4. Relation to Local Water Use Planning

Pursuant to the IRWM Guidelines, each IRWM Plan is to document the local water planning documents on which it is based. The Guidelines ask for:

1. A list of local water plans used in the IRWM Plan;
2. A discussion of how the IRWM Plan relates to planning documents and programs established by local agencies; and
3. A description of the dynamics between the IRWM Plan and local planning documents.

As emphasized in the Guidelines, regional planning does not replace or supersede local planning; rather, regional planning should appropriately incorporate local planning elements. Per California Water Code §10540(b), the IRWM plan must describe how the RWAG has or will coordinate its water management planning activities to address a variety of local water management topics.

There are no groundwater management plans applicable to the IRWM Plan for the Upper Sacramento, McCloud, and Lower Pit Region (USR). Other planning documents, however, such as water, wastewater and storm water master plans, do reference groundwater. While most USR communities are reliant upon springs for municipal water supply, no communities in the region draw extensively from a defined and regulated groundwater aquifer. The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) of 2014 requires groundwater management plans for high and medium priority basins. The two sub-basins identified in the USR, McCloud and Toad Well basins, are designated as very low priority according to SGMA, and therefore have undergone very limited monitoring.\(^1\) Because of the identified lack of groundwater knowledge in the USR, there are several projects identified in Chapter 10, Project Review Process and Implementation, that deal with this topic.

Due to the limited extent of agricultural activity in this mountainous region, there is no mandatory agricultural water management planning activity, such as is required in many IRWM regions in part to Senate Bill X7-7.\(^2\)

Concerning the subject of urban water management, none of the cities or communities in this region fall under the applicable definition of “Urban”. Pursuant to Division 6 Part 2.6 of the Water Code §10610 - 10656\(^3\), Urban Water Management Plans (UWMP) are prepared by urban water suppliers in California to support long-term resource planning and to ensure that adequate water supplies will be available to meet future water demands.

Concerning the subject of water supply assessments, given the relatively small size of communities in the USR and relatively slow rate of growth, it is unlikely that a development project large enough to trigger the requirements of SB 221 and SB 610 will be proposed. Senate Bills 610 (Chapter 643, Statutes of

---

1. While the Shasta County Water Agency has prepared a Coordinated AB 3030 Groundwater Management Plan for the Redding Groundwater Basin, the USR is not within the area addressed by that groundwater plan, except for the extent that the watershed of the Sacramento River as a whole relates to that groundwater basin. Proposition 1 funding allowed for the completion of the California State Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) Compliant Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Final Report (Harrison/Roberts Environmental Management 2017). Sponsored by Trout Unlimited, the project partnered non-profits and tribes in the development of a baseline dataset of USR groundwater elevations.

2. SBx7-7, signed into law in 2009, contains water resource management provisions that require water suppliers that provide water to 25,000 irrigated acres or more to implement various monitoring and conservation measures, including preparation of Agricultural Water Management Plans.

2001) and 221 (Chapter 642, Statutes of 2001) amended state law, effective January 1, 2002, to improve the link between information on water supply availability and certain land use decisions made by cities and counties. Both statutes require detailed information regarding water availability to be provided to the city and county decision-makers prior to approval of specified large development projects. Both SB 221 and SB 610 apply to projects generally equivalent to a 500-unit residential development, an industrial development of roughly equivalent projected use, or a project that would increase the number of the public water system’s existing service connections by 10%. No water supply assessments in that context were available for consideration in preparation of this IRWM plan.

The RWAG for this region includes representatives from all three entities that have local water supply responsibilities. These agencies typically have master plans or other management plans concerning the operation, maintenance and expansion, as needed, of their water systems. Cities periodically prepare and update such master plans. For example, the City of Mt. Shasta Master Water Plan was prepared in 1986. It contains the results of investigation of the water system including supply, storage, and distribution facilities. A Master Water Plan identifies a number of the primary recommendations for improvement of the system. During preparation of the 2013 IRWM Plan, the RWAG was receptive to concerns and information from local agencies regarding water use planning issues as reflected in their master water plans and related planning studies.

