

**San Joaquin River Restoration Program
Water Management Work Group
Technical Feedback Meeting
Friday, May 7, 2010
Piccadilly Inn University
Fresno, CA**

MEETING NOTES

Attendees:

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|
| Dave Mooney | Reclamation | Sean Geivet | Porterville, Saucelito, Terra Bella IDs |
| Valerie Curley | Reclamation | | |
| Mario Manzo | Reclamation | Dale Brogan | Delano-Earlimart ID |
| Ernie Taylor | DWR | Steve Collup | Arvin-Edison WSD |
| Peter Vorster | The Bay Institute | Dan Vink | Lower Tule River ID |
| Rod Meade | SJRRP RA | Chris Acree | Revive the San Joaquin |
| Ron Jacobsma | FWUA | Tom Boardman | SLDMWA |
| Steve Ottemoeller | FWUA | Larry Rodriguez | Kern County WA |
| Eric Quinley | FWA | Dick Moss | Provost & Pritchard |
| Doug Welch | Chowchilla WD | Mike Day | Provost & Pritchard |
| Paul Hendrix | Tulare ID | John Roldan | MWH |
| | | Jeff Payne | MWH |

Next Meeting:

June 11, 2010, 8:30am – 11:00am

Summary of Meeting:

Comments on April Meeting Notes

The following clarification was noted by members of the group:

- Interim Flow Scheduling – The approach used by Reclamation to determine the Interim Flow volume may overestimate the volume of water required.

Recovered Water Account

Steve Collup presented a method for establishing pre-Settlement baseline operational conditions for use in determining post-Settlement water supply impacts to the Friant Division long-term contractors for purposes of crediting the RWA.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- Friant feels this method represents a compromise position; and
- TBI/NRDC feels this method overestimates impacts.

Madera & Friant-Kern Canals Capacity Correction Assessment and Friant-Kern Canal Reverse Flow Feasibility Studies

John Roldan reviewed the Federal planning steps from feasibility study through construction and provided a status update for both feasibility studies. Jeff Payne reviewed a handout of the capacity deficient areas of the Madera and Friant-Kern canals as depicted by the hydraulic model and described the alternatives.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- The FWA is interested in investigating the execution of a cooperative agreement with Reclamation to enable the FWA to lead or participate in the construction effort;
- The Friant-Kern Canal is currently operating at maximum capacity in many locations. A process should be established to collect additional operational data while conditions warrant;
- The weed growing in the earthen sections of the canal may increase the perceived roughness coefficients of these sections and will be reflected in the operational data; and
- The check structures on the Madera Canal are not shown on the figure in the handout.

Recapture and Recirculation

Dave Mooney and Valerie Curley discussed the status of the project descriptions of the recapture and recirculation pathways. They identified a potential exchange of east side water for recaptured water currently in storage in San Luis Reservoir that could provide water in Millerton Lake for allocation to long-term contractors this year. Another alternative being considered by Reclamation is to issue an RFP requesting proposals for transferring, exchanging, or conveying recaptured water in San Luis Reservoir to the long-term contractors.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- Friant Districts feel Reclamation has an obligation to return the water to the long-term contractors;
- Friant Districts do not believe the RFP process to be practical due to time constraints;
- Friant questions include:
 1. Whose responsibility is it to get the water back;
 2. Who will contract with the operational entities of the required conveyance facilities;
 3. Who is responsible for funding and environmental documentation; and
 4. Do individual contractors acquire their own share, or is the returned water distributed pro rata?
- The proposed exchange appears to work under this year's water conditions, but does not assure the recapture and recirculation of Restoration releases in future years;

- A default plan is desired that is viable under all hydrologic conditions and is not dependent on opportunistic exchanges and transfers. Friant believes this plan should involve contractual agreements with the operators of the major conveyance features required (California Aqueduct, Cross Valley Canal, etc.);
- The recaptured water in San Luis Reservoir is earmarked as CVP water for Friant Division long-term contractors;
- AEWS D offered to assist in the recirculation of water currently in San Luis Reservoir beyond what can be moved under the proposed exchange;
- Reclamation indicated a willingness to work on an agreement with DWR to move water in the California Aqueduct;
- Reclamation will meet with the proponents of the proposed exchange and determine the specifics of the exchange agreement, such as exchange amounts and timing of return, and then determine the appropriate mechanism of the exchange (exchange of blocks of water, exchanges with individual long-term contractors, etc.) and whether the consolidated place of use is needed;
- Friant will hold internal discussions to obtain a consensus on the acceptability of the proposed exchange (i.e. timing of return, allocation method – by RWA account totals or contract quantities).

Interim Flow Scheduling

Dave Mooney informed the group that transfers of RWA credits between long-term contractors would be allowed. He indicated that a policy would be developed for transfers of RWA credits in the near future, but would be handled on a case-by-case basis in the meantime.

The following point was raised by members of the group:

- Dan Vink requested that Reclamation consider increasing the RWA credits for year-to-date Restoration releases from 50,000 to 100,000 acre-feet. He felt this would still be a conservative estimate.

Public Comment

None.