

RUSSIAN RIVER WATER FORUM

# Summary of Interview Findings

January 2023

Image credit: Erin Watt

Prepared by

**K E A R N S**  **W E S T**

Funding for this project has been provided in full or in part from the Budget Act of 2021 and through an agreement with the State Department of Water Resources.



## I. Background

This Summary of Interview Findings document presents overarching themes and key perspectives from interviews Kearns & West conducted with a broad cross-section of parties with an interest in Pacific Gas & Electric Company's Potter Valley Hydroelectric Project (PVP) and/or water supply or associated resources in the Russian River and Eel River basins.

For more than 100 years, the diversion of water from the Eel River to the Russian River via the PVP has provided an important source of water for the Russian River basin. PG&E plans to decommission the PVP, which could reduce or eliminate this water source. The Russian River Water Forum (Water Forum) is a new collaborative process initiated by Sonoma Water and a collection of regional partners with funding from a California Department of Water Resources grant. The Water Forum aims to preserve the flow of water from the Eel River via the PVP into the Russian River while also fostering collaboration to support water supply resiliency in the Russian River watershed.

Kearns & West has been engaged to help establish and facilitate the Water Forum through an inclusive, transparent process. The interviews for this report represent an initial step in that process, and the findings will help inform the governance structure and engagement approach of the Water Forum.

This document summarizes key views on the diversion from the Eel River and the Water Forum, including challenges to overcome, keys to success, and elements of potential solutions. The findings are intended solely to reflect input provided by interviewees, except where stated otherwise. Input from the interviews has been synthesized and aggregated to protect the confidentiality of the interview participants.

For questions about the Water Forum or this document, please contact Jim Downing, Kearns & West, [jdowning@kearnswest.com](mailto:jdowning@kearnswest.com).

## II. Methodology

Kearns & West conducted 38 interviews with a total of 73 individuals, as listed in Appendix A. The interviewees represented county and city governments, water providers, agricultural interests, recreation interests, business groups, environmental groups, state and federal regulatory agencies, and resource conservation districts. A separate process for gathering input from Tribes in Sonoma and Mendocino counties is also underway.

Interviews were led by Kearns & West senior staff members Anna West, Jim Downing, Morgan Lommele, and Ben Gettleman.

The interviews had several objectives:

- Understand the interviewees' connection to the PVP and how the potential loss of the diversion to the Russian River could impact their organization;

- Understand their organization's interests as they relate to water supply or water resource issues;
- Provide an overview of the Water Forum concept and gather input on a proposed structure and how interviewees and their organizations might like to participate in the Water Forum;
- Gather recommendations for effective and inclusive engagement and how interviewees would like to stay updated; and
- Understand organizations' interest in contributing to the future operation of the Potter Valley Project (financially, politically, etc.)

*The interview instrument is provided in Appendix B.*

### III. Overarching Findings

Several overarching findings emerged from the interviews:

- **Support for Concept** – Interviewees understand the need for the Water Forum – both to address the PVP diversion and broader water Russian River resiliency topics – and support moving forward with it.
- **Urgency** – There is a recognition that time is short, much is at stake, and a solution will need to be developed quickly.
- **Inclusion and Transparency** – Broad representation and a commitment to transparency will be critical to the success of the Water Forum. Interests from both the Russian and Eel River basins need to be at the table, and Tribes should be involved.
- **Financing** – Water users are generally willing to pay to support continued Eel-Russian water diversions, contingent on the cost and reliability of the water and the availability and cost of alternative sources. Non-water users are willing to contribute in other ways (supporting grant applications, advocating for state and federal funding, and providing political support).
- **Fairness** – Considerations of fairness should inform discussions on sharing burdens, including costs, water curtailments, and other impacts.
- **Technical Resources** – Interviewees cited a need for data, technical resources, and a menu of scenarios to inform discussions of the viability of the PVP vs. other water sources and future options for the PVP water source.
- **Education and Outreach** – Community awareness of the PVP and related issues is relatively low, even though impacts from the loss of the PVP water source could be significant. There is a need for broad education/outreach on the importance of the PVP and broader water resilience issues.