As discussed in Chapter 5, Relation to Local Land Use Planning, counties and cities have prepared and maintain general plans pursuant to state planning law. These general plans contain various policies and proposals that represent various levels of local water planning and practitioners must coordinate with local water providers where appropriate. The following discussion addresses local water use planning policies in Shasta and Siskiyou Counties, as well as policies in the cities of Dunsmuir and Mt. Shasta.

Below is a list of water management plans considered in the development of the 2013 IRWM Plan, organized by the entity overseeing their development and implementation.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictional Type</th>
<th>Plan Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Shasta County General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shasta County Water Agency: plans for County Service Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siskiyou County General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siskiyou County Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siskiyou County Groundwater Management Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services District</td>
<td>McCloud Community Services District Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City of Dunsmuir General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dunsmuir Water and Wastewater Operational Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta Master Water Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sewer System Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta Sewer System Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Mt. Shasta Sewer System Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Plans</td>
<td>McCloud River Coordinated Resource Management Plan (CRMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Sacramento River Watershed Assessment and Management Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Because the 2018 IRWM Plan update was completed for the purpose of complying with revised state funding guidelines and was not a comprehensive update, these documents were not considered during the 2018 update.
Table 4.1: Local water plans used in the development of the USR IRWM Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictional Type</th>
<th>Plan Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local watershed planning (USFS)</td>
<td>Local watershed planning (USFS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basin Plan</td>
<td>Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basin Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Plan</td>
<td>State Water Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Shasta County

Shasta County’s General Plan includes Section 6.0, Resources Group. The Resources Group section, which fulfills many of the requirements of a general plan conservation element as required by the State General Plan Guidelines, addresses the preservation, management, and utilization of the county’s natural resources. Included in that section are subsections addressing water resources and water quality, as well as other natural resources including: agricultural lands; timber lands; minerals; energy; air quality; fish and wildlife habitat, and other subjects related to natural resources.

The Resources Group section of the General Plan includes a subsection entitled Section 6.6, Water Resources. This subsection contains objectives and policies concerning water resources. Many of the provisions of that section specifically address the Redding Basin, which is Shasta County’s primary population center. The Redding Basin is not within the Upper Sacramento IRWM region. Several policies of that general plan section are applicable to water management planning in the Upper Sacramento IRWM Plan region. For example:

W-c. All proposed land divisions and developments in Shasta County shall have an adequate water supply of a quantity and a quality for the planned uses. Project proponents shall submit sufficient data and reports, when requested, which demonstrate that potential adverse impacts on the existing water users will not be significant. The reports for land divisions shall be submitted to the County for review and acceptance prior to a completeness determination of a tentative map. This policy will not apply to developments in special districts that have committed and documented, in writing, the ability to provide the needed water supply.

W-e. The Shasta County Water Agency should encourage and promote interagency water planning efforts within the County, particularly in the Redding Basin.

W-f. The County shall encourage and participate in interagency planning efforts, such as the Redding Area Water Council, to protect and enhance the quality of all groundwater and surface water resources.

Within this IRWM region, the County of Shasta maintains three county service areas (CSAs) that provide water service to rural unincorporated communities in the county. These three CSAs are: CSA No. 2 – Sugarloaf; CSA No. 3 – Castella; and CSA No. 23 – Crag View. The County manages these CSAs and has related plans for water use in these areas.

The Shasta County Water Agency was formed to develop water supplies in Shasta County. It wholesales 1,022 acre-feet of CVP water-to-water districts and other parties. The Water Agency acts as staff to the Redding Area Water Council, which has developed the Redding Basin Water Resources Management Plan to ensure adequate water supply in future droughts.

4.2 Siskiyou County

In the Siskiyou County General Plan Conservation Element (1973), the County expresses the following objectives:
Objective 1: To conserve and protect the land resources of Siskiyou County.

Objective 2: To protect and conserve the lakes, streams and reservoirs of the county of potable and agricultural water for recreation areas but more important as wildlife habitat which will be beneficial to the residents, present and future, of Siskiyou County and the State.

