

**San Joaquin River Restoration Program
Water Management Work Group
Technical Feedback Meeting
Friday, February 12, 2010
Lamp Liter Inn
Visalia, CA**

MEETING NOTES

Attendees:

Jason Phillips	Reclamation	Dan Vink	Lower Tule River ID
Dave Mooney	Reclamation	Paul Hendrix	Tulare ID
Tony Buelna	Reclamation	Fergus Morrissey	Orange Cove ID
Ernie Taylor	DWR	Dale Brogan	Delano-Earlimart ID
Peter Vorster	The Bay Institute	Keith Norris	Tea Pot Dome WD
Rod Meade	SJRRP RA	Steve Dalke	Kern-Tulare WD
Ron Jacobsma	FWUA	Dennis Keller	Garfield/Lewis CreekWD
Steve Ottemoeller	FWUA	Mark Larsen	Kaweah Delta WCD
Eric Quinley	FWA	Chris Acree	Revive the San Joaquin
Gary Perez	FWA	Erick Johnson	The Water Agency, Inc.
Steve Collup	Arvin-Edison WSD	Brian Hauss	The Water Agency, Inc.
Jeevan Muhar	Arvin-Edison WSD	Dan Steiner	Consultant
Sean Geivet	Porterville, Saucelito,	Dick Moss	Provost & Pritchard
	Terra Bella ID	John Roldan	MWH
Jerry Ezell	Shafter-Wasco ID	Jeff Payne	MWH

Next Meeting:

March 5, 2010, 9:00am – 12:00pm

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 public review draft of the Part III Guidelines is scheduled to be released in March.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- Friant expressed interested in reviewing the latest draft prior to the public release; and,
- Reclamation inquired about the status of the FWUA Mediation Agreement and was informed that it has not received full support from all districts and should not be viewed as a guiding document for the Part III Guidelines.

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

Jeff Payne reviewed the overall 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. Jeff then led the group through a handout with a draft list of guiding assumptions developed for the feasibility studies and asked for the group to provide comments by the end of next week.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- The level of effort being applied toward these feasibility studies is consistent with other Reclamation feasibility studies of similar construction value; however, the aggressive deadlines (August 2010) established for these studies will result in an expedited feasibility process;
- The No-Action Alternative should 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
- Additional time is needed to discuss the progress and development of these feasibility studies which may require a separate meeting.

Action Items:

- Reclamation will evaluate the ability to expand the scope of the Reverse Flow feasibility study to include a pump station at the White River Check based on time and budgetary constraints and will notify Friant of its decision. Construction of this additional facility, if determined to be feasible, would require modification to the legislation; and
- John Roldan will send out an electronic version of the draft assumptions list and request comments by February 19th.

Interim Flow Releases/Recapture and Restoration Flow Guidelines by Dave Mooney (Reclamation), Rod Meade (Restoration Administrator), and Dan Steiner (MWH Team)

Dave Mooney reviewed the method and schedule for determining annual Restoration Flow quantities. Rod Meade reviewed his hydrograph recommendations for the normal-wet and normal-dry year types. Rod highlighted his assumption that the flexible flow provisions of the Settlement apply to the Interim Flows and informed the group of the scientific purposes and safety concerns behind the features of his recommended hydrographs. Dave then reviewed the potential points of recapture of the Interim Flows and the potential points of delivery to the Friant districts.

Dave reviewed a handout describing the total RWA resulting from the 2009 Interim Flows and the percentages attributed to each district. He then described the alternative methods of determining the RWA that have been considered for inclusion in the Restoration Flow Guidelines. Dan Steiner discussed the limitations of using the operational modeling approach to determine the RWA by presenting a comparison of modeled and actual operations for 2008 and 2009. While the model is useful in predicting water deliveries on an annual basis, month-by-month comparisons can differ significantly at times due to political interference and/or variations in risk tolerance from

month to month. The operational modeling approach will not be a viable method of determining the RWA by itself; a “shadow model” will likely require a separate auditing process that can adjust and reconstruct operational conditions for the pre-SJRRP condition.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- If it is determined that the flexible flow provisions do not apply to the Interim Flows, the decision will default back to Reclamation, who may ultimately need to slowly ramp the flows up and down for safety and seepage concerns in much the same manner that Rod has recommended;
- Reclamation is currently working with DWR to develop project descriptions for recapture and recirculation with the goal of completing the required environmental documentation by May/June.

Public Comment

None.