

Upper San Joaquin River Basin Storage Investigation

Workshop Summary

Workshop # 6 – August 27, 2003

Introduction

This summary briefly describes the proceedings of the Upper San Joaquin River Basin Storage Investigation (Investigation) Workshop #6. Facilitator Charles Gardiner explained the purposes of this workshop were to review progress, seek stakeholder input, and discuss the next steps in the Investigation. Agenda topics included:

- Investigation Overview
- Overview of Analyses
- Appraisal results for surface storage option sites:
 - Temperance Flat
 - Friant Enlargement
 - Fine Gold
 - Yokohl Valley
- Conjunctive Management
- Next Steps

Major Issues/Topics

- **Investigation Overview.** The Investigation is completing the first phase of the feasibility study, and will be moving into its next phase of more detailed study and environmental review. Phase 1 of the Investigation identified 16 site-specific surface storage options and narrowed the range of options to be carried forward for more detailed study to six.
- **Surface Storage Options Screening.** Surface storage options to be carried forward are: Friant Dam Raise, Temperance Flat Reservoir (Sites MP274, MP279, and MP 286), Fine Gold Creek Reservoir, and Yokohl Valley Reservoir. The Temperance Flat Reservoir Site MP286 is actually located upstream of the Temperance Flat area and has also been referred to as Kerckhoff Reservoir Enlargement. The option of raising the spillway gates at Mammoth Pool is currently being pursued separately by the Friant Water Users Authority and will be tracked by this Investigation for potential inclusion in the future. Reservoir operations modeling, engineering and geology reviews, environmental review, and an analysis of hydropower generation and impacts have been completed at the appraisal level.
- **Conjunctive Use and Groundwater Storage.** The Investigation is using a three-step approach for formulating conjunctive use options: 1) identification of the potential for recharge and stakeholder interest; 2) definition of potential options; and 3) evaluation of potential projects to distinguish projects that could support the Investigation objectives. These results must be incorporated into the Investigation no later than June 2004. Step

one is largely complete. Step 2, defining potential options, will be accomplished through a series of stakeholder meetings led by DWR over the next several months.

Public Input

Comments and questions from workshop attendees are summarized as follows:

Although Congress has authorized a feasibility study, the Investigation should still document the appraisal level findings and conclusions.

Operational assumptions should reflect the purpose of the project, as they will affect the analysis.

To continue to be considered, conjunctive management alternatives should meet a test of functional equivalency.

Review criteria must be applied equally. If there is no conjunctive use for lack of local support, then objections regarding land use changes should also be respected.

In addition to replacing power, the potential for increased power generation should be assessed.

The Investigation should also address the legalities of any proposed project, such as contract authorization, CVP operations, place of use, etc.

Modeling should assume that water flows past Mendota Pool and incorporate assumptions that measure the feasibility of full river restoration.

Restoration beneficiaries need to contribute to the project.

What is the strategy for providing a Restoration Plan?

How will water quality fit into the environmental review?

Action Items

- Complete the Phase 1 Report
- Incorporate comments and analyses on operations
- Convene a conjunctive management working session with stakeholders
- Issue a Notice of Intent/Notice to Prepare
- Consider adding cooperating agencies with specific expertise for Investigation needs
- Develop a Feasibility Study Work Plan, including further studies to evaluate storage options; the development and application of comparison criteria; development and refinement of a final set of alternatives; and planning for public participation.
- Initiate Feasibility June 2004 and complete by June 2006

Next Workshop

The next public meeting will be scheduled for early 2004.

Attendees

Workshop Participant

Jon Basila
Chuck Binder
Tom Boardman
Gary Bobker
John Brooks
Steve Burke
Robert Davidson
Greg Foulke
Bruce Haddix
Steve Haze
David Hoffman
Randy Houk
Randy Houk
Ron Jacobsma
Paula Landis
Anita Lodge
Shannon Lodge
Bill Luce
Barry Nelson
Steve Ottemoeller
Phil Pierre
Stephen Roberts
Dale Sally
Mario Santoyo
Kevin Shakespeare
Mark T. Smith
Dale West
Harold Woody
Rosemarie Woody
Carolyn Yale

Organization

SunMaid Raisin Growers of CA
SAIC
San Luis and Delta Mendota Water Authority
The Bay Institute
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Protect Our Water
Friant Water Users Association
Senator Chuck Poochigian
CSU Fresno
Millerton Area Watershed Coalition
Porterville Irrigation District
Columbia Canal Company
Columbia Canal Company
Friant Water User Association
Department of Water Resources
Property owner
Property owner
Bureau of Reclamation
NRDC
Madera Irrigation District
Root Creek Water District
Department of Water Resources
Exeter Irrigation District/Ivanhoe
Friant Water Users Authority
Congressman Devin Nunes
Sierra National Forest
Stone Corral Irrigation District
Property owner
Property owner
USEPA

Study Team Members Present

| | |
|---|---|
| Reclamation | Marian Echeverria Jason Phillips |
| PAM | Charles Gardiner |
| MWH | James Herbert Jill Miller Stephen Osgood Foster Pelton Bill Swanson Irina Torrey Philip Unger |
| CDM | Coral Cavanagh Sandra Lunceford Gina Veronese |
| MBK | Walt Bourez |
| SKS | Russ Grimes |
| Daniel B. Steiner, Consulting Engineer | Dan Steiner |