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

MEETING NOTES

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 CreekWD
Eric Quinley	FWA	Mark Larsen	Kaweah Delta WCD
Steve Collup	Arvin-Edison WSD	Chris Acree	Revive the San Joaquin

Jeff Payne

MWH

Sean Geivet Porterville, Saucelito, Steve Haze Sierra RCD/SJVWLF Terra Bella ID Bill Swanson **MWH** Gary Serrato Fresno ID John Roldan **MWH**

Jerry Ezell Dan Vink Lower Tule River ID

Next Meeting:

Attendees:

February 12, 2010, 8:30am – 10:00am

Summary of Meeting:

Comments on Recent Meeting Notes by John Roldan (MWH)

Shafter-Wasco ID

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.

<u>Interim Flow Releases / Recapture by Dave Mooney (Reclamation)</u>

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.

None.