San Joaquin River Restoration Program
Water Management Work Group
Technical Feedback Meeting
Friday, March 5, 2010
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
South-Central California Area Office
Fresno, CA

MEETING NOTES

Attendees:
Jason Phillips Reclamation  Doug Welch  Chowchilla WD
Dave Mooney Reclamation  Lance Johnson  Madera ID
Edward Salazar Reclamation  Carl Janzen  Madera ID
Robert Campbell Reclamation  Steve Collup  Arvin-Edison WSD
Erin Rice Reclamation  Sean Geivet  Porterville, Saucelito,
Rufino Gonzalez Reclamation  Terra Bella ID
Darrin Williams Reclamation  Dale Brogan  Delano-Earlimart ID
Douglas DeFlitch Reclamation  Dennis Keller  Garfield WD/Lewis
Allen Lindauer Reclamation  Creek WD/Hills Valley
Ernie Taylor DWR  ID/ Kaweah Delta WCD
Peter Vorster The Bay Institute  Chris Acree  Revive the San Joaquin
Rod Meade SJRRP RA  John Roldan  MWH
Steve Ottemoeller FWUA  Jeff Payne  MWH
Eric Quinley FWA  Eric Clyde  MWH

Next Meeting:
April 2, 2010, 10:00am – 1:00pm

Summary of Meeting:
Comments on February Meeting Notes by John Roldan (MWH)

The following corrections were noted by members of the group:

- Status Update on Water Management Activities – The FWUA mediation
document may still be used as general guidance for the water management
activities, even without the unanimous support of the member districts; and
- Interim Flow Releases/Recapture and Restoration Flow Guidelines - The monthly
discrepancies between Steiner’s modeled results and the actual operational data
results are due to the variations in real-time risk tolerance of the operator caused
by ever changing conditions and the inability to rely on perfect foresight as the
model does, not political interference. Also, the operational modeling approach
may still prove to be a viable approach to determining the RWA with further
refinement.
Discussion of Proposed Implementation Agreement of the Friant Settlement by Steve Ottemoeller (FWUA)

Steve Ottemoeller walked the group through the Proposed Implementation Agreement of the Friant Settlement, while the Friant district managers provided insight into the rationale and alternative perspectives of the participants in the mediation.

The group discussed:
- Many of the parties originally expressed support for the document based on the assumption that it would receive unanimous support, and consequently view the document as a package deal in recognition of the numerous compromises that were made by the parties across all issues;
- Consistent rules are needed to enable districts to develop long-term water management programs;
- The RWA should account for “real” water lost by districts, not “paper” water that may be allocated to a district but cannot be fully utilized by that district;
- Allocating mitigation resources to districts based on RWA balances would ensure assistance to those districts who have suffered the greatest impacts;
- Restoration flows recaptured and returned in the year they are released could best mitigate impacts; and
- A district may potentially want to deliver $10 water down the river to an alternate diversion point.

Action Items:
- Jason Phillips stated Reclamation’s support for the mediation process and described the need to integrate the requirements of Federal policy and law. Jason will establish a forum for Reclamation and the Friant contractors (likely a small group) to begin these discussions. The Proposed Implementation Agreement can serve as the framework for this discussion, but hopes contractors will keep an open mind.

Madera & Friant-Kern Canals Capacity Correction Assessment and Friant-Kern Canal Reverse Flow Feasibility Studies by Eric Clyde (MWH) and Dave Mooney (Reclamation)

Eric Clyde reviewed the Federal planning process for the Capacity Correction and Reverse Flow feasibility studies and the status of the work currently being done on the preliminary design reports for both projects. Dave Mooney then informed the group that the White River Check could be added to the Reverse Flow feasibility study, but additional authorization and direction will be needed to construct these additional facilities. Impacts to budget and schedule will need to be determined.

The following points were raised by members of the group:
- The legislation authorizes the Secretary to construct the projects consistent with the applicable feasibility studies;
- The No-Action Alternative will be developed to reflect the decrease in Friant Division water supplies due to Restoration Flows to allow the mitigation provided by the Action Alternatives to be quantified; and
• Full implementation of the projects is desired, but analysis of partial implementation may be required.

Interim Flow Releases by Dave Mooney (Reclamation) and Edward Salazar (Reclamation)

Dave Mooney reviewed the February releases from Friant Dam and informed the group that the system is currently being operated to meet dual criteria: 1) the Exhibit B Friant Dam release and 2) the Gravelly Ford flow target. Dave then reviewed the current annual allocation and default flow schedule at Gravelly Ford. Ed Salazar then provided current unimpaired inflow information for the San Joaquin River.

The following point was raised by members of the group:

• The contractors request clarification and involvement in the allocation process, as the outcome has significant implications on the contractors’ water supplies.

Restoration Flow Guidelines by Jeff Payne (MWH)

Jeff reviewed the alternative methods that have been considered for calculating the RWA, introduced a new conceptual method, and solicited the group for other ideas that should be considered.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

• Concerns were raised over the new conceptual method introduced;
• Steve Collup indicated he has been working through a potential method that may be ready to discuss at the next meeting; and
• This topic should be first on next month’s agenda.

Next Meeting Date and Time by John Roldan (MWH)

Action Item:

• Jason Phillips requested that the group email all preferences for future meeting dates, locations and times to John.

Public Comment

None.