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 Dave Mooney Edward Salazar Robert Campbell Erin Rice Rufino Gonzalez Darrin Williams Douglas DeFlitch Allen Lindauer Ernie Taylor Peter Vorster Rod Meade Steve Ottemoeller Eric Quinley Reclamation Reclamation Reclamation Reclamation Reclamation Reclamation Reclamation Reclamation DWR The Bay Institute SJRRP RA FWUA FWA

Lance Johnson Carl Janzen Steve Collup Sean Geivet

Doug Welch

Dale Brogan Dennis Keller

Chris Acree John Roldan Jeff Payne Eric Clyde Chowchilla WD Madera ID Madera ID Arvin-Edison WSD Porterville, Saucelito, Terra Bella ID Delano-Earlimart ID Garfield WD/Lewis Creek WD/Hills Valley ID/ Kaweah Delta WCD Revive the San Joaquin MWH 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.

1

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.

3

Public Comment

None.