

# Notes from 02.01.10 HBMWD's Water Resource Planning Public Meetings

## Desired outcomes

By the end of the meeting, the members of the public will have...

- An understanding of the highlights of the current situation, the Water Resources Planning Process and where we are in it
- An understanding of the Framework for Evaluating Water Resource Planning Options and how it was developed
- An understanding of the two strategic options and the three types of water uses
- Provided their thinking on the benefits, concerns, and implications of the three types of water uses
- Generated "hot ideas" for specific water uses and the conditions under which they would be acceptable
- An understanding of next steps

## Opening—Questions people are bringing with them

- Local control – how to maintain it?
- What's the best and highest use for the water?
- Estuary is a concern – what is the potential impact to fish and wildlife?
- How to educate people about the real costs for water?
- Learn more to formulate questions
- Sheer volume of water used is small relative to full amount in the river and how the water is used and allocated is important

## Criteria—What stands out?

- We're looking regionally—taking a larger view
- Impressed with how much is reflected in documents with what was discussed at previous meetings
- Difficulty in defining "Quality of Life"
- Some of the criteria seem to be mutually exclusive. There might need to be some trade-off down the road
- Concern about knowing the cost of shutting down the industrial side of the system (district is working on it)
- Better than past processes
- Provides a tool to evaluate options
- Describes the breadth of what people are interested in

**Questions/Comments**

- What about sending some water to Fortuna?

**Report out from small group discussions**

	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Concerns/Implications</b>	<b>Conditions</b>
In-Stream purposes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fisheries and wildlife benefitted</li> <li>▪ Power production</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ May not benefit the river or estuary</li> <li>▪ Who'll pay for the studies?</li> <li>▪ Long-term legal liability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need studies</li> </ul>
Within HBMWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand economic benefit</li> <li>▪ Increasing municipal flow from industrial and might be able to serve other areas (this may then go outside HBMWD)</li> <li>▪ Work to re-open pulp mill</li> <li>▪ Reduce rates</li> <li>▪ Expand delivery to other areas – Elk River, Old Arcata Road – current extraction is affecting the river – a limit of extraction would be a benefit</li> <li>▪ Outside expansion could help pay for it</li> <li>▪ Try to utilize aquaculture – recruit businesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Environmentally – is aquaculture good for us?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Outside HBMWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Could reduce rates, provide funding for infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Could keep/ maintain local control</li> <li>▪ We would lose it anyway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does it protect our water rights?</li> <li>▪ Easier to lose local control</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Protect environmental conditions in the watershed</li> <li>▪ Cost of delivery is not out of district but cost is borne elsewhere</li> </ul>

**Table template notes (transcribed directly from the large sheets recorded at the tables)**

	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Concerns/Implications</b>	<b>Conditions</b>
In-Stream Purposes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Could benefit the river estuary as well as the rest of the river</li> <li>▪ Protects fishery (3)</li> <li>▪ Enhances watershed conditions (2)</li> <li>▪ Power production (2)</li> <li>▪ Long-term viability</li> <li>▪ District</li> <li>▪ Recreation</li> <li>▪ Research</li> <li>▪ Cheapest way to use water since no infrastructure cost</li> <li>▪ No pollution</li> <li>▪ No negative environmental impact</li> <li>▪ Supports community values</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ May not benefit the estuary or the rest of the river (2)</li> <li>▪ Too much water could hurt the estuary (2)</li> <li>▪ Long-term viability – isn't!</li> <li>▪ Export?</li> <li>▪ Legal viability?</li> <li>▪ Payment?</li> <li>▪ Not biggest bang for the buck</li> <li>▪ Doesn't off-set costs to municipal users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Environmental study needed (2)</li> <li>▪ Who pays?</li> <li>▪ Money to study impacts</li> <li>▪ Mitigations?</li> <li>▪ No ecosystem damage</li> <li>▪ Doesn't raise rates</li> </ul>

