

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #6 Summary

February 14, 2014

Organizations represented

| | |
|---|---|
| Amador County | Jackson Valley Irrigation District |
| Amador Water Agency | MyValleySprings.com |
| Calaveras County | North San Joaquin Water Conservation District |
| Calaveras County Water District | Pacific Gas & Electric |
| Calaveras Planning Coalition | San Joaquin County |
| Calaveras Public Utility District | San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District |
| California Sportfishing Protection Alliance | San Joaquin Farm Bureau |
| City of Lodi, Public Works | Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter |
| City of Stockton | Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority |
| East Bay Municipal Utility District | |
| Foothill Conservancy | |

Key Decisions

- Public Outreach Plan: was approved by the MCG.
 - Project Assessment TM: was approved by the MCG.
 - Peer-reviewers: Karen Johnson and Steve Macaulay were selected.
-

Action Items

- MCG: continue to submit project concepts to RMC; deadline is February 28, 2014.
 - RMC: post press release, Public Outreach Plan, and Project Assessment TM to public portion of the website.
 - RMC: post San Joaquin County's presentation to the protected portion of the website.
 - MCG: submit redlines of Environmental Conditions Overview TM to RMC by February 28, 2014.
 - RMC: make change to attribution table in Project Assessment TM.
-

- RMC: update diversion table with JVID numbers.
 - MCG: submit redlines of Mokelumne Methodology to RMC by January 28th, 2014.
 - RMC: send out the concept list to the MCG, along with a table indicating which objectives are met by the projects.
 - RMC: distribute copy of Feb. 19 public workshop presentation to MCG organizations for potential use in briefing their members on MokeWISE progress.
-

Summary

I. January Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #5 (January 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the concept brainstorming and encouraged MCG members to continue submitting concepts for future consideration.

II. Final Public Outreach Plan

There were no further comments on the Public Outreach Plan. It was approved by consensus and will be posted to the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the first Public Outreach Meeting to be held on February 19th, 2014 from 7-9pm at Amador County Board of Supervisors Boardroom at 810 Court Street in Jackson, CA. A press release was drafted and distributed to four major papers in the region. A flyer was also drafted and posted to the website; it was suggested that the press release also be posted to the website.

III. Environmental Conditions Overview Update

RMC provided an update on the progress of the document, indicating that Balance Hydrologics and Chuck Hanson had edited the document per the comments received by the MCG. The MCG indicated a need for more time to review the document; the deadline for further comments is February 28th, 2014. The revised document will be ready for MCG approval in March. The document will be expanded to include analysis of the portfolios in late spring or early summer.

IV. Revised Project Assessment TM

There were no further comments on the revised Project Assessment TM. It was approved by consensus and will be posted to the public portion of the website. It was suggested that, under the recreation category, salmon, trout, and steelhead should be included together anytime fish are mentioned. RMC will make this addition.

RMC will send out the concept list to the MCG, along with a table indicating which objectives are met by the projects on the concept list. RMC will also re-send the

brainstorming template to allow MCG organizations to continue submitting concepts; the deadline for concept submittal is February 28th, 2104.

V. San Joaquin County Update

Brandon Nakagawa provided an overview of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Authority (GBA), highlighting groundwater projects and programs implemented and currently being considered by the GBA. Stormwater and low-impact development (LID) practices were also presented. These presentations will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

Any MCG member organization is invited to present to the MCG on current organization activities. The City of Lodi has signed up to present during the March meeting; Foothill Conservancy also expressed interest in presenting at a future meeting.

VI. Revised Draft Water Availability Methodology

RMC provided an update on the Non-Mokelumne Methodology, indicating that all comments received were incorporated. There were no further comments and the Non-Mokelumne Methodology was approved by consensus.

RMC presented the Mokelumne Methodology, explaining the work of the Modeling Workgroup and outlining the tasks within the methodology. There was some question about the 2040 CCWD diversion number, specifically that there may be some projects moving forward which would increase that number. CCWD will verify this number internally and report back to the MCG and RMC. JVID diversion numbers have been unintentionally omitted from the presented table; RMC will add them back in.

There was discussion regarding the necessity of Task 2, indicating that a daily time-step in the lower river isn't necessary because it is so heavily regulated. It was also suggested that daily flows in the lower river may be of use when considering flood flows, as there are a number of tributaries which flow into the Mokelumne downstream of Camanche. Foothill Conservancy indicated that PG&E has a document which details roughly 60 years of historical record and may be of use to the Modeling Workgroup. It was decided that Task 2 will remain as it is currently written and that review of the historical record is necessary to determine which periods require a more directed focus.

It is anticipated that the MCG will approve the Mokelumne Methodology at the March meeting. Once the Mokelumne Methodology is approved, it will be combined with the Non-Mokelumne Methodology into one document which will be distributed to the peer-reviewers. After some discussion, Karen Johnson and Steve Macaulay were chosen as peer-reviewers.