta Vision Task Force releases final report.
32 Other Delta planning processes continue.
- 33 2008 DWR initiates Bay-Delta Conservation Plan EIS/EIR.
34 Governor Schwarzenegger declares statewide drought after second dry/critical year.
35 Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force releases strategic plan.

APPENDIX A
CALIFORNIA WATER CHRONOLOGY

- 1 2009 Legislature passes the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta Reform Act, creating the Delta
- 2 Stewardship Council as an independent state agency and directing the Delta Stewardship Council
- 3 to adopt a comprehensive management plan for the Delta no later than January 1, 2012.

4

- 5 (Chronology adapted from the California Water Plan [DWR, 2009] and the Water Education Foundation
- 6 Layperson's Guides.)

1
2

Appendix B Major Dams

**Table B-1
Dams in Watersheds Tributary to the Delta or that Provide Water Supplies to Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta with Storage Capacity Greater than 10,000 acre-feet**

Stream	Dam Name	Owner	County	Year	Capacity (acre-feet)
Dams in Watersheds Tributary to the Delta					
American River	Folsom	Reclamation	Sacramento	1956	975,000
Arroyo Valle	Del Valle	DWR	Alameda	1968	77,100
Bear River	Rollins	Nevada Irrigation District	Nevada	1965	66,000
Bear River	Lower Bear River	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Amador	1952	48,750
Bear River	Camp Far West	South Sutter Water District	Yuba	1963	104,500
Big Creek	Huntington Lake 1	Southern California Edison Company	Fresno	1917	88,834
Big Dry Creek & Dog Creek	Big Dry Creek	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District	Fresno	1948	30,200
Big Grizzly Creek	Grizzly Valley (Lake Davis)	DWR	Plumas	1966	83,000
Bucks Creek	Bucks Storage	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Plumas	1928	103,000
Butt Creek	Butt Valley	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Plumas	1924	49,800
Cache Creek	Cache Creek	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Lake	1914	315,000
Calaveras River	New Hogan	USACE	Calaveras	1963	317,000
Canyon Creek	French Lake	Nevada Irrigation District	Nevada	1859	12,500
Canyon Creek	Bowman	Nevada Irrigation District	Nevada	1927	64,000
Cedar Creek	Tule Lake	John Hancock Mutual Ins Co	Lassen	1904	39,500
Cherry Creek	Cherry Valley	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	Tuolumne	1956	273,500
Chowchilla River	Buchanan	USACE	Madera	1975	150,000
Clear Creek	Whiskeytown	Reclamation	Shasta	1963	241,100
Cottonwood Creek	Thermalito Forebay	DWR	Butte	1967	11,768

**Table B-1
Dams in Watersheds Tributary to the Delta or that Provide Water Supplies to Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta with Storage Capacity Greater than 10,000 acre-feet**

Stream	Dam Name	Owner	County	Year	Capacity (acre-feet)
Deer Creek	Scotts Flat	Nevada Irrigation District	Nevada	1948	49,000
Dry Creek	Virginia Ranch	Browns Valley Irrigation District	Yuba	1963	57,000
Eleanor Creek	Lake Eleanor	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	Tuolumne	1918	28,600
Feather River	Thermalito Diversion	DWR	Butte	1967	13,328
Feather River	Oroville	DWR	Butte	1968	3,537,577
Feather River	Thermalito Afterbay	DWR	Butte	1967	57,041
Fordyce Creek	Lake Fordyce	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Nevada	1873	48,900
Fresno River	Hidden	USACE	Madera	1975	90,000
Gerle Creek	Loon Lake	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	El Dorado	1963	76,500
Hamilton Creek	Indian Ole	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Lassen	1924	24,800
Helms Creek	Courtright	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Fresno	1958	123,300
Highland Creek	New Spicer Meadow	Calaveras County Water District	Tuolumne	1989	189,000
Indian Creek	Antelope	DWR	Plumas	1964	22,566
Iron Canyon Creek	Iron Canyon	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Shasta	1965	24,300
Jackson Creek	Jackson Creek	Jackson Valley Irrigation Dist	Amador	1965	22,000
Little Butte Creek	Paradise	Paradise Irrigation Dist	Butte	1957	11,500
Little Last Chance Creek	Frenchman	DWR	Plumas	1961	55,477
Little Stony Creek	East Park	Reclamation	Colusa	1910	51,000
Los Banos Creek	Los Banos Detention	Reclamation	Merced	1965	34,600
Lost Creek	Sly Creek	South Feather Water And Power Agency	Butte	1961	65,050
Mariposa Creek	Mariposa	USACE	Mariposa	1948	15,000
Martis Creek	Martis Creek	USACE	Nevada	1972	20,400
McCloud River	McCloud	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Shasta	1965	35,300
Merced River	New Exchequer	Merced Irrigation Dist	Mariposa	1967	1,032,000
Middle Fork American River	L. L. Anderson	Placer County Water Agency	Placer	1965	155,500
Middle Fork Stanislaus River	Beardsley	Tri-Dam Project	Tuolumne	1957	77,600
Middle Fork Stanislaus River	Donnells	Tri-Dam Project	Tuolumne	1958	56,893
Middle Fork Yuba River	Jackson Meadows	Nevada Irrigation District	Nevada	1965	52,500
Mokelumne River	Camanche	East Bay Municipal Utilities District	San Joaquin	1963	417,120
Mokelumne River	Pardee	East Bay Municipal Utilities District	Amador	1929	197,950