## IV. Connection to and Awareness of the PVP

*Note: Interviews included questions and discussion on awareness of the PVP and tracking of the decommissioning process, potential impacts of the loss of the PVP water source, past involvement in discussions on a local solution, and interest in participating in the Water Forum process. Responses on these topics were scored on a 1-5 scale; the responses are referenced in this document and tabulated in Appendix C.*

- Overall, awareness of the PVP was very high across the participants interviewed (average score 4.5 out of 5). Most have been tracking the PVP decommissioning as well (average score 4.2). However, many noted that they are unclear on the status of the Two-Basin Solution discussions and would have liked that process to be more transparent and inclusive.
- Every category of interest perceived a high or very high impact on the loss of the diversion (3.9 to 5). Recreation and agricultural interests anticipate the greatest impact, followed by environmental NGOs, municipal water users, resource agencies, and county government.
- Interest in participating in the Water Forum among those interviewed was correlated most strongly with the perceived impact of the loss of the PVP as a source of water ( $\rho = 0.49$ ), followed by past involvement in discussions about a local solution ( $\rho = 0.39$ ).
- There is a recognition that many in the Russian River basin (including some water users) aren't aware of the full range of impacts of the loss of the diversion, such as the likelihood of broader water curtailments in the basin and effects on the recreation and tourism economies.

## V. Priority Interests

- Interviewees identified a collection of interests that could serve as a starting point for discussions on the goals of the Water Forum. Each of these topics was referenced by multiple interviewees.
  - Water supply needs in the Russian River Basin
  - Fisheries and ecosystem health in the Russian River and Eel River basins
  - Recreational uses of the Russian River
  - Availability of water for aerial wildfire suppression needs in the region
  - The region's economy, especially the agriculture and recreation/tourism sectors
  - Tribal interests related to the Russian and Eel River basins

## VI. Recommendations for Water Forum, Interest in Participation

### *Recommendations for the Water Forum*

- **Broad representation in the Water Forum**, including Eel River Basin and Lake County interests, will be critical to success. Given that the geographic scope extends beyond the Russian River Basin, consider renaming/rebranding.
- **Have clearly stated goals** that resonate with the interests of participants. It should be clear what is negotiable and what is not, and how this effort differs from the Two-Basin Solution process.
- **Seek commitments to the Water Forum process** from participants. Strive to have participants commit that, within the group, they will commit to working together across interests. And outside the group, they will commit to not working at cross-purposes to Water Forum goals.
- **Transparency.** Nearly all respondents cited transparency as a critical factor for success. To the extent possible, membership, governance processes, and progress updates should be public and easily accessible. In particular, the role of Sonoma Water in the Water Forum should be clearly communicated to address the potential concerns that Sonoma Water could have too much influence over the Water Forum (note: at the same time, many appreciate Sonoma Water's leadership).
- **Seek to leverage existing groups working on related topics** and to extend the reach of education and outreach efforts. Relevant groups include the Russian River Confluence, the Russian River Watershed Association, the Upper Russian River Water Managers Group, and Groundwater Sustainability Agencies.

### *Technical/Supporting information is Needed to Inform Water Forum Discussions*

- Technical information will be critical for identifying clear scenarios/options and for the group's deliberation. Information needs include:
  - Clear analysis of PVP project v. other water supply options
  - Clearly defined potential PVP options, with (to the extent possible) information on estimated costs, risks/liabilities, and water reliability
  - Timelines and milestones in the PG&E license surrender process
  - Water supply alternatives to continuing the PVP diversion, and associated costs
  - Clarification of water rights
  - Information on surface-groundwater interactions in key basins

### *Interest in Participating in the Water Forum*

- Overall, interest in participating in the Water Forum was strong (average response 3.6 out of 5); even participants skeptical about prospects for a solution are interested in being at the table. Interest was generally highest among those who anticipate a large impact from changes to PVP water flows, including agricultural interests (average response 4.5), environmental NGOs (4.5), and water providers in the Upper Russian River Basin (4.3).
- Lower Russian River Basin and county elected officials notably reported lower interest in direct participation in the Water Forum (average responses 3.3 and 3.0, respectively). In general, these interviewees expected their involvement in the process would likely be through a representative. For example, Water Advisory Committee (WAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members could represent the nine Sonoma Water contractors, and county interests could be represented by a technical staff lead and one or two supervisors.

