

**San Joaquin River Restoration Program
Water Management Work Group
Technical Feedback Meeting
Friday, September 5, 2008
Lamp Lighter Inn
Visalia, CA**

MEETING NOTES

Attendees:

Antonio Buelna	Reclamation	Fergus Morrissey	OCID
David Mooney	Reclamation	Paul Hendrix	TID
		Dale Brogan	DEID
Peter Vorster	The Bay Institute	Bill Carlisle	SSJMUD
		Dale Sally	EID, IID
Ron Jacobsma	FWUA	Doug Welch	CWD
Steve Ottemoeller	FWUA	Brandon Tomlinson	CWD
Bill Luce	FWUA	Michael Cunningham	MID
Sean Geivet	PID, SID, TBID		
Laurence Kimura	FID	Bill Swanson	MWH
Steve Collup	AEWSD	John Roldan	MWH
Jerry Ezell	SWID	Jeffrey Payne	MWH
Dale West	SC ID		

Next Meetings:

October 3rd, 12:00 pm – 2:00pm in Visalia @ Lamp Lighter Inn
November 7th, 12:00 pm – 2:00pm in Visalia @ Lamp Lighter Inn

Summary of Meeting Notes:

Opening comments by Bill Swanson (MWH):

This meeting will provide an update of the progress being made on the Water Management Plan in accordance with Settlement Paragraphs 16(a) and 16(b). It will also provide an opportunity to initiate discussions on Recovered Water Account (RWA) procedures and issues.

Simulation Walk-through Reminder by Bill Swanson (MWH)

A Restoration Flow Guideline meeting is scheduled for September 10th to walk through the Restoration Flow allocation process and the decision making process related to the shifting of Restoration Flow timing and the use of Buffer Flows.

The group noted the following:

- A large percentage of the FWUA districts have board meetings during the second week of the month. If district participation is being sought, this week should be avoided for future meetings if possible.

Paragraph 16(a) – Bill Swanson (MWH)

Background/Introduction: Paragraph 16(a) of the Settlement includes the development of a plan for recirculation, recapture, reuse, exchange or transfer of the Interim and Restoration Flows to reduce or avoid water supply impacts to the Friant Districts.

The presentation provided the following information related to the development of a recapture plan:

- Institutional agreements that affect recapture
- Levels of system integration for recapture analysis
 - System Response
 - Modify Vernalis Adaptive Management Program (VAMP)
 - Modify Coordinated Operations Agreement (COA)
 - Add new CVP south of delta delivery for Friant
- Average system integration analysis results under System Response and Modify VAMP scenarios

The group noted and discussed the following:

- Modification of Institutional Agreements – The results of the system integration analysis scenarios may identify opportunities that can be pursued during negotiation of the modifications to the institutional agreements.
- Exchange Opportunities – Potential exchanges of Interim and Restoration Flows along the SJR under different restoration alternatives and year types were discussed.
- The group was informed that the remaining scenario results would be forthcoming.

Paragraph 16(b) – John Roldan (MWH)

Background/Introduction: Paragraph 16(b) of the Settlement includes the implementation of a RWA and program that will make wet year water at Friant Dam available to impacted long-term Friant water users at \$10/af.

The presentation provided the following information related to the 16(b) opportunity assessment for the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals:

- Assumptions behind the Friant-Kern Canal 16(b) opportunity assessment
- Modeling results – Opportunities with existing, restored and expanded Friant-Kern Canal capacities and required recharge capacities

- Overview of potential groundwater banking projects identified by FWUA
- Madera Canal design and operating capacities

The group noted and discussed the following:

- The shortcomings of average annual results were discussed. The group requested to see results presented on an annual basis or at least on an average water year type basis.
- The magnitude of available recapture was questioned. Comparisons were drawn to the Upper San Joaquin River Storage Investigation results which were much lower. The Project Team will review the analysis and results.
- Steve Collup noted that the 16(b) supplies were not new supplies, just existing supplies that the districts have always taken. The only difference is now these supplies are being offered at a lower price.
- Additional groundwater banking opportunities that were not included on the potential groundwater banking summary slide were identified. These included non-Friant groundwater banks in Kern County (Water Management Area 7) and groundwater recharge within Chowchilla Water District (Water Management Area 1). It was noted that these potential projects were already identified, but the Project Team was unable to estimate recharge capacities based on the limited information available. Doug Welch will provide recharge capacity for the Chowchilla Water District projects. Peter Vorster requested backup information on the summary slide to help understand which projects were included in the totals.
- It was noted that turnout delivery data would be needed on the Madera Canal to perform an opportunity assessment similar to the Friant-Kern Canal. Doug Welch indicated that he has 5 years of daily delivery data in an electronic format.

The presentation provided the following information to initiate discussions on the RWA allocation and accounting procedures:

- Definition of the RWA
- Credits (+) and offsets (-) to the RWA in accordance with the Settlement
 - Water supply impacts (+)
 - 16(a) deliveries (-)
 - 16(b) deliveries (-)
 - Title III project deliveries (-)
 - Other project deliveries that contribute to meeting the Water Management Goal (-)
- Two approaches to quantify water supply impacts to long-term contractors discussed in previous Technical Memorandum: (1) daily and (2) annual accounting

The group noted and discussed the following:

- The impact to the RWA from Title III funded projects was discussed and the following questions were raised:
 - How do 16(a), 16(b), Class 1, Class 2, Section 215 and non-Project/non-Settlement deliveries to a Title III banking project impact a district's RWA? It was noted that since 16(a) and 16(b) deliveries already reduce the RWA, there could be double-counting if they are deducted again when they are delivered to a Title III project. Others were concerned if non-Project/non-Settlement supplies, such as Kings, Kaweah, Tule and Kern River supplies, would be allowed in Title III projects and what, if any, impact this would have on the RWA.
 - Is the RWA reduced when deliveries are made to the Title III banking project or when water is extracted from the banking project?
 - Whose RWA is reduced – the district banking the water in a Title III facility or the district who owns the Title III facility?
 - Is there a break-even point when Title III funding is considered repaid and the RWA is no longer reduced by Title III project deliveries?

- The discussion went back to the quantification of water supply impacts for the purpose of crediting the RWA. The following thoughts and questions were discussed:
 - The RWA must be in place prior to the Interim Restoration Flows or the advancement of the Water Management and Restoration Goals are not being accomplished in an equal fashion.
 - Peter Vorster suggested that only impacts to Class 1 and Class 2 long-term contractor water deliveries qualify for RWA credits. He acknowledges that there does not appear to be a technical method to separate Class 2 and Section 215 deliveries to long-term contractors in the existing model; and therefore, he believes a policy solution is necessary to reduce the reported impact from the model so that Section 215 deliveries to long-term contractors are not added to the RWA.
 - Tony Buelna suggested that the annual “back-casting” approach that had been recommended in the previous Technical Memorandum was the appropriate method to quantify impacts. It avoids the need for a cumbersome daily accounting procedure and instead relies on a pre-Settlement baseline water delivery condition in accordance with the Settlement.
 - What is the ability to take 16(b) supplies during the first year? Can the districts borrow against future RWA credits? Paul Hendrix suggested that an up front provisional credit could be negotiated that would be “trued up” at the end of the year. It was noted that this is consistent with the Settlement which seeks to avoid impacts, not just reduce them after they are incurred.

The presentation provided the following information on the future meeting schedule:

- October 3rd, November 7th, December 8th: 11:00am – 1:30pm, Visalia

The group noted and discussed the following:

- Peter Vorster requested that future meetings be moved to 1:00pm to allow him to attend in person. It was decided that the October meeting will begin at 12:00pm.