

**San Joaquin River Restoration Program
Water Management Work Group
Technical Feedback Group Meeting
Friday, July 11, 2008
Lamp Lighter Inn
Visalia, CA**

MEETING NOTES

Attendees:

Jason Phillips	Reclamation	Jerry Ezell	SWID
Antonio Buelna	Reclamation	Dan Vink	LTRID
Doug DeFlicht	Reclamation	Lance Johnson	Madera
Katie Lee	Reclamation	Keith Norris	Tea Pot Dome WD
Rufino Gonzalez	Reclamation	William West	Stone Corral ID
		Fergus Morrissey	OCID
Peter Vorster	The Bay Institute	Paul Hendrix	Tulare ID
		Aaron Fukuda	Tulare ID
Ron Jacobsma	FWA		
Steve Ottemoeller	FWUA	Chris Acree	Revive the San Jqn.
Bill Luce	FWUA		
Sean Geivet	PID, SID, TBID	Walter Bourez	MBK
Laurence Kimura	Fresno ID	Dan Steiner	Independent
Michael Hagman	Lindmore ID		
Steve Dalke	KTWD	Bill Swanson	MWH
Steve Collup	AEWSD	John Roldan	MWH
Doug Welch	Chowchilla WD	Jeffrey Payne	MWH

Next Meeting:

August 8th, 11am – 1:30pm in Visalia @ Lamp Lighter Inn

Summary of Meeting Notes:

Opening comments by Jason Phillips (Reclamation):

Meeting to address progress on the Settlement's paragraph specific to the Water Management Goal, especially with regard to the Initial Program Alternatives Report

Meetings to continue on a monthly basis

John Roldan (MWH) to take lead on coordinating future meetings on Recovered Water Account

Slides by Bill Swanson (MWH)

Settlement language on 2 Goals
Documentation for the PEIS/R
What the IPAR alternatives are/are not

Slides by John Roldan

Initial Water Management Alternatives

16 a/b terminology

77 current Options taken from

- Feinstein report
- Interviews with FWUA districts

Organization of WM alternatives in IPAR follows

- intended source of water (16a or 16b)
- whether options involve developing conveyance or storage
- whether infrastructure development is local or regional

The terms local and regional were discussed. General definitions were:

Regional – benefits FWUA as a whole, or at least multiple districts

Local – beneficiaries are limited to a few districts, operations are expected to be handled by districts

A conversation started on ‘system integration’. Comments included the following:

The IPAR does not include integration with North of Delta operations.

It was suggested that, since the IPAR is going in the direction of qualitative assessment, non-structural opportunities should be included, even if they aren’t going to be studied quantitatively

It was suggested that the bookends should be left open to include opportunities in the North of Delta system, or they may not be available in the future

Reclamation feels the PEIS should be written to include all valid RWA opportunities; within the scope of the settlement and that it is not the intention to pre-screen alternatives that may be viable.

A placeholder was needed in future documents for a description of integration. Section 2 of the IPAR may need coordination with other non-project parties

Slides by Bill Swanson: Recap of 16(a) – direct recapture opportunities

It was noted that the magnitude of seepage in the river and its effect on the availability of 16(a) supplies remains uncertain.

Slides by Walter Bourez: 16(b) opportunities

16(b) being evaluated, current progress includes

- survey of Friant-Kern and Madera capacities
- historical operations/assessment of opportunities
- future modeling exercise

The following comments were collected:

Restoration Flow Guidelines, which are not yet complete, will have an impact on the availability and use of 16(b) water.

Exchanges, transfers and institutional issues were even more important than canal capacity issues

There was some concern that the current direction is starting with a question of whether Tulare Basin storage or FKC capacity limitations were controlling. It was stated that a feasibility study was necessary for exploring capacity corrections, but FWUA wasn't sure that Restoration needed to explore feasibility directly. Suggested that previous years, with 1000 cfs of missed opportunity for over 30 days, went a long way to justifying canal capacity improvement.

There was some indication that the primary problems were institutional, and that transfer and exchange restrictions were the controlling problem. Suggestion that 'carte blanche' transfers would help, and that 'exchange' could include this concept for fewer restrictions within the CVP.