Under Section H. Watershed and Water Recharge Lands, the Conservation Element includes the objective:

To preserve the quality of the existing water supply in Siskiyou County and adequately plan for the expansion and retention of valuable water supplies for future generations and to provide for a comprehensive program for sustained multiple use of watershed lands through reduction of fire hazards, erosion control and type conversion of vegetation where desirable and feasible.

Following that objective, the element lists the following as recommendations:

1. Provide for the safety and welfare of the residents of the county by flood control efforts on a regional scale.

2. Continue to assure the high quality of water within the county with management programs for agriculture waters and emphasizing programs that stop intrusion of agricultural waste into the water supply.

3. Every precaution must be maintained to eliminate the danger of any pollution to the streams and lakes as well as recharge areas through human and industrial waste and agricultural runoff.

4. Continue a program [of] research into the future water demands of Siskiyou County to establish the need for any future facilities.

5. Promote a plan for future expansion of water storage reservoirs to be utilized as water supply as well as recreation.

6. Utilize latest scientific techniques towards reclamation and recycling of wastewater.

7. Use of watershed or recharge lands for urban or second homes purposes should be permitted only under rigid controls.

Aside from the county general plan, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors also adopted a Strategic Plan in November 2008 to outline various policy statements and intended actions. Under the category of F. Natural Resources, the county expressed the need for a strategy (F-4) to: “Develop overarching policy and network for Siskiyou County water resources.”

Siskiyou County maintains a Groundwater Management Ordinance as County Code Title 3, Chapter 13. This ordinance requires that a discretionary permit is required from the county for the extraction of groundwater from any groundwater basin underlying the county for use outside the basin from which it was extracted, with exceptions specified in the ordinance for water bottling facilities (detailed below). In adopting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors cited findings including declarations that the groundwater basins underlying the county form significant water resources that must be managed in trust, and must be conserved so that they may be placed to the reasonable and beneficial uses of potential users, while avoiding waste and unreasonable use of these resources. The county also found that it is essential for information gathering and monitoring purposes, and for the protection of the county’s groundwater resources, that the county should adopt a permit process to address excessive extraction of groundwater.
for use outside the basin from which it would be extracted. Issuance of a permit is subject to approval by
the Board of Supervisors following review by and recommendations from the Planning Commission.

Among the exceptions from the permitting requirements are bottling and transporting bottled water by a
commercial bottling water enterprise. However, the exemption for commercial bottled water is not
applicable to water that is extracted and exported in bulk for bottling at a location outside Siskiyou
County.

Siskiyou County’s Groundwater Management Ordinance expresses the county’s intent to, as resources
permit, undertake development of “a County water plan to more specifically address water availability,
needs and usages in an attempt to foster prudent water management practices to avoid significant adverse
overdraft-related environmental, social, and economic impacts.” Such a water plan has yet to be
developed.

While the community of McCloud is unincorporated and therefore within the jurisdiction Siskiyou
County’s, the McCloud Community Services District maintains a management plan for its water system
and the services it provides to the unincorporated community. McCloud’s primary guidelines for
governing water are outlined in Ordinance 23 Water Policy.

4.3 City of Dunsmuir

The City of Dunsmuir adopted a comprehensive update of its general plan in 2006. The Open Space
Element and the Conservation Element for the City of Dunsmuir have been combined into a single
element that addresses both subjects. The City’s General Plan states that the Open Space and
Conservation elements are closely linked in Dunsmuir due to the proximity of the Sacramento River, the
steepness of forested canyon walls on either side of the city, and the role open space and natural resources
play in supporting Dunsmuir’s economy. Accordingly, the City of Dunsmuir General Plan includes a
number of implementation measures to safeguard water resources under Goal OC-3 “Protection of the
City’s water resources,” as well as the following objective:

Objective: The City’s water supply and the Sacramento River running through the City are vital to the
community. The City must protect the watershed in order to maintain the quality and quantity of the
municipal water supply, as well as sustain fishing, recreation and scenic benefits related to water
resources.

