San Joaquin River Restoration Program
Water Management Work Group
Technical Feedback Meeting
Friday, January 8, 2010
Lamp Liter Inn
Visalia, CA

MEETING NOTES

Attendees:
Jason Phillips  Reclamation  Paul Hendrix  Tulare ID
Dave Mooney  Reclamation  Dale Brogan  Delano-earlimart ID
Katrina Harrison  Reclamation  Doug Welch  Chowchilla WD
Peter Vorster  The Bay Institute  Lance Johnson  Madera ID
Rod Meade  SJRRP RA  Keith Norris  Tea Pot Dome WD
Ron Jacobsma  FWUA  Steve Dalke  Kern-Tulare WD
Steve Ottemoeller  FWUA  Dennis Keller  Garfield/Lewis Creek WD
Eric Quinley  FWA  Mark Larsen  Kaweah Delta WCD
Steve Collup  Arvin-Edison WSD  Chris Acree  Revive the San Joaquin
Sean Geivet  Porterville, Saucelito, Terra Bella ID  Steve Haze  Sierra RCD/SJVWLF
Gary Serrato  Fresno ID  Bill Swanson  MWH
Jerry Ezell  Shafter-Wasco ID  John Roldan  MWH
Dan Vink  Lower Tule River ID

Next Meeting:
February 12, 2010, 8:30am – 10:00am

Summary of Meeting:

Comments on Recent Meeting Notes by John Roldan (MWH)

No comments.

Status Update on Water Management Activities by John Roldan (MWH)

John Roldan notified the group that the next draft of the Restoration Flow Guidelines (RFG) would be released this month.

Part III Guidelines by John Roldan (MWH)

John Roldan reviewed the updated schedule for finalization of the Part III Guidelines. Reclamation is currently conducting a policy review of the document and is scheduled to issue a public draft prior to the legislatively mandated deadline of March 30, 2010. Minimum project criteria and potential selection criteria were discussed and Jason Phillips reviewed the Federal budgeting process and its implications on the Part III funding process.
The following points were raised by members of the group:

- Equitability criteria is referenced in the legislation and should be included;
- Federal participation will be included in the selection criteria and will likely be defined as the ability to make purchased water available from a project to assist Reclamation in meeting their Settlement obligations;
- As a general rule, Part III funding must be appropriated prior to the issuance of a solicitation (RFP); however, under certain circumstances it may be possible to issue a solicitation if Reclamation is confident that an appropriation will occur;
- Friant requested another chance to review the document prior to the issuance of a public draft.

Action Items:

- Ron Jacobsma asked for districts to submit their potential projects to assist in 2011 and 2012 budgeting discussions with Reclamation.

PEIS / Program Alternatives by Jeff Payne (MWH)

Jeff Payne reviewed the recapture alternatives included in the PEIS.

The following point was raised by members of the group:

- The program document should provide coverage for the recirculation process to convey the recaptured water back to the Friant Division, including water quality impacts.

Interim Flow Releases / Recapture by Dave Mooney (Reclamation)

Dave Mooney reviewed the monitoring results of the 2009 Fall Interim Flows and described the quality control process that occurs with all measurement data to reconcile for changing conditions at the monitoring stations. Dave also reviewed the wet year Interim Flow hydrograph to demonstrate the maximum potential Interim Flows for 2010, subject to the actual spring forecast and reductions due to existing channel capacity limitations.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- The benefits of the Interim Flows to the Restoration Program will be documented in the Annual Technical Report;
- Public outreach may be necessary to prevent flood control problems being blamed on the Restoration Program.

Madera & Friant-Kern Canals Capacity Correction Assessment and Friant-Kern Canal Reverse Flow Facilities by John Roldan (MWH)

John Roldan reviewed the progress of the Capacity Correction and Reverse Flow projects, noting that the hydraulic model of the Friant-Kern Canal requires additional surveying to assist in reconciling inconsistencies between model output and actual operational observations in the lower reach of the canal.
The following point was raised by members of the group:
  • The completion of the hydraulic model and development of alternatives should be expedited.

Public Comment

None.