San Joaquin River Restoration Program
Water Management Work Group
Technical Feedback Meeting
Friday, November 7, 2008
Lamp Liter Inn
Visalia, CA

MEETING NOTES

Attendees:

Gary Bobker	The Bay Institute	Dennis Keller	Garfield WD, Lewis Creek WD, Hills Valley ID, and Tri-Valley WD
Dale Brogan	Delano-Earlimart ID		
Antonio Buelna	Reclamation		
Michael Camarena	City of Lindsay		
Steve Dalke	Kern Tulare WD	Laurence Kimura	Fresno ID
Doug DeFlitch	Reclamation	Bill Luce	FWUA
Scott Edwards	Lindsay-Strathmore ID	David Mooney	Reclamation
Garth Gaddy	City of Fresno	Fergus Morrissey	Orange Cove ID
Ali Gasdick	CH2M HILL	Steve Ottemoeller	FWUA
Sean Geivet	Porterville, Saucelito, Terra Bella ID	Jeffrey Payne	MWH
		John Roldan	MWH
Paul Hendrix	Tulare ID	Dale Sally Jr.	Exeter ID, Ivanhoe ID
Ron Jacobsma	FWUA	Gary Serrato	Fresno ID
Lance Johnson	Madera ID	Peter Vorster	The Bay Institute
		Bill Swanson	MWH

Next Meetings:

December 8th 12:00 – 2:00 p.m. in Visalia at the Lamp Lighter Inn

Summary of Meeting:

Opening comments by Bill Swanson (MWH)

Bill Swanson, MWH, reviewed the agenda and led introductions of those present (see list above). The invite list for the Water Management Work Group Technical Feedback Meetings has been expanded to include Friant Division long-term contractors outside the Friant Water Users Authority and Third Parties. Because of the expanded invite list and new meeting attendees, the meeting primarily will be a review of progress to date.

Overview of Settlement and Progress to Date by Bill Swanson (MWH)

Bill Swanson, MWH, provided an overview of the Settlement's Water Management Goal and Restoration Goal along with an overview of progress to

date. Reclamation and the State of California are currently preparing a Program Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIS/R) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Program EIS/R will contain both a programmatic analysis of the potential impacts of implementing the Program and a project-level analysis of the potential impacts of implementing some Program actions, such as the Restoration Flows. Additional, project-level analysis will be needed to implement most of the Restoration Program actions.

Three steps were taken to developing the Recapture Plan pursuant to Paragraph 16(a). These steps were:

1. Identify river and Delta pumping and exchange opportunities based on water quality and canal capacity constraints
2. Identify how the CVP/SWP would respond to Restoration Flows based on existing institutional agreements
3. Develop other water recapture strategies

Institutional agreements such as the Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan, the Coordinated Operations Agreement, the Operations Criteria and Plan, and the Cross Valley Canal Capacity Share Agreement affect the recapture and recirculation opportunities available.

Based on the above three steps, three potential recapture and recirculation strategies were developed. These three potential recapture and recirculation strategies are as follows:

1. No Delta Action by Federal Government. This strategy includes no changes to any existing institutional agreements.
2. Direct Recapture of Restoration Flows. This strategy includes (1) potential pumping plant on lower San Joaquin River; (2) potential water exchanges along lower San Joaquin River; or (3) Restoration Flows become south-of-Delta water transfers.
3. Integrate Restoration Flows into CVP Supply and Friant demands into CVP Delta Operations.

The Draft Program EIS/R will include an analysis of various potential recapture and recirculation strategies.

<u>Recovered Water Account Discussion by Bill Swanson (MWH)</u>

Paragraph 16(b) of the Settlement calls for the implementation of a Recovered Water Account (RWA) that would make wet year water at Friant Dam available to impacted long-term Friant water users at $10 per acre-feet. A preliminary analysis is being conducted to determine the timing and magnitude of this water and if there is available capacity in the Friant-Kern or Madera canals at this time.

The preliminary capacity analysis for the Friant-Kern Canal includes three possible canal capacities, existing capacity, restored or design capacity, and expanded capacity (design capacity plus 1,000 cubic feet per second). The analysis also includes a range of recharge capacities needed to take advantage of the RWA water. All of the Program alternatives will include a common RWA component comprised of a specified amount of canal and banking capacity. The next steps include a CalSim long-term hydrologic modeling analysis of 16(b) alternatives and 16(a) recapture strategies.

A project level analysis is currently underway to investigate a capacity correction of the Madera and Friant-Kern Canals. The project includes hydraulic modeling of both canals leading to a preliminary engineering design report. An environmental assessment is included in the scope of work, as is the development of a Plan of Study for a Feasibility Report.

The Technical Feedback Members noted and discussed the following:

- The analysis does not include land spreading. Land spreading is used to spread water on lands when permanent crops are dormant. An analysis of the potential for land spreading to contribute to recharge of RWA water should be considered.
- The available recharge capacity (acreage) amounts used in the RWA analysis should be viewed as a reasonable boundary condition. The values are not intended to lock in or commit the Friant districts to constructing this recharge capacity. The lower bound of the analysis assumes that no additional recharge capacity would be constructed and that 16(b) water would be delivered under existing infrastructure capabilities and to existing recharge areas.
- Historical hydrology and water use may not entirely be representative of future hydrology and future water demands. Additionally, recent crop changes, including relatively recent transition from annual crops to permanent crops, have changed the amount and timing of demands.

The basic accounting elements of the Recovered Water Account were then provided to the group. They are as follows:

1. Quantify RWA credits (impacts);
2. Quantify offsets from 16(a) and 16(b) deliveries;
3. Quantify supplies from projects funded by Title III or other sources; and
4. Allocation of net RWA credit to individual long-term contractors.

The Technical Feedback Members focused their discussion on the quantification of water supply impacts and the appropriate determination of RWA credits (item 1).