**Table template notes (transcribed directly from the large sheets recorded at the tables)**

	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Concerns/Implications</b>	<b>Conditions</b>
Within HBMWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand economic development</li> <li>▪ Reduce rates</li> <li>▪ Aquaculture – economic</li> <li>▪ Power production</li> <li>▪ Expand delivery to areas not currently served – Elk River, Cutten, Old Arcata Rd,, Indianola</li> <li>▪ Grow Hemp!</li> <li>▪ Increase capacity</li> <li>▪ Municipal source</li> <li>▪ Industrial source</li> <li>▪ Financial and economic benefit</li> <li>▪ Cheapest way to use existing infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are there really customers?</li> <li>▪ Who?</li> <li>▪ Cost?</li> <li>▪ Environmental concerns</li> <li>▪ Hemp is currently illegal – change the law!</li> <li>▪ Limited financial gain</li> <li>▪ Limited “uses” for large volume of water</li> <li>▪ Potential impacts related to new industries</li> <li>▪ Decreases quality of life if more residential development to use the water</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Protect the environmental quality of the water</li> <li>▪ Can’t cost the District</li> <li>▪ Available dollars</li> <li>▪ No ecosystem compromise (2)</li> <li>▪ Positive benefit on the economy</li> </ul>

**Table template notes (transcribed directly from the large sheets recorded at the tables)**

	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Concerns/Implications</b>	<b>Conditions</b>
Outside HBMWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduces rates</li> <li>▪ Expand the District to sell to the other/ neighboring municipalities and shift 20 mgd to those municipalities</li> <li>▪ Would lose water and maintain local control</li> <li>▪ Expand to Rio Dell, Trinidad, Fortuna, Sonoma City</li> <li>▪ More money for HBMWD</li> <li>▪ <b>Legally:</b> Using water, protects rights</li> <li>▪ New revenue sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does it protect our water rights? (3)</li> <li>▪ Can we get the community to agree?</li> <li>▪ Infrastructure cost to shift municipal ability to serve other neighboring municipalities</li> <li>▪ Deplete our water supply</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Protect the water rights (2)</li> <li>▪ Protect the environmental conditions</li> <li>▪ District should benefit from the sale</li> <li>▪ No new cost to ratepayers</li> <li>▪ Local control</li> <li>▪ Generate revenue</li> <li>▪ Negotiate – then pay</li> <li>▪ Stop delivery</li> <li>▪ Secondary to fish, wildlife, humans</li> <li>▪ HBMWD power to revoke outside use</li> <li>▪ No evaporation loss during transport</li> </ul>

**“Hot Ideas” from individual participants at Feb. 1 public meetings**

	<b>Hot Ideas</b>	<b>Conditions under which implementing these would be acceptable to you?</b>
In-Stream Purposes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Build pipeline to Van Duzen to feed mouth of Eel</li> <li>▪ Get PG&amp;E to fund as “community benefit”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mitigation for Wave Energy impacts to fisheries i.e. fishermen want Potter Valley Dam removed</li> </ul>
Within HBMWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Help our local breweries expand nationally</li> </ul>	
Outside HBMWD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ruth Lake as a reservoir of water for the rest of the state in firefighting season</li> <li>▪ Expand area of HBMWD within Humboldt County</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reversible at HBMWD option</li> <li>▪ Still maintain local control</li> <li>▪ Wouldn't harm the environment/watershed</li> </ul>

**Additional “Hot Ideas” from Feb. 1 public meeting**

- Expand district boundaries
- Pump water over to “the valley”
- Pump water to the South Fork of the Eel River
- Use water towards carbon sequestrian uses
- Sell water credits
- Ask the State for a permit that looks back 20 years
- Abandon industrial side
- Pump to Eel River Valley or transfer at Low Gap
- Forestall infrastructure projects to help off-set rate increases
- Increase the recreational value at Ruth Lake
- Vineyards anywhere along the watershed below Ruth Lake
- Sell water at same rate as it costs to use wells, e.g., SunValley