Table B-1
Dams in Watersheds Tributary to the Delta or that Provide Water Supplies to Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta with Storage Capacity Greater than 10,000 acre-feet

Stream	Dam Name	Owner	County	Year	Capacity (acre-feet)
Mono Creek	Vermilion Valley	Southern California Edison Company	Fresno	1954	125,000
North Fork American River	North Fork	USACE	Placer	1939	14,700
North Fork Cache Creek	Indian Valley	Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Lake	1976	300,000
North Fork Feather River	Lake Almanor	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Plumas	1927	1,308,000
North Fork Kings River	Wishon	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Fresno	1958	118,000
North Fork Mokelumne River	Salt Springs	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Amador	1931	141,900
North Fork Willow Creek	Crane Valley Storage	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Madera	1910	45,410
North Yuba River	New Bullards Bar	Yuba County Water Agency	Yuba	1970	969,600
Old River	Clifton Court Forebay	DWR	Contra Costa	1970	29,000
Pilot Creek	Mark Edson	Georgetown Divide Public Utilities District	El Dorado	1962	20,000
Pit River	Pit No.6	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Shasta	1965	15,700
Pit River	Pit No.3	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Shasta	1925	34,600
Pit River	Pit No. 7	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Shasta	1965	34,000
Red Rock Creek	Red Rock No 1	Edgar S. (Red) Roberts	Lassen	1893	10,000
Rock & Little John Creeks	Farmington	USACE	San Joaquin	1951	52,000
Rock Creek	Salt Springs Valley	Rock Creek Water District	Calaveras	1882	10,900
Rubicon River	Lower Hell Hole	Placer County Water Agency	Placer	1966	208,400
Sacramento River	Box Canyon	Siskiyou County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Siskiyou	1969	26,000
Sacramento River	Keswick	Reclamation	Shasta	1950	23,772
Sacramento River	Shasta	Reclamation	Shasta	1945	4,552,000
San Joaquin River	Big Creek No. 7	Southern California Edison Company	Fresno	1951	35,000
San Joaquin River	Mammoth Pool	Southern California Edison Company	Fresno	1960	123,000
San Joaquin River	Friant	Reclamation	Fresno	1942	520,500
San Luis Creek	O'Neill	Reclamation	Merced	1967	56,400
San Luis Creek	B.F. Sisk	Reclamation	Merced	1967	2,041,000
Silver Creek	Union Valley	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	El Dorado	1963	230,000
Silver Fork	Caples Lake	El Dorado Irrigation District	Alpine	1922	21,580
Simmons Creek	Woodward	South San Joaquin Irrigation District	Stanislaus	1918	35,000

**Table B-1
Dams in Watersheds Tributary to the Delta or that Provide Water Supplies to Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta with Storage Capacity Greater than 10,000 acre-feet**