In addition to the General Plan provisions that reflect local water planning policy, the City maintains
master plans for its municipal water and wastewater systems, and the City has adopted standards
addressing particular water resource issues. For example, the City adopted its Water Efficient
Landscaping Ordinance (Ordinance No. 532) in March 2011. The ordinance was codified as Chapter

4.4 City of Mt. Shasta

The City of Mt. Shasta General Plan (2007) addresses the City’s goals and objectives for water use. Since
water use is directly related to land use, the Land Use Element contains policies addressing water supply.
For instance:

Goal LU-18: Maintain a water supply and distribution system that meets drinking water standards and
that serves the domestic and fire protection needs of the community.

Policy LU-18.1: Ensure that the growth of the community does not outstrip the water supply and
distribution system of the City.
In 2017, the City of Mt. Shasta participated in Resilience Dialogs in conjunction with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. The process led the City to undertake a comprehensive update of its general plan. The update will include a review all elements through the lens of climate change, and for the first time the City of Mt. Shasta General Plan will include an optional water resource element. The anticipated date for completion of the General Plan update is 2020. Any new General Plan policies relevant to climate change adaptation or mitigation will be incorporated into the IRWM Plan during the next plan update, as appropriate.

As noted above, the City of Mt. Shasta has a Master Water Plan that was prepared in 1986 and updated in 2010. This plan is the primary source of information on improvement needs for the City’s water system and for the use of water within the City’s service area. There is also a City of Mt. Shasta Master Sewer Plan for the Sewage Collection and Treatment Facilities (1992), as well as a 2010 Sewer System Management Plan. In the context of the IRWM Plan, the City of Mt. Shasta has been especially interested in pursuing improvements to the wastewater treatment plant to implement the master plan and to comply with new wastewater discharge requirements.

### 4.5 Other Local Plans

Various local plans have been prepared which merit mention in this section due to the relation of those plans to water resources in the USR. In other cases, proposed strategies with planning recommendations have resulted from planning efforts, but such recommended strategies may not necessarily be considered as local plans if they have not been adopted by a local jurisdiction with the authority to implement such recommendations.

**The McCloud CRMP**

One notable resource plan within the planning area is the McCloud River Coordinated Resource Management Plan (CRMP). The McCloud River CRMP was adopted in July 1991. Its purpose was to define the organizational structure and establish guidelines to coordinate management activities in an identified area of the McCloud River drainage area with principle landowners and public agencies that administer programs in that area. The signatories of the memorandum of understanding (MOU) that adopted the plan agreed that the mission of the CRMP is to, among other objectives, coordinate various land management activities to improve management of resources while promoting cooperation between agencies, groups, and individuals responsible for resource management and land use planning and implementation within the CRMP area boundaries. The Winnemem Wintu Tribe, who are RWAG members, have stated that they have been excluded from CRMP membership, although the McCloud River area is their historical traditional territory and has designated Traditional Cultural Properties as well as presently-used ceremonial sites.

Another important objective was, “To allow a sustained flow of wood, fiber, recreation use, and other services and benefits from such lands while at the same time protecting and enhancing the area’s natural environmental qualities and fully recognizing and protecting the rights of private participants in their property.” (McCloud River CRMP 1991) The CRMP was formed as an alternative to a then-proposed effort to designate the McCloud River as a “Wild and Scenic River” under the California Wild and Scenic River Act. The CRMP includes a number of specific management practices to help achieve its objectives, including recognition of types of project proposals that should, if proposed, be subject to study by the CRMP coordinating group.

The raising of Shasta Dam would inundate the lower section of the McCloud River up to the new full pool elevation of Shasta Reservoir. In the opinion of the Winnemem Wintu Tribe, the flooding of this section of the McCloud is in direct violation of the California Resource Code and challenges the stated objectives and purposes of the CRMP.
Watershed Assessments and Analyses

Various watershed assessments have been prepared for several specific areas within the region. Watershed assessments provide an evaluation of resources and management issues in an identified study area. In some cases, the watershed assessments include recommendations (in the form of a “strategy” or otherwise) concerning planning and management of resources including water.