### *Recommendations for Resiliency Group to Facilitate Basin-wide Collaboration*

- Most respondents saw a need for a forum for basin-wide collaboration beyond the PVP and are interested in participating. Recognized regional issues/needs include:
  - Future water supply resiliency given climate change
  - Regional cooperation on the development of new water supplies through water reuse and groundwater recharge
  - Cooperation on water demand management
  - Cooperation in pursuing state and federal funding
- Some believe that some regional planning on water supply options needs to occur before or in parallel with PVP discussions to understand whether the Eel-Russian water diversion is needed and economically competitive with alternative water supplies.
- Some also note the need to prioritize issues related to the water diversion in the near-term, given the PVP decommissioning timeline.

## VII. Elements of a Potential Solution

### *Financing*

- Willingness to Pay
  - Water users expressed willingness to pay for the continuation of the PVP water supply, pending information about the cost of water from this source compared to potential alternative sources or demand reduction. Other considerations include:
    - Which other participants or entities are contributing, and what external (state, federal, other) financial support is the project receiving (that is, how the costs are being shared).
    - Potential risks associated with not contributing financially and with the project not moving forward due to a lack of funding.
    - For agricultural users, the likely economic return (crop/livestock revenue) on the water.
    - For municipal water providers, whether customers support investing in this project and are willing to accept rate increases to do so.
- Fairness
  - Interviewees felt that contributions to PVP sequel project costs should be equitable, though the definition of “equitable” varied. Most stated that water users should have the primary financial responsibility, with costs proportional to use. Some noted that agricultural and municipal water could reasonably be valued differently when determining a fair allocation of costs.
  - The approach to allocating capital and unit costs used by the Sonoma Water contractors – the WAC and TAC members – was cited as a potential model.
  - Several suggested that costs should be shared more broadly, e.g. through county property tax assessments, bond measures, state and environmental funding, or grants. Such broader sharing would be justified because the impacts of the loss of the PVP water source would extend beyond water users. Other interviewees objected to this approach.

## Scott Dam Removal

- Positions on Scott Dam removal are wide-ranging.
- Interviewees opposed to dam removal noted the following concerns:
  - Removal may not yield a significant recovery of Eel River fisheries, given other habitat and predator issues in the basin; the sediment behind the dam would damage downstream habitat and/or be very costly to manage.
  - Removal would hurt the Lake Pillsbury community and its recreation economy and would eliminate an important open water body that is used for aerial wildfire suppression in the region.
  - Removal would remove important water storage infrastructure, which is likely to be increasingly valuable as the climate continues to change.
- Those supporting dam removal cited the following reasons:
  - Removal will contribute meaningfully to fisheries recovery in the Eel River.
  - Continuation of Eel-Russian water diversions is not dependent on Scott Dam remaining; it is possible to meet Russian River Basin water needs without Scott Dam.
  - Practically speaking, Scott Dam removal is a precondition for Eel-Russian water diversions to continue because multiple critical interests would likely block an agreement that does not include dam removal.
- Some interviewees did not have a position on dam removal or felt they needed more information on potential scenarios and impacts. Key questions include:
  - Whether the sediment behind Scott Dam can be managed to avoid serious impacts on downstream habitat, at a practical cost.
  - Detailed information on infrastructure configurations that include Scott Dam removal and continued Eel-Russian diversions, including whether Cape Horn Dam would be removed or modified to improve fish passage.
  - How the diversion would be operated, given the anticipated effects of climate change on the Eel River Basin hydrograph, including the timing of flows, expected annual variability, and impacts of the operation of Lake Mendocino and flows downstream of Coyote Valley Dam.

## Water Rights

- Several interviewees noted that water rights implications must be part of the discussions on the future of the PVP diversion. Changes in Lake Mendocino water levels would impact the exercise of existing water rights. A new water rights regime in the Russian River Basin may be needed regardless of the future of the PVP diversion. Changes in the timing and volume of flows in the Russian River will likely result in a need for increased water rights monitoring and enforcement, and capacity at oversight agencies is already a concern.

