

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #17 Summary

Located at Pardee Center

January 9, 2015

Organizations represented

Amador County	MyValleySprings.com
Amador Water Agency	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras County	San Joaquin County
Calaveras County Water District	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Calaveras Public Utility District	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	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

- Mokelumne and Stormwater sections of the Water Availability Analysis were approved.
- Environmental assessment on concept 7b (Raise Lower Bear Feasibility) was approved.

Action Items

- RMC: make final changes to Mokelumne section and finalize; post to website
- Foothill Conservancy, CSPA, AWA, Amador County: Discuss language on concept 1a (Anadromous Fish Restoration) and come to February meeting with proposal.
- MCG: provide comments on how generic planning language applied to concept 7b may apply to other planning concepts.

- RMC: draft new Benefit Allocation methodology based on discussion.
 - RMC: compile new portfolios to send to MCG; schedule webinar to discuss portfolios prior to February meeting.
-

Summary

I. MokeWISE Overview

It was determined that because there were no elected officials present at the meeting, the MokeWISE overview was not needed.

II. December Meeting Summary and Brief Update

RMC read the one change to the meeting summary that clarified the San Joaquin Agreement. San Joaquin County clarified that the 6,000 acre-feet in a dry years is in a dry-year sequence. This was added and the summary was approved by consensus; it will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC summarized the key points from the January 8 evening public meeting, including that the Amador Calaveras Consensus Group offered to do a presentation to the MCG. An MCG member commented that SPI's involvement is significant. SPI will have increased involvement if the ACCG presents to the MCG, as SPI is a member of the ACCG.

RMC discussed soliciting comments on the draft Resolution of Support letter and explained that the draft will be revisited at a later date. The purpose of discussing the draft now is to get MCG members thinking about what support for MokeWISE may mean for their particular organization.

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 6 months.

III. Water Availability Analysis – Mokelumne and Stormwater

RMC presented an overview of Mokelumne and Stormwater revisions, including the new stormwater language on percentage of losses. There were a few remaining comments on the Mokelumne section, including questions on unit conversions and language clarifications. These changes were noted during the meeting and will be made to the document. Given these changes, both the Mokelumne and Stormwater sections were approved by the MCG. Once the Water Availability Analysis is compiled, it will be posted to the public portion of the website.

IV. Revised Environmental Assessment of Concepts

RMC explained that the environmental assessment on concept 7b (Raise Lower Bear Feasibility) was returned to the geomorphologists to revise the assessment given the sensitivities and concerns expressed at the December meeting.

There was a concern about the new assessment under General Comments, particularly that there are a number of generalizations about mitigation and about the potential benefits. It was suggested that the project description be revised to state what the proposed benefits of the project would be, particularly what potential benefits would be evaluated in the study.

Given the discussion, the project description was revised during the meeting to include the following: *The study would include evaluation of the proposed beneficial uses of the project and clarifying operational parameters. It would also identify benefits, impacts, and constraints in the following areas: technical, political, environmental (including both species-related and geomorphic), economic, legal, and recreation – recognizing that a more detailed Environmental Impact Report would be required prior to implementing a project. The study will include consultation with members of the MokeWISE MCG.* After this new description was approved, the environmental assessment was revised to combine assessments from previous revisions. In addition, a sentence explaining that operations would drive benefits and impacts was added at the end of each paragraph. This assessment was approved by the MCG.

There was then discussion on adding the language that was added to the project description of concept 7b to other planning study concepts. RMC sent an email to the MCG with the language that was added to concept 7b with the request that MCG members provide comments on how the language might apply to the other planning concepts. Comments are due back to RMC by February January 23rd.

V. Draft Benefit/Cost Allocation Methodology

RMC presented an overview of the methodology, explaining each task involved. There was a general concern that if a cost is attributed to an agency, that agency may find it difficult to approve the final portfolio. It was further agreed that this methodology would involve many value judgments that would likely be difficult to come to agreement.

RMC suggested a qualitative approach, explaining the general benefits, beneficiaries, and a discussion on the general magnitude of benefits received by beneficiaries. There would also be a general discussion on cost, without apportioning the cost to any beneficiaries. It was suggested to conduct a high-level of costs analysis and clearly state assumptions. It was also suggested that

there be a discussion of allocated benefits between entities and between the two regions, as well as a discussion of general public beneficiaries.

RMC will revise the methodology to outline this new approach and send it out prior to the February meeting.

VI. Assessment of Concepts and Concept Groupings

RMC presented the changes resulting from MCG feedback, including the conflicting comment on concept 1a (Anadromous Fish Restoration). The MCG decided to remove objective D-21 (which pertains to data for UWMPs) from the assessment as it pertains more to the MokeWISE program than it does to any one concept. It will remain as an objective, but not be used in the concept assessment. There was a proposal to remove objective E-28 (which pertains to wild and scenic legislation) as no concepts meet that objective. The MCG elected to leave the objective in the assessment. Concept 3a (Solar Powered Desalination Study) does not have a sponsor; it was suggested that this concept be removed for lack of sponsor. The MCG elected to leave it as a concept.

There was concern that concept 1a (Anadromous Fish Restoration) may potentially result in a reduction in flow for water agencies. There was a proposal to remove the sentence about reduction in water supply from the environmental assessment. A counter-proposal suggested adding a sentence that explains that proponents of the concept do not anticipate an impact to water agencies. It was suggested that language added to concept 7b (Raise Lower Bear Feasibility) could also be added to concept 1a. It was ultimately decided that those entities most interested in the language (Foothill Conservancy, CSPA, AWA, Amador County) would discuss language changes offline and bring back a proposal to the MCG in February.

VII. Preliminary Portfolio Proposal

RMC presented the preliminary proposed portfolio, including how the portfolio was compiled. There was a general concern that the modeling results would be helpful in putting the portfolios together. The MCG broke into three groups to discuss the proposed portfolio and each of the concepts. After a period of time, the MCG came back together and each of the groups reported on their discussion. RMC took note of these discussions.

Based on the discussions, RMC will prepare a new set of portfolios to send to the MCG. In an effort to stay on schedule, it was decided that a webinar would be held prior to the February meeting to approve the portfolios so assessment on the portfolios could be presented, reviewed, and discussed at the February meeting. The date and time of the webinar will be determined via email.

VIII. Wrap-Up and Action Items

None.