

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #14 Summary

October 10, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County Water District	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Stockton, City of
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Foothill Conservancy	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
Lodi, City of	

Key Decisions

- *None.*
-

Action Items

- RMC: begin drafting language for a resolution process.
 - RMC: include potential outreach opportunities on agenda for November meeting.
 - Facilitator: reach out to PG&E and Amador County to encourage active MCG participation.
-

Summary

I. September Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #13 (September 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

Foothill Conservancy indicated that they are not interested in sponsoring the Wild and Scenic Policy. The other entities who have indicated an interest in including a wild and scenic policy within the MokeWISE program have been asked if they are interested in sponsoring. If these entities are not interested in sponsoring, the concept will be removed from the list. If a sponsor is identified, the concept will begin the assessment process.

RMC provided an update on the Policy and Initiatives Workgroup, indicating that they have met once and will be meeting again on October 23rd to review progress made on individual policies and initiatives.

RMC provided an update on the Modeling Workgroup, indicating that they had met to review the MOCASIM model preliminary outputs of the two base cases. Some of these results were later presented that day.

Calaveras Planning Coalition cautioned that the MokeWISE process should not wait until near the end for MCG stakeholders to identify areas of concern about project concepts. The schedule provides time for boards and other decision making bodies to review the preferred alternative. Challenges associated with board approval were discussed, including board turnover. The process of reaching out to newly elected officials was briefly discussed and tabled for the next meeting. The question of “what does support really mean?” was brought up; RMC will draft language for a resolution of support that will outline the definition of support.

II. MyValleySprings.com Presentation

MyValleySprings.com provided an overview of the organization, including history of Calaveras County and the work in which MyValleySprings.com has been involved. A brief question and answer period followed. The handout provided as part of the presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

III. Water Availability Analysis

RMC gave an overview of the peer-review comments submitted on each section, as well as the specific comments where RMC took a different approach than was suggested in the comment.

Comments from the MCG about the proposed response to comments were solicited. Some of these comments included adding an opportunities section to each supply type to capture potential use opportunities and cite page numbers in the in-text citations. All comments stated during the meeting were captured by RMC and will be included in the revised version of the document. MCG members were encouraged to submit further comments through email and redline.

IV. Water Availability Analysis – Mokelumne River Supply

RMC reviewed preliminary results from the MOCASIM modeling effort. Information of interest to the MCG includes average unallocated flow over period of record, seasonal flows, and a comparison of JSA required and modeled flows. RMC will begin drafting the Mokelumne piece and send to the MCG later in October.

V. Preliminary Concept Assessment Information

RMC presented the preliminary environmental concept assessment from Balance Hydrologics and Hanson Environmental. General comments included presenting an explanation of the scale and adding a column to discuss the mitigation measures that could be used to capture more project benefit. These comments will be passed on to Balance and Hanson Environmental for incorporation into the revised version.

VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items

RMC presented a master schedule, highlighting each of the deadlines over the month of October.

Outreach to PG&E will continue to be conducted to potentially identify a new representative. Additionally, outreach to Amador County will be conducted to encourage the County to attend meetings and provide comments on process and documents.