

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #15 Summary

November 14, 2014

Organizations represented

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

Key Decisions

- Include brief discussion of EBMUDs current stormwater study.
 - Include a quadrupled implementation level in the conservation section.
 - Include a daily hydrograph from 1998 forward in the Mokelumne River section. Show monthly graphs for wet years and yearly for all other years.
-

Action Items

- RMC: post EBMUD Board presentation after EBMUD December Board meeting.
 - RMC: secure location for January 8th public meeting.
 - RMC: develop a list of resource agencies and points of contact for invitations to the March public meeting.
 - MCG: comments on WAA to RMC by Wednesday November 26th.
 - Amador County: provide breakfast snacks at January meeting
-

Summary

I. October Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #14 (October 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC presented an update on the Policies and Initiatives Workgroup, including that the members are working on fleshing out those concepts. The final meeting is in January and drafted products will be presented to the MCG in February. The Modeling Workgroup is working with the MOCASIM model and will meet again in December to review project results.

Amador County indicated that it will be increasing its level of participation in MokeWISE by more frequently attending meetings. Foothill Conservancy and CSPA are working with PG&E to encourage them to increase their participation level.

RMC reviewed the MokeWISE process, including where the MCG is currently and the outcomes for the MokeWISE program. Additionally, RMC reviewed the schedule, including the major decision points for each of the remaining 7 months.

II. Outreach Opportunities

RMC presented on the different outreach opportunities available. RMC reiterated that the January meeting at Pardee will be a good opportunity to bring elected officials and introduce/update them on the process. CCWD stated that they have hired a new General Manager and have several new Board members; invitations will be extended to these individuals.

RMC suggested the formation of an Outreach Workgroup, which would help coordinate outreach to elected official, support public meetings, and coordinate additional outreach activities. There was no interest in forming this group. EBMUD did state that they would be updating their Board in the beginning of December and would be willing to make this presentation available to the MCG.

There are three remaining public workshops: January, March, and May.

- The January meeting will be focus on the Water Availability Analysis and the preliminary assessment of concepts. This meeting will be held on January 8th in Calaveras County. RMC will secure a location and develop meeting materials.
- The March meeting will focus on analysis of portfolios. RMC suggested that this meeting, in addition to being a public meeting, target resource agencies. There was a concern that the public is generally available at night and resource agencies are generally available during the day, which would make scheduling this joint meeting

difficult. RMC will compile a list of resource agencies and points of contact.

- The May meeting will focus on the preferred MokeWISE program.

RMC provided a general overview of the draft Resolution of Support and explained that this does not need to be the same resolution for each MCG entity; members can tailor it their entity, but it needs to indicate support for the process. The Resolution would be appended to the final document, but it is understood that the final Board update process will likely happen in June/July. DWR understands this and final Board adoptions will not jeopardize the DWR agreement. MCG members were encouraged to provide comments on the draft Resolution.

III. California Sportfishing Protection Alliance Presentation

California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA) provided an overview of the organization, including its history and the work in which CSPA has been involved. A brief question and answer period followed. The presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

IV. Water Availability Analysis – Non-Mokelumne Supply

RMC gave an overview of the comments and provided a study hall period for MCG members present to review the proposed response to comments. MCG comments are due to RMC by Wednesday November 26th.

One of the comments on the stormwater section questioned why stormwater potential in the EBMUD service area was not calculated. EBMUD explained that they are currently investigating stormwater potential and will have a technical memorandum in January 2015 with this information. After some discussion, it was decided that to address this comment, information about EBMUD's current effort would be summarized. Several comments on the conservation section expressed a desire to see additional, more aggressive levels of conservation to determine potential savings. It was decided that expanded implementation level currently shown (which is double current levels) would be expanded further to double the expanded levels (or quadrupled the current levels). Additional comments were expressed at the meeting, which were catalogued by RMC and will be incorporated.

V. Water Availability Analysis – Mokelumne River Supply

RMC explained that the implemented methodology differs from the original work plan due to disagreements on the definition of available water. Ultimately, a mutually-agreed upon definition of unallocated water was chosen and fisheries and geomorphology impacts will be considered in conjunction with projects. This history has now been captured in the Mokelumne section. Comments that and concerns that were expressed during the meeting were addressed in the latest version of the section; MCG members were encouraged to read it and provide any further comments or concerns.

RMC reviewed general comments on the Mokelumne section and explained the proposed process for creating a daily hydrograph. There was some concern about creating a daily hydrograph prior to 1998, because historical flow prior to 1998 does not reflect current operating conditions on the River. The MCG decided that from 1998 forward, daily unallocated/allocated flow will be provided with the caveat that it is only shown to provide information about monthly variability and is not meant to provide information on pulse flows and geomorphic work. For the wet years from 1998 to 2010, present graphs that show daily unallocated/allocated by month; for all other hydrologic year types, show daily unallocated/allocated by year. Comments are due to RMC by Wednesday November 26th.

VI. Revised Concept Assessment Approach

RMC reviewed the changes that were made to the environmental assessment, including that an additional column explaining how additional benefits could be captured was added and that a general qualitative explanation of the 1-5 scale was added. No additional comments were provided at the meeting.

RMC explained the concept cut-sheets, including that each cut-sheet would include the concept name, description, and other relevant information. The assessment will be based on the MokeWISE program objectives and include an open, closed, or half circle for each objective with an explanation for the assessment.

VII. Wrap-Up and Action Items

Amador County offered to bring breakfast snacks to the January meeting.