## VIII. Communication and Engagement

### *Public Outreach and Education*

- Public education is needed. The general public needs to better understand how the water system works and how these issues could affect them. Few know where the PVP is located or what it does. One interviewee suggested naming future diversion infrastructure in a way that makes clearer the connection to Russian River water supplies.
- The Water Forum should be a trusted source of information about the PVP and the water diversion. Public-facing materials should be simple and infographic-driven and should be objective (not advocacy-oriented). Use multiple channels, including print, video, web, and social media. The website should include both simple explanatory information and links to technical information for those interested in details and to promote transparency.
- In messaging, focus on potential successes, i.e., that maintaining this water diversion is a wise investment, not a financial penalty. Include information about economic benefits.
- Public workshops will be valuable.
- Consider language needs – materials in Spanish, interpreters at events

## Appendix A: List of interviewees

| Sector               | #  | Organization  | Name   | Title   |
|----------------------|----|---|--|---|
| Agriculture and RCDs | 1  | CA Land Stewardship Institute<br>Mendocino County Farm Bureau | Laurel Marcus<br>Devon Boer                                      | Executive Director<br>Director  |
|                      | 2  | Sonoma County Farm Bureau                                     | Dayna Ghirardelli<br>Pat Burns                                   | Executive Director<br>Board Member                                    |
|                      | 3  | Sonoma RCD<br>Gold Ridge RCD                                  | Valerie Quinto<br>John Nagle<br>Brittany Jensen<br>Sierra Cantor | Executive Director<br>Board Chair<br>Executive Director<br>Ecologist  |
|                      | 4  | Mendocino RCD   | Stephanie Garrabrant-Sierra<br>Joe Scriven<br>Deborah Edelman    | Executive Director<br>Asst. Executive Director<br>Project Manager     |
| County Government    | 5  | Sonoma Board of Supervisors                                   | Susan Gorin<br>Chris Coursey                                     | District 1 Supervisor<br>District 3 Supervisor                        |
|                      | 6  | Sonoma Board of Supervisors                                   | David Rabbitt  | District 2 Supervisor   |
|                      | 7  | Sonoma Board of Supervisors                                   | James Gore   | District 4 Supervisor   |
|                      | 8  | Sonoma Board of Supervisors                                   | Lynda Hopkins  | District 5 Supervisor   |
|                      | 9  | Mendocino Board of Supervisors                                | Glenn McGourty<br>Ted Williams                                   | District 1 Supervisor<br>District 5 Supervisor                        |
|                      | 10 | Mendocino Board of Supervisors<br>Mendocino County            | John Haschak<br>Dan Gjerde<br>Darcie Antle                       | District 3 Supervisor<br>District 4 Supervisor<br>CEO                 |
|                      | 11 | Lake Board of Supervisors<br>Lake County                      | Bruno Sabatier<br>Eddie Crandell<br>Anita Grant                  | District 2 Supervisor<br>District 3 Supervisor<br>County Counsel      |
|                      | 12 | Humboldt Board of Supervisors<br>Humboldt County              | Rex Bohn<br>Hank Seeman  | District 1 Supervisor<br>Deputy Director of Environmental<br>Services |
|                      | 13 | Sonoma County LAFCO   | Mark Bramfitt  | Executive Officer   |

