

CALFED WORKSHOP 2/26/96

GREEN GROUP NOTES

GENERAL SESSION

(Notes not typed up.)

GREEN BREAKOUT GROUP

INTRODUCTION

QUESTIONS

- Have you considered the action of raising Friant Dam to increase San Joaquin storage?
- How do we deal with reoperation of existing reservoir system? How do we operate new storage?
- Are we abiding by California Water Law with respect to basic assumptions in formulating alternatives? What is assumed and what isn't?
- What about non-flow factors such as introduced species, water quality, habitat, etc?
- How does groundwater banking work?
- What were the assumptions as to water quantity available from conjunctive use from the Sacramento Valley?
- Why was restoration of habitat limited to a great extent in most alternatives to the Delta and not the rivers?
- Why were diversions from the Delta assumed to be maximum?
- Why include programs to benefit striped bass, a non-native species?

RESPONSES

- With regards to striped bass and the introduction of non-native organisms, the plan should not just look at ESA species, but all species that have a large economic benefit or important ecological role. Likewise the plan needs to halt the further introduction of exotics through controls of ship ballast and border crossings. These are core actions.
- Groundwater banking involves diverting surface waters in wetter years to recharge ground water banks or replace ground water pumping, so that more groundwater will be available in drier years. This is primarily an option for the San Joaquin Valley; whereas, the option is more complicated in the Sacramento Valley.
- Habitat restoration focuses on the Delta because CVPIA focuses on rivers and tributaries.

FURTHER QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q: What is the conjunctive use capacity? Kern County Water Bank is owned by state, but has yet to yield any capacity. A: Ours was a reasonable first cut; may or may not be possible.

CATEGORY 1 - REOPERATION DISCUSSION

Q: How do we get from 20 alternatives to 8 to 12? Are the 20 tent stakes or representatives? Outer edge or inside? A: Representatives not boundary alternatives. We need to take a reasonable range into scoping: 3 to 5 will be reasonable.

Q: **Reoperation** - does it include reallocation of water? A: No

C: Reoperation creates losers. Q: Who will be hurt by reoperation? A: There is the potential for more yield.

(Note: reoperation implies yield will be distributed differently; maybe more or less yield. Concern for how the change is distributed.)

Q: Is California Water Law taken into account in reoperation? A: Within existing constraints. We are identifying impacts and benefits of reoperation actions so that it will be consistent with solution principles.

Q: By pushing reoperation into other months in the past two decades have we hurt the ecosystem? Has this been part of the problem? A: Yes.

C: Six alternatives include **demand management**. There is already much demand management in the pipeline as best management practices. This should be a core action and should recognize limited further benefits. Focus of demand management is agricultural and M&I uses, while none is on environmental use of water. Demand management for AG/M&I will take place to the maximum limit regardless of CALFED program, with the exception of taking land out of production. Question whether there should be any consideration for demand management other than taking land out of production. Q: Why not consider demand management for refuges, fish actions, and other environmental designations/uses of water? Is all water released for fish necessary? A: Best Management Practices are considered for Duck Clubs and refuges.

Comments of Reoperation: What is good, bad, or missing.

- Cheapest: needs no new facilities. Makes most of existing facilities.
- Tied to conjunctive use makes most of reoperation.
- Need to look at whole system for reoperation, not just two projects. *(Note: other features could be included: PG&E Delta plants, Delta and river agricultural diversions, etc.)*
- Need to look at effect in whole system and in Bay-Delta. *(For example: changes for Delta may affect river flows.)*
- Reoperation is in keeping with adaptive management objectives.
- Real-time monitoring allows for adaptations.
- There are fewer windows of non-fish risk than we think for exports.
- There are times when exports don't hurt fish (floods).

2/27/95

T. Cannon

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

- There is room for improving export timing based on real-time monitoring.
- Reoperation allows intelligent shifting of exports.
- ◆ Capacity has been limiting our ability to help fish. (*Referring to the inability to capture peak flows so that we can reduce exports at other times that damage fish.*)
- Eventually we will have to specify how reoperation will be implemented in order to evaluate its potential benefits and effects: what we are proposing now is simply arm waving.
- Potential benefits of reoperation with existing system are minimal. Even in this wet year we are at only 60% of historical deliveries. (*Implies that existing constraints limit potential benefits.*)
- Changing rules is different than reoperation.
- ◆ Standards may need to change to attain reoperation benefits.
- ◆ The full benefits of reoperation can only be obtained with maximum flexibility to operate projects including ability to pump water to south of Delta storage, above the present channel capacity limits, and above existing permit/standard limits.
- Care must be taken to consider effects of additional pumping to south of Delta storage by pumping at times when impacts are low. Maybe upstream storage is better, since it doesn't involve diversions.
- Looks like we are trying to move more water south.
- Alternative with reoperation appeared to limit exports to exporters, while to environmental interests it looked like more exports would be taken from Delta.
- Reoperation is OK to northern water users as long as their water supply reliability is unaffected or increased. Note that the Tehema Colusa Canal is already shorted on contracted supply, like many other diverters in the Sacramento Valley.
- Water Quality for drinking is missing from reoperation scheme. As proposed reoperation would be detrimental to drinking water quality.
- Reoperation as proposed is only a short-term and limited solution to our problems.
- In Delta storage in reoperation alternatives is bad for drinking water quality.
- More focus is needed on drinking water quality in reoperation scheme.
- Reoperation actions such as transfers won't work unless there is more through-Delta capacity to move water. Need more facilities in form of channel capacity and south of Delta storage - ability to move more water and a place to put it.
- How far can we reduce water supply and water quality objectives in reoperation alternatives?
- Are there other actions we can add to help reoperation meet objectives? New storage north and south of Delta.
- Storage by itself does not do it. More detail is needed on water right considerations.
- A program is needed to deal with Delta agriculture drainage to improve water quality: consolidate, manage, treat, or different landuse practices.
- Should consider actions to repel seawater or reduce salinity in Delta for all water users. (*Note this is one of the potential benefits of in-Delta storage.*)
- Should consider a drought water bank in core program.
- A pollutant source control program also is needed in core program.
- We should not pull old discounted remedies of the shelf.

2/27/95

T. Cannon

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

- Pricing schemes should