

# Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #19 Summary

March 13, 2015

---

## Organizations represented

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
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Foothill Conservancy	
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
MyValleySprings.com	

---

## Key Decisions

- Convene Institutional Arrangements workgroup to provide recommendation to MCG during April meeting.
  - Hold fourth public meeting at San Joaquin Farm Bureau with targeted invitations to resource agencies.
  - Develop problem statements and MokeWISE stakeholder interest statements for select Projects as discussed
  - Approve RMC moving forward with implementation of the benefit allocation methodology
- 

## Action Items

- MCG: send in redlines on policies and initiatives to RMC by Friday March 20<sup>th</sup>.
  - RMC: distribute public outreach materials and reach out to resource agencies.
  - RMC: correct statements regarding WID's water right and upload corrected Water Availability Analysis.
-

- Institutional Arrangements Workgroup: meet to determine recommendation to present to the MCG at the April meeting.
  - RMC: email Project workgroup list to MCG and individual emails to workgroups.
  - MCG: work with agreed-upon MCG entities to revise preliminary engineering (expanded project descriptions) and add interest statements where decided for review during the April meeting.
  - RMC: revise preliminary engineering (revised project descriptions) for review during the April meeting.
  - RMC: implement benefit allocation methodology and distribute to the MCG for review at the April meeting.
- 

## Summary

### I. February Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #18 (February 2015) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

Prior to the last MCG meeting, write-ups on the policies and initiatives were distributed. At that meeting, RMC indicated that the workgroup had not yet reached consensus on policy 9d. At this meeting, RMC provided an update on policy 9d, indicating that the workgroup was unable to reach consensus and as such, policy 9d is not moving forward. The MCG was instructed to send in any redlines on the remaining policies and initiatives by Friday March 20<sup>th</sup>.

RMC reviewed corrections made to the Water Availability Analysis, including a correction of Woodbridge Irrigation District's water rights and inclusion of the conversion factor from acre-feet per year (AFY) to cubic feet per second (cfs). During the meeting, it was further clarified the Woodbridge Irrigation District's water rights total 414.4 cfs. This will be corrected in the document; this version will be uploaded to the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the Climate Change Committee, indicating that the Committee met and decided to address climate change programmatically. The climate change section is currently being drafted, which will be shared with the Committee and be distributed to the MCG for review at the April meeting.

RMC also provided an update on Project 1a (Re-Introduction of Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Upstream of Pardee Reservoir), including that Amador Water Agency, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA), and Foothill Conservancy reached consensus on the objective assessment and environmental assessment. Foothill Conservancy reiterated that the need for the project is to lead a pilot project, which has more immediate funding needs. Foothill Conservancy and

CSPA will propose language for an updated project description, which could include incorporating phases.

At previous meetings, the MCG discussed holding the fourth public meeting in Sacramento and tailoring it to resource agencies. Given that the projects are less capital intensive than originally anticipated, RMC suggested that there may not be the same interest from resource agencies. RMC proposed that the meeting be held at the San Joaquin Farm Bureau on April 9<sup>th</sup> at 6:30pm and that resource agencies receive personal invitations. The MCG approved the proposal. RMC will draft a flyer and press release to be distributed to local papers and to MCG member agencies so they may distribute to their constituencies.

On Tuesday March 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015, RMC distributed a draft technical memorandum summarizing potential options for final MokeWISE project implementation governance and stakeholder coordination. RMC explained that this is a required portion of the Final Report and that the MCG will make a final determination on the institutional arrangement during the April meeting. RMC proposed that a workgroup convene to discuss the options and prepare a recommendation to the MCG during April's meeting. Entities involved in this workgroup are: the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority, San Joaquin County, Amador Water Agency, Calaveras Planning Coalition, East Bay Municipal Utility District, and the City of Stockton.

RMC reviewed the schedule for April, May, and June.

## **II. Sierra Club Presentation**

The Sierra Club provided an overview of the Club, including its history, mission, and current projects. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

## **III. San Joaquin County Presentation**

San Joaquin County provided information focusing on efforts the County has pursued in terms of alternate water supplies to the Mokelumne River. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

## **IV. Preliminary Engineering (Expanded Project Descriptions)**

RMC explained the concern that was expressed by some of the MCG members at the end of the February meeting regarding Project 1a (Re-Introduction of Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Upstream of Pardee Reservoir) not being added to the list of projects. Because Project 1a was the only project that was on the cusp of making onto the list, it was added.

The California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA) presented an overview of the work the environmental caucus had completed after the draft scopes of work

were distributed on Friday March 6<sup>th</sup>. The environmental caucus recommended using the revised scope for Project 7d as a template for reworking some of the other scopes. Recommended changes included: replacing each abstract with a problem statement and summary of MokeWISE stakeholder interests, and adding more specific information to some of the scopes, including adding specificity to phrases such as “legal issues.” It was also decided that RMC would add a climate change as an item as part of the climate change overview section indicating that each project completed as part of the MokeWISE program should address climate change as applicable.

The MCG agreed that this exercise is beneficial and has merit and that the preliminary implementation plan should be pushed from April to May. RMC indicated that doing this means that the MCG will see less material up front (and will instead see some items for the first time when they appear in draft form in the Draft Plan in May). The MCG approved this revised approach and schedule.

During the meeting, each Project was discussed and the MCG determined whether an interest statement was needed. For those Projects that the MCG deemed an interest statement necessary, a workgroup with an assigned lead was identified. This group was tasked with developing a problem statement and stakeholder interest section for the Project; RMC will take the lead on addressing changes to the Project scopes. RMC will email out the final list to the MCG, with individual emails to each workgroup to begin facilitating the discussion. Revised scopes must be completed in time for review during the April meeting.

It was also decided that project 1g, which was not identified for further development in the February meeting, should be further developed and a scope of work prepared. All remaining projects without expanded scopes were discussed, and this was the only project recommended to be expanded.

## **V. Revised Benefit Allocation Methodology**

The MCG agreed to allow RMC to implement the methodology. RMC will bring the implemented methodology back to the MCG for comment in April.

## **VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items**

None.