For example, a project that should be acknowledged as having been considered in preparation of the IRWM Plan for this region is the Upper Sacramento River Watershed Assessment and Management Strategy (2010). The preparation of that document was managed by The River Exchange and was funded by a grant through Proposition 50 (via the CALFED Watershed Program), as administered by the California Department of Water Resources. The project consultant was North State Resources, Inc., with assistance from ICF International and Lee Benda and Associates, Inc.

With assistance from a broad-based public advisory group and steering committee, the project included an assessment of resources and issues in the watershed of the Upper Sacramento River (from its headwaters to Shasta Lake). The assessment of these resources has contributed substantially to the Region Description portion of this IRWM Plan. The watershed assessment also provided recommendations for, as the name of the document implies, a management strategy. One of the expressed objectives of the assessment process and document was to, “Produce a document that can be incorporated into future watershed planning and management decisions.”

The local planning conducted by the Shasta-Trinity National Forest (STNF) is applicable to the subject of water use and resource planning in the Upper Sac IRWM region. The STNF Land and Resource Management Plan (1995) was prepared to guide the management of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest. The primary goals of that plan are to integrate a mix of management activities that allow use and protection of forest resources, meet the needs of guiding legislation, and address local, regional, and national issues. This federal land and resource-planning program is described in more detail in the Land Use section of the Region Description. As part of this planning program, the STNF has produced a series of watershed analyses that warrant mention in this context. Following is a list of watershed analyses (WA) or basically equivalent ecosystem analyses that have been prepared by the STNF covering areas that are located completely or partially within the Upper Sac IRWM region:

1. Mount Shasta WA
2. Lower McCloud WA
3. Squaw Valley Creek WA
4. Edson WA
5. Pit Arm Shasta Lake WA
6. Porcupine WA
7. Headwaters Sacramento River Ecosystem Analysis
8. Shasta Lake West WA
9. Squaw Creek WA
10. McCloud Arm WA
11. Bartle WA
12. Shotgun-Slate WA
13. Iron Canyon WA
14. McCloud Flats Ecosystem Analysis
15. Upper Sacramento River (Castle/Soda Creek area – not on website)

A watershed analysis was also prepared for the Medicine Lake Highlands by the Modoc National Forest.
**Storm Water Resource Plans**

Water Code § 10562 (b)(7) requires the development of a storm water resource plan (SWRP) and compliance with these provisions to receive grants for storm water and dry weather runoff capture projects. Upon development of a SWRP, the code states that Regional Water Management Groups shall incorporate the SWRP into the IRWM Plan. This requirement does not apply to DACs with a population of 20,000 or less and that is not a co-permittee for a municipal separate storm water system national pollutant discharge elimination system permit issued to a municipality with a population greater than 20,000.

Currently there are no SWRPs in, or under development in, the USR region. The City of Mt Shasta submitted an application in 2016 to develop a SWRP, but the grant was not awarded. Interest in developing a SWRP for Mt. Shasta continues, but the timeline is uncertain. Should the City of Mt. Shasta or any other USR stakeholders develop a SWRP, the plan will be incorporated into the IRWM Plan as appropriate.

### 4.6 Statewide Plans with Local Significance

Statewide plans with local significance include the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board’s Basin Plan and the Department of Water Resources’ State Water Plan. Both are central to water planning throughout the state and, thus, the region.

**Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basin Plan**

Basin Plans consist of a designation or establishment for the waters within a specified area of beneficial uses to be protected, water quality objectives to protect those uses, and a program of implementation needed for achieving the objectives. State law also requires that Basin Plans conform to the policies set forth in the Water Code beginning with Section 13000 and any state policy for water quality control. This Basin Plan doesn’t specifically mention the Upper Sacramento or Lower Pit Rivers as far as policy is concerned, but does identify beneficial use goals for:

- The McCloud River (Municipal Domestic, Power, Recreation (contact and non-contact), cold freshwater and spawning habitat, and wildlife habitat);
- The Pit River from the mouth of Hat Creek to Shasta Lake Reservoir (Municipal Domestic, Irrigation, Stock Watering, Power, Recreation (contact, non-contact, and canoeing and rafting), cold freshwater and spawning habitat, warm spawning habitat, and wildlife habitat);
- The Upper Sacramento River to Box Canyon Dam (Irrigation, Stock Watering, Recreation (contact, non-contact), cold freshwater habitat, and wildlife habitat);
- The Upper Sacramento River from Box Canyon Dam to Shasta Lake Reservoir (Irrigation, Stock Watering, Recreation (contact, non-contact, and canoeing and rafting), cold freshwater and spawning habitat, and wildlife habitat); and
- Lake Siskiyou (contact and non-contact recreation, warm and cold freshwater habitat, and wildlife habitat).

Each of these bodies has specific management objectives for the beneficial uses assigned to it. USR stakeholders are aware of this and have structured proposed projects — in this IRWM Plan and outside of this planning process — in coordination with these management goals. Coordination with the Central Valley Water Quality Control Board will continue into the future.
An issue that has risen in level of importance on a statewide basis for the State Board is that of salts and nutrient management. This issue is linked to the increase in recycled water implementation and use throughout the state. Salts and nutrient inputs are not currently an issue in the USR and are not expected to be in the near future. However, if recycled water is pursued as an implementation project, the Central Valley Board will be contacted to coordinate salt and nutrient management.

**State Water Plan**

Volume 1 of the State Water Plan identifies general vulnerabilities and opportunities for water management in California as a whole. Chapter 7 of this volume discusses implementation of the Plan and identifies 13 objectives for implementation. Several of those, which are more relevant to the USR, are discussed in the list below.

- **Objective 1: Expand Integrated Regional Water Management** — USR stakeholders are vested in the success of the IRWM program in the region and in the state. Investment of the state in the IRWM program is essential for many rural and/or disadvantaged parts of California due to the low population levels and extensive human and natural infrastructure. In addition, these (largely) source water areas provide millions of dollars of benefit to the rest of the state and should be part of taxpayer investment in water resources. IRWM is a good way to funnel these funds because of the balanced nature of participation and project review.

- **Objective 4: Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality** — Water quality is generally quite good in the USR, but climate change projections indicate possible threats to these resources. Most regional inhabitants not served by municipal water providers depend on groundwater resources through private groundwater wells. Those residents who do receive municipal supply are also, indirectly, dependent upon groundwater through the use of springs for most municipal supply. As mentioned throughout this IRWM Plan, groundwater quality and quantity is largely unknown throughout the USR; increasing regional understanding of this resource will add to regional resiliency as the region experiences the hydrology change projected as a result of climate change. In addition, some of the wastewater treatment infrastructure in the region affects the water quality of receiving waters. Decreased flow because of changing precipitation patterns may create a more challenging situation when it comes to compliance with designated beneficial uses. It is essential that stakeholders address these issues now, when they have the flexibility and adaptive advantage of time.

- **Objective 5: Expand Environmental Stewardship** — Reliable water supplies and resilient flood protection require environmental stewardship and resource and ecosystem sustainability to be a primary goal and foundational action for water resources management. Stakeholders in the USR are invested in the health of the watersheds around them and will continue to work together to promote, improve (where needed), and maintain the functionality and value of these resources.

- **Objective 7: Manage a Sustainable California Delta** — While the California Bay-Delta is outside of the USR planning region, the repercussions of Delta management are felt throughout the system. It is clear that water resources, planning, management, and policy in California will not be addressed without a solution to the Delta challenges. In that spirit, several USR stakeholder entities are involved in the process of developing and identifying options and strategies for the Delta, and in the process are ardently defending the resources of northern California interests. A solution for the Delta, while necessary, cannot be developed on the backs of northern California water users.