Stream	Dam Name	Owner	County	Year	Capacity (acre-feet)
Sly Park Creek	Sly Park	El Dorado Irrigation District	El Dorado	1955	41,000
South Fork American River	Slab Creek	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	El Dorado	1967	16,600
South Fork Feather River	Little Grass Valley	South Feather Water And Power Agency	Plumas	1961	93,010
South Fork San Joaquin River	Florence Lake	Southern California Edison Company	Fresno	1926	64,406
South Fork Silver Creek	Ice House	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	El Dorado	1959	37,120
South Fork Stanislaus River	Main Strawberry	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Tuolumne	1916	18,312
South Fork Yuba River	Lake Spaulding	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Nevada	1913	74,773
Stanislaus River	New Melones	Reclamation	Calaveras	1979	2,400,000
Stanislaus River	Tulloch	Tri-Dam Project	Calaveras	1958	68,400
Stevenson Creek	Shaver Lake	Southern California Edison Company	Fresno	1927	135,283
Stockdill Slough	Dorris	USFWS	Modoc	1930	11,100
Stony Creek	Black Butte	USACE	Tehama	1963	143,700
Stony Creek	Stony Gorge	Reclamation	Glenn	1928	50,350
Summit Creek	Relief	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Tuolumne	1910	15,122
Susan River	McCoy Flat	Lassen Irrigation Company	Lassen	1891	17,290
Trinity River	Lewiston	Reclamation	Trinity	1963	14,660
Trinity River	Trinity	Reclamation	Trinity	1962	2,447,650
Tule River	Success	USACE	Tulare	1961	82,300
Tuolumne River	O' Shaughnessy	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission	Tuolumne	1923	360,000
Tuolumne River	Don Pedro	Turlock Irrigation District	Tuolumne	1971	2,030,000
Tuolumne River	Modesto Reservoir	Modesto Irrigation District	Stanislaus	1911	29,000
Tuolumne River	Turlock Lake	Turlock Irrigation District	Stanislaus	1915	45,600
Yuba River	Englebright	USACE	Yuba	1941	70,000
Dams in Tulare Lake Region that Serve Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta					
Kaweah River	Terminus	USACE	Tulare	1962	143,000
Kern River	Isabella	USACE	Kern	1953	568,000
Kings River	Pine Flat	USACE	Fresno	1954	1,000,000
Offstream Storage	Buena Vista	J G Boswell & Co	Kern	1890	205,000
Dams in San Francisco Bay Area that Serve Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta					
Bear Creek	Briones	East Bay Municipal Utilities District	Contra Costa	1964	67,520
Calaveras Creek	Calaveras	City & County of San Francisco	Alameda	1925	100,000
Conn Creek	Conn Creek	City of Napa	Napa	1946	31,000

Table B-1
Dams in Watersheds Tributary to the Delta or that Provide Water Supplies to Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta with Storage Capacity Greater than 10,000 acre-feet

Stream	Dam Name	Owner	County	Year	Capacity (acre-feet)
Coyote Creek	Coyote	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Santa Clara	1936	23,666
Coyote River	Leroy Anderson	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Santa Clara	1950	91,280
Gordon Valley Creek	Lake Curry	City of Vallejo	Napa	1926	10,700
Kellogg Creek	Los Vaqueros	Contra Costa Water District	Contra Costa	1997	100,000
Los Gatos Creek	James J. Lenihan	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Santa Clara	1953	21,430
Offstream Storage	San Justo	Reclamation	San Benito	1958	10,300
Putah Creek	Monticello	Reclamation	Napa	1957	1,602,000
San Antonio Creek	James H Turner	City & County of San Francisco	Alameda	1964	50,500
San Benito River	Hernandez	San Benito County Water District	San Benito	1962	18,000
San Leandro Creek	Chabot	East Bay Municipal Utilities District	Alameda	1892	10,281
San Leandro Creek	New U San Leandro	East Bay Municipal Utilities District	Alameda	1977	42,000
San Mateo Creek	Lower Crystal Springs	City & County of San Francisco	San Mateo	1888	57,910
San Pablo Creek	San Pablo	East Bay Municipal Utilities District	Contra Costa	1920	43,193
San Mateo Creek	San Andreas	City & County of San Francisco	San Mateo	1870	19,027
Uvas Creek	Uvas	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Santa Clara	1957	10,000
Dams in Southern California that Serve Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta					
Bear Creek	Bear Valley	Big Bear Municipal Water District	San Bernardino	1911	74,000
Bernasconi Pass	Perris	DWR	Riverside	1973	131,452
Boulder Creek	Cuyamaca	Helix Water District	San Diego	1887	11,740
Bouquet Creek	Bouquet Canyon	City of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	1934	36,505
Castaic Creek	Castaic	DWR	Los Angeles	1973	323,700
Castaic Creek	Elderberry Forebay	City of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	1974	28,400
Colorado River	Parker	Reclamation	San Bernardino	1938	648,000
Copper Basin	Copper Basin	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	San Bernardino	1938	22,000
Cottonwood Creek	Barrett	City of San Diego	San Diego	1922	44,755
Cottonwood Creek	Morena	City of San Diego	San Diego	1912	50,206
Domenigoni Valley Creek	Diamond Valley Lake	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Riverside	2000	800,000
Green Val Road Creek	Ramona	Ramona Municipal Water District	San Diego	1988	12,200
Little Bear Creek	Lake Arrowhead	Arrowhead Lake Association	San Bernardino	1922	48,000