RUSSIAN RIVER WATER FORUM  
Summary of Interview Findings

| Sector                               | #  | Organization  | Name   | Title   |
|--------------------------------------|----|---|--|---|
| Env. NGO                             | 14 | Trout Unlimited<br>CalTrout                                   | Matt Clifford<br>Charlie Schneider<br>Redgie Collins | Staff Attorney<br>Lost Coast Coordinator<br>Legal and Policy Director |
|                                      | 15 | Russian Riverkeeper   | Don McEnhill<br>Jaime Neary                          | Executive Director<br>Staff Attorney & Policy Director                |
|                                      | 16 | Russian River Watershed Protection<br>Committee               | Brenda Adelman                                       | Board Chair   |
|                                      | 17 | American Rivers   | Meghan Quinn   | Associate Director, California River<br>Restoration and Dam Removal   |
| Recreation                           | 18 | River's Edge Kayak and Canoe<br>SOAR Russian River Adventures | Kim Lockhart<br>Larry Laba                           | Owner & Operator  |
| State Agency                         | 19 | SWCRB,<br>Division of Water Rights                            | Erik Ekdahl<br>Sam Boland-Brien                      | Deputy Director<br>Supervising Engineer                               |
|                                      | 20 | North Coast RWQCB   | Matt St. John  | Executive Officer   |
| Water Supplier - Lower Russian River | 21 | City of Cotati  | Susan Harvey<br>Craig Scott                          | Councilmember<br>Public Works Director                                |
|                                      | 22 | City of Petaluma  | Mike Healy<br>Dan Herrera                            | Councilmember<br>Deputy Director of Public Works and<br>Utilities     |
|                                      | 23 | City of Rohnert Park  | Samantha Rodriguez<br>Mary Grace Pawson              | Vice Mayor<br>City Engineer   |
|                                      | 24 | City of Santa Rosa  | Natalie Rogers<br>Jennifer Burke<br>Peter Martin     | Councilmember<br>Water Director<br>Deputy Director of Water Resources |
|                                      | 25 | City of Sonoma  | Jack Ding<br>Mike Berger                             | Mayor<br>Public Works Director  |
|                                      | 26 | Town of Windsor   | Sam Salmon<br>Cristina Goulart                       | Councilmember<br>Environmental Program Manager                        |
|                                      | 27 | Valley of the Moon Water District                             | Jon Foreman<br>Matt Fullner                          | Board Member<br>General Manager                                       |
|                                      | 28 | North Marin Water District                                    | Jack Baker<br>Tony Williams                          | Board Member<br>General Manager                                       |
|                                      | 29 | Marin Municipal Water District                                | Jack Gibson<br>Paul Sellier                          | Board of Directors<br>Operations Director                             |
|                                      | 30 | Sonoma County Alliance Water<br>Supply Committee              | Brian Ling   | Water Committee Lead  |

RUSSIAN RIVER WATER FORUM  
**Summary of Interview Findings**

| Sector                               | #  | Organization   | Name  | Title   |
|--------------------------------------|----|--|---|---|
| Water Supplier - Upper Russian River | 31 | City of Cloverdale   | Todd Lands<br>David Kelley                    | Mayor<br>City Manager                           |
|                                      | 32 | City of Healdsburg   | Terry Crowley                                 | Utilities Director                              |
|                                      | 33 | City of Ukiah  | Jim Brown<br>Sage Sangiacomo<br>Sean White    | Mayor<br>City Manager<br>Water & Sewer Director |
|                                      | 34 | Willow County Water District<br>Redwood Valley County Water District                                 | Jared Walker<br>Tom Schoenman                 | General Manager<br>Board President              |
|                                      | 35 | Russian River Flood Control and Water Conservation Improvement District                              | CJ Watt<br>John Reardon<br>Elizabeth Salomone | Board Member<br>Board Member<br>General Manager |
|                                      | 36 | Geyserville Alexander Valley Municipal Advisory Committee, Russian River Property Owners Association | Walter Kieser                                 | Chair   |
|                                      | 37 | Potter Valley Irrigation District, Inland Water and Power Commission                                 | Janet Pauli                                   | Board Chair                                     |
| Business/<br>Landowner               | 38 | Russian River Property Owners Association  | Brad Petersen                                 | President                                       |