- **Objective 10: Improve Data and Analysis for Decision-making** — While the technology for increased and improved water information and monitoring is available, new technology has not
been implemented in a meaningful, universal way throughout the state for many years. The CIMIS (California Irrigation Management Information System) station network has not been updated since implementation, and the real-time monitoring now available for snowpack, runoff, and temperature is not available in enough watersheds. In addition, this information could be useful to inform reservoir management rule curves, which could result in both significant water savings (through resource conservation in the spring) as well as the avoidance of significant flooding disasters (through water releases using real-time data on storm temperature and capacity). The gap in knowledge regarding groundwater resources has been noted throughout this IRWM Plan, and a real need for increased data — and the coordination and sharing of that data — is apparent.

- **Objective 12: Improve Tribal Water and Natural Resources** — Four tribes (and two bands of one tribe) have been active in the USR IRWM planning process. It is clear from conversations — both public and individual — that water issues are at the forefront of many tribes’ and aboriginal nations’ concerns. Improvements that DWR is able to make as far as communication and coordination with tribes will only serve to strengthen the coordination and communication with and integration of tribes and nations into the IRWM planning process, thereby funneling a greater percent of statewide benefits to and through tribes.

- **Objective 13: Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits** — Through this USR planning process, and building on experiences of other IRWM planning regions, it was noted that both tribes and disadvantaged communities share an inhibitor to IRWM process participation. Limited budgets, an excessive workload-to-staffing ratio, and a difficulty in identifying the importance of the IRWM planning and implementation process is a set of challenges identified throughout California’s rural and (often) source water area regions. The distribution of public benefits to these communities and planning areas goes beyond adequate funding for projects, to the heart of the question of participation. It is important that, as DWR promotes Objective 1, to expand and promote the IRWM process, that they keep in mind those real hurdles to participation by stakeholders in some of the key watersheds making up and contributing to California’s water system and resources.

The Resource Management Strategies (RMS) make up a significant portion of the State Water Plan, and all of Volume 2. The relevance of these strategies are discussed in the RMS Chapter (Chapter 8).

Volume 3 of the State Water Plan identifies region-specific issues through twelve regional reports. That report which includes the Upper Sacramento, McCloud, and Lower Pit Rivers is the Sacramento River Regional Report. Within the report, DWR states that “[t]he Pit and McCloud Rivers contribute major volumes of water from the mountains above Shasta Lake.” Aside from mentioning the hydrologic connectivity of the McCloud and Pit Rivers to Shasta Lake Reservoir, the report makes no mention of USR resources. It does include some generalities regarding Native American concerns with resources in the region, and identifies the USR IRWM planning effort, but doesn’t recognize the uniqueness of the USR with relation to environmental and water (specifically, springs) resources.
This is a possible activity for USR stakeholders with the periodic updates of the California Water Plan: to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the way the Sacramento Hydrologic Region is described in the Regional Report.

4.7 Future IRWM Collaboration Concerning Local Water Use Planning

The RWAG will continue to invite and be receptive to local agencies that wish to share and discuss their water use plans with others in the region. The RWAG will encourage and help local agencies consider the regional opportunities and ramifications of their local plans, and will welcome suggestions for how those local plans and related project proposals might be supported by regional planning. As noted above, almost all local water-service agencies in the region have been active members of the RWAG, and this participation facilitates consideration of local water use plans.

Participation with the RWAG will also facilitate review of periodic updates of local plans, if and when the local agencies would like to present their updates to the RWAG for discussion.

When updates of local water use plans are presented to the RWAG for discussion, review will include consideration of any notable or potential inconsistencies between a local plan and the regional plan. The RWAG will consider whether and when the regional plan should be updated, if warranted, to accommodate or support a change in a local plan.

Since a major tenet of the IRWM program is that regional planning does not supersede local planning, but rather works to appropriately incorporate local planning, it is expected that local plans and their updates will be accommodated within the scope of the IRWM plan. That is, the Upper Sac IRWM plan is broad enough in scope to complement and support local plans.