

**San Joaquin River Restoration Program  
Water Management Work Group  
Technical Feedback Meeting  
Friday, April 2, 2010  
Piccadilly Inn University  
Fresno, CA**

**MEETING NOTES**

---

**Attendees:**

Dave Mooney	Reclamation	Steve Collup	Arvin-Edison WSD
Edward Salazar	Reclamation	Dennis Keller	Garfield WD/Lewis
Robert Campbell	Reclamation		Creek WD/Hills Valley
Rufino Gonzalez	Reclamation		ID/ Kaweah Delta WCD
Douglas DeFlicht	Reclamation	Dan Vink	Lower Tule River ID
Allen Lindauer	Reclamation	Chris Acree	Revive the San Joaquin
Valerie Curley	Reclamation	Steve Haze	Sierra RCD/SJVLF
Peter Vorster	The Bay Institute	Kimberly Brown	Paramount Farming
Rod Meade	SJRRP RA	Sarge Green	RMC / CWI
Ron Jacobsma	FWUA	Tom Boardman	SLDMWA
Steve Ottemoeller	FWUA	Rhonda Reed	NMFS
Eric Quinley	FWA	Leslie Mirise	NMFS
Paul Hendrix	Tulare ID	John Roldan	MWH
Lance Johnson	Madera ID	Jeff Payne	MWH

**Next Meeting:**

May 7, 2010, 10:00am – 1:00pm

**Summary of Meeting:**

**Comments on March Meeting Notes**

The following corrections were noted by members of the group:

- Discussion of Proposed Implementation Agreement of the Friant Settlement – Steve Ottemoeller clarified that he did not lead the discussion but rather provided a summary of the document. It was also clarified that the RWA should account for “real” water lost by districts, not “paper” water that may *have been* allocated to a district but *could not have been* fully utilized by that district. Under the Action Items, Friant also asked Reclamation to identify the most challenging items of the document to implement and what are the limiting factors.

**Recovered Water Account Status Update**

Steve Collup has been circulating some ideas within Friant on a conceptual method to determine the RWA. If the conceptual method is determined to have merit, it will be refined and presented at a future meeting.

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

John Roldan provided a status update and milestones for the planning steps for both feasibility studies. He also reviewed the draft alternatives that are being developed, as well as the plan for the economic benefit analyses. Jeff Payne reviewed the comments received from Friant on the Modeling Analysis Strategy Technical Memorandum that will guide the modeling analyses that will provide the required inputs for the economic benefit analyses. It was noted that the review efforts of the intermediate work products is intended to keep the process on track with the stakeholders and shorten the review and revision time required for the final documents.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- The economic analyses should consider the value of lost groundwater supply;
- The feasibility studies will include implementation plans which can prioritize activities and provide for incremental construction of the projects;
- Friant expressed interest in potentially managing and constructing the capacity correction and reverse flow projects; and
- An additional reverse flow pump station at the White River Check would provide access to additional demand and should initially be given an operating capacity of 150 cfs for preliminary analysis.

## Interim Flow Scheduling

Dave Mooney reviewed the current process being used to determine Interim Flow volumes and flow schedules. Dave also reviewed the daily operations process being used by the river operating entities to pass Interim Flows downstream and account for flows through Mendota Pool.

The following point was raised by members of the group:

- The allocation procedures presented match the process outlined in Reclamation's recent letter on operational protocols; however, the Settling Parties have not indicated whether they are in agreement with the method;
- The method being used by Reclamation to determine the Interim Flow volume may overestimate the volume of water required;
- The 117 thousand acre-feet figure being used to represent the annual riparian demand in Reach 1 includes the 5 cfs flow requirement past Gravelly Ford;
- The hydrograph used for the October - February time period will be the same water-year type hydrograph used for the preceding March - September time period;
- There is interest in understanding how the volume of Interim Flows reaching the Merced River confluence will be calculated; and
- There is also interest in retroactively applying the operational principles to the fall period Interim Flows to determine the quantity of water available in San Luis Reservoir.

## Recapture and Recirculation

Dave Mooney reviewed the project descriptions of the recapture and recirculation activities. He then asked for input on any pathways and activities that may be missing from the project descriptions.

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- Recapture should occur if there is excess capacity at the Delta pumps;
- It was suggested that the absence of the Interim Flows in the Delta Biological Opinions may provide flexibility in their recapture;
- A meeting should be scheduled with Reclamation, Friant, National Marine Fisheries, Westside interests, San Joaquin River Group Authority, and other affected parties to discuss how the Interim Flows reaching the Merced River will affect Delta and San Joaquin River tributary operations and if they will trigger the need for reconsultation of the Biological Opinions;
- The project description for recirculation should acknowledge Reclamation's responsibility for the program. It should identify how Reclamation will get water back to the individual districts, not require each district to separately negotiate and enter into agreements on their own;
- Arvin Edison Water Storage District is supportive of recirculation and the significant role the district could potentially play, but cautioned that water quality impacts to the district must be addressed to maintain their support;
- It was noted that the potential exchange with the Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District for Kings River water could be performed with other local tributaries as well.

## Part III Guidelines

John Roldan informed the group that the public review draft has been released and that comments are due by May 28, 2010. The draft is available on the SJRRP website and comments should be sent to [Part3Guidelines@restoresjr.net](mailto:Part3Guidelines@restoresjr.net).

The following points were raised by members of the group:

- Friant is interested in establishing a small group to discuss the draft. Steve Ottemoeller will be the point of contact.

## Next Meeting Date and Time

John Roldan informed the group that the next meeting is scheduled for May 7<sup>th</sup> and that it coincides with the last day of the ACWA convention. After discussion of alternate dates, it was recommended that the meeting remain on May 7<sup>th</sup>.

## Public Comment

None.