## Appendix B: Interview Instrument

### STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

#### Russian River Water Forum

##### *Background and Introduction*

- **Key background information:**
  - Mention that our team shared a background information document and that we can reference this during the discussion if helpful. We will be teeing up some of the information from that document during the interview.
- **Purpose of interviews.** These interviews/discussions have several key purposes:
  - Understand your connection to the Potter Valley Project, and how the potential loss of the diversion to the Russian River could impact your organization/agency;
  - Understand your organization/agency's interests as they relate to water supply or water resource issues;
  - Provide an overview of the Russian River Water Forum concept, and gather input on a proposed governance structure and how you might like to participate in the Forum;
  - Gather recommendations for effective and inclusive engagement, and how you would like to stay updated; and
  - Understand your organization/agency's interest in contributing to the future operation of the Potter Valley Project (financially, politically, etc.)
- **Note on confidentiality.** The interviews will be confidential to encourage an open exchange; the summary will characterize various sector/sub-sectors feedback but will not be specifically attributed to individuals.
- **Anticipated products:**
  - K&W will develop a summary report that captures key findings from these interviews. We will be looking for cross-cutting themes and areas of alignment; comments will not be attributed to any specific interviewees.
  - K&W will use the findings from the interviews to inform development of a Communications & Engagement Plan for the Water Users Forum. This will help guide collaboration and outreach efforts moving forward.

Do you have any questions before we proceed?

## Interview Questions

### Background and Connection to Potter Valley Project

1. To what extent are you aware of the Potter Valley Project owned and operated by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)?
  - a. Invite open response first and then ask for level of awareness on scale of 1 to 5 (1 = not aware at all, 5 = highly aware).
2. To what extent you have been tracking PG&E's decommissioning of the Potter Valley Project and the potential loss of the diversion to the Russian River?
  - a. Invite open response first and then ask for level of awareness on scale of 1 to 5 (1 = not aware at all, 5 = highly aware).
3. How would the potential loss of the diversion impact your organization (and constituents, if relevant)?
  - a. What's the basis of your thinking? (probe to understand if there is a water right issue)
  - b. Ask follow-up question re: extent to which it would impact their organization on scale of 1 to 5 (1 = not all, 5 = highly).
4. To what extent have you been involved in or aware of the identification of a local solution to maintaining the water diversion related to PG&E's decommissioning of the Potter Valley Project?
  - a. Invite open response first and then ask for level of involvement on scale of 1 to 5 (1 = not involved at all, 5 = highly involved).
  - b. Probe to understand if they were involved in the Two Basin Solution, and if so what their take-aways are from the process. What went well, why it wasn't successful, etc.
5. There is discussion that a regional entity needs to be formed to own and operate a future water supply project for this water supply to the Russian River. Do you have any thoughts on how best to organize this?
  - a. Probe questions:
    - i. *Who should own and operate the project in the future?*
    - ii. *How would you suggest structuring the financing of its future operation?*
    - iii. *What do you see as your/your organization's role in that structure?*

### Priority Interests

6. What are your organization's interests as they relate to water supply or water resource issues? Do you have a geographic region that you focus on?
7. Of the various water resource issues facing the Russian River basin, where does identifying a solution to the Potter Valley Project diversion rank in terms of your top priorities? Is it your top priority, or are there other areas that are of higher or equal importance associated with water resiliency in the Basin?
  - a. We can provide examples – water use efficiency, groundwater management, desal, FloodMAR, flood protection, etc.

### Water Forum Structure

*[Script for interviewer: I am going to share my screen showing a high-level visual of the [draft governance structure](#) for the Water Forum. Note that this is conceptual and nothing has been decided yet.]*

8. What feedback do you have regarding the goals and current structure that we're discussing?
9. What are the keys to success for the Forum achieving these goals? What challenges do you anticipate and how can they be addressed?
  - a. If previously active in the Two Basin solution, probe on lessons learned from that effort that can be applied here.
10. Would you envision participating in the Forum, and if so which of these committees or groups would you be interested in participating in?
  - a. Invite open response first and then ask for overall level of interest in participating on scale of 1 to 5 (1 = not interested at all, 5 = highly interested).
11. Who do you see as the key organizations or thought leaders whose participation will be critical?
12. The Forum will need to balance the near-term need to develop a solution to maintain the Potter Valley diversion with the need to address a broader set of water resiliency issues in the Basin. What ideas do you have regarding how to achieve an appropriate balance?
  - a. Probe on whether interviewee thinks the Forum/Regional Entity will still have value even if maintaining the Potter Valley diversion doesn't work out.