**Table B-1
Dams in Watersheds Tributary to the Delta or that Provide Water Supplies to Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta with Storage Capacity Greater than 10,000 acre-feet**

Stream	Dam Name	Owner	County	Year	Capacity (acre-feet)
Los Angeles River	Sepulveda	USACE	Los Angeles	1941	17,425
Otay River	Savage	City of San Diego	San Diego	1919	49,510
Owens River	Tinemaha	City of Los Angeles	Inyo	1928	16,405
Owens River	Long Valley	City of Los Angeles	Mono	1941	183,465
Piru Creek	Pyramid	DWR	Los Angeles	1973	180,000
Rose Valley	Haiwee	City of Los Angeles	Inyo	1913	46,600
Rush Creek	Grant Lake	City of Los Angeles	Mono	1940	47,525
San Diego River	El Capitan	City of San Diego	San Diego	1934	112,800
San Dieguito River	Hodges, Lake	City of San Diego	San Diego	1918	37,700
San Fernando Creek	Lower San Fernando	City of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	1918	10,000
San Fernando Creek	Los Angeles Reservoir	City of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	1977	10,000
San Gabriel River	Santa Fe	USACE	Los Angeles	1949	32,109
San Gabriel River	Whittier Narrows	USACE	Los Angeles	1957	67,060
San Gabriel River	San Gabriel No 1	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works	Los Angeles	1938	44,183
San Gabriel River	Morris	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works	Los Angeles	1935	27,500
San Jacinto River	Railroad Canyon	Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District	Riverside	1928	11,586
San Luis Rey River	Henshaw	Vista Irrigation District	San Diego	1923	50,000
San Vicente Creek	San Vicente	City of San Diego	San Diego	1943	250,000
Santa Ana River	Prado	USACE	Riverside	1941	314,400
Santa Ana River	Seven Oaks	San Bernardino County Department of Transportation And Flood Control District	San Bernardino	1999	145,600
Santa Ysabel Creek	Sutherland	City of San Diego	San Diego	1954	29,000
Santiago Creek	Villa Park	County of Orange	Orange	1963	15,600
Santiago Creek	Santiago Creek	Serrano Water District & Irvine Ranch Water District	Orange	1933	25,000
Stone Canyon Creek	Stone Canyon	City of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	1924	10,372
Sweetwater River	Sweetwater Main	Sweetwater Authority	San Diego	1888	27,700
Sweetwater River	Lake Loveland	Sweetwater Authority	San Diego	1945	25,400
Temecula Creek	Vail	Rancho California Water District	Riverside	1949	51,000
Cajalco Creek	Mathews	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Riverside	1938	182,000
Escondido Creek	Olivenhain	San Diego County Water Authority	San Diego	2003	24,900

Table B-1
Dams in Watersheds Tributary to the Delta or that Provide Water Supplies to Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta with Storage Capacity Greater than 10,000 acre-feet

Stream	Dam Name	Owner	County	Year	Capacity (acre-feet)
San Jacinto River	Lake Hemet	Lake Hemet Municipal Water District	Riverside	1895	14,000
Tucalota Creek	Robert A Skinner	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Riverside	1973	43,800
Tujunga Wash	Hansen	USACE	Los Angeles	1940	25,446
Walnut Creek	Puddingstone	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works	Los Angeles	1928	16,342
West Fork Mojave River	Mojave	USACE	San Bernardino	1971	89,700
West Fork Mojave River	Cedar Springs	DWR	San Bernardino	1971	78,000
Dams in Central Coast Region of California that Serve Users of Water from Watersheds Tributary to the Delta					
Nacimiento Rv	Nacimiento	Monterey Co Water Res Agency	San Luis Obispo	1957	350,000
Cuyama River	Twitchell	US Bureau of Reclamation	San Luis Obispo	1958	240,000
Santa Ynez River	Bradbury	US Bureau of Reclamation	Santa Barbara	1953	205,000
Arroyo Grande Cr	Lopez	San Luis Obispo Co Fcwcd	San Luis Obispo	1969	52,500
Old Creek	Whale Rock	Whale Rock Commission	San Luis Obispo	1960	40,662
Salinas River	Salinas	Corps of Engineers	San Luis Obispo	1942	26,000
San Benito River	Hernandez	San Benito Co Water Dist	San Benito	1962	18,000
Offstream	San Justo	US Bureau of Reclamation	San Benito	1958	10,300
Nacimiento Rv	Nacimiento	Monterey Co Water Res Agency	San Luis Obispo	1957	350,000

Source: DWR Division of Safety of Dams, 2010