### Communication & Engagement Approach

13. K&W will be developing an approach for engaging a cross-section of interests (water users, Tribal and cultural interests, environmental interests, business interests, recreation interests) in the Russian River basin that is transparent, broad, and inclusive. What do you see as the keys to success for ensuring an effective, inclusive engagement approach?
14. What related efforts have you participated in (or are participating in now), and what successes or lessons learned apply to this effort in terms of effective engagement and transparency? Should any of these related efforts be coordinated with the Water Forum?
15. What is the most effective way to engage your organization and/or constituents in providing input or feedback on the development and deliberations of the Forum? How would you or representatives from your organization like to participate in planning this project?
16. How do you like to stay updated on initiatives or projects that are important to you?
  - a. Where do you get your information? What sources do you trust?

### Next Steps and Other Comments, Questions, or Advice

17. Looking ahead, with PG&E decommissioning the PVP, those who benefit from the water in some manner (i.e., for water supply or beneficial uses like fish habitat flows, recreation, etc.) will need to contribute to its future operation. Are you aware of this? Might your organization be willing to contribute financially (or help seek funding) to cover these costs, understanding that the financing details haven't been determined yet?
  - a. Are you willing to support the diversion by helping to seek funding?
  - b. Are you willing to support the diversion publicly and politically?
  - c. What factors will inform your willingness to pay or support (water supply reliability, etc.)?
18. Do you have any other questions, comments, or advice for us?

## Appendix C: Summary of 1-5 Scale Questions

|                                      | <i>n</i> | Awareness of PVP | Tracking Decommissioning | Impact of Loss of PVP | Previous Involvement in Local Solution | Interest in Participating in Water Forum |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| Agriculture and RCDs                 | 7        | 4.1              | 3.8                      | 4.6                   | 2.7                                    | 4.5                                      |
| County Government                    | 13       | 4.7              | 4.6                      | 3.9                   | 2.8                                    | 3.3                                      |
| Environmental NGO                    | 5        | 5.0              | 4.0                      | 4.4                   | 2.2                                    | 4.4                                      |
| Recreation                           | 2        | 3.0              | 2.0                      | 5.0                   | 2.0                                    | 3.0                                      |
| Resource Agency                      | 2        | 4.8              | 4.0                      | 4.0                   | 3.0                                    | 4.0                                      |
| Water Supplier – Lower Russian River | 10       | 4.3              | 4.6                      | 4.0                   | 1.9                                    | 3.0                                      |
| Water Supplier – Upper Russian River | 7        | 4.6              | 4.1                      | 4.4                   | 2.9                                    | 4.3                                      |
| Total/Averages                       | 46*      | 4.5              | 4.2                      | 4.2                   | 2.5                                    | 3.7                                      |

### Notes:

- Questions posed during the interviews relating to the above columns are as follows:
  - *Awareness of PVP*: To what extent are you aware of the Potter Valley Project owned and operated by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)?
  - *Tracking Decommissioning*: To what extent you have been tracking PG&E's decommissioning of the Potter Valley Project and the potential loss of the diversion to the Russian River?
  - *Loss of Impact of PVP*: To what extent would the loss of the diversion impact your organization?
  - *Involvement in Local Solution*: To what extent have you been involved in or aware of the identification of a local solution to maintaining the water diversion related to PG&E's decommissioning of the Potter Valley Project?
  - *Interest in Participating in Water Forum*: What is your overall level of interest in participating in the Forum?
- \* The team conducted 38 interviews with a total of 73 individuals. The total number of responses to the 1-5 scale questions is 46 because only one set of responses was recorded for each organization, except in the case of county supervisors. So, for example, the team recorded one set of responses from the interview with three officials from the City of Ukiah, and two sets of responses from the interview with

Mendocino County supervisors McGourty and Williams (one set of responses for each supervisor).

- The “Agriculture and RCDs” category includes agricultural interests, water suppliers that primarily serve agricultural water users, and resource conservation districts.
- The “Water Supplier” categories include water agencies, municipalities (interviewed in their capacity as water suppliers), and associations of water suppliers.
- The Lower Russian River and Upper Russian Rivers regions are defined as the Russian River Basin downstream and upstream, respectively, of the Dry Creek confluence.



Funding for this project has been provided in full or in part from the Budget Act of 2021 and through an agreement with the State Department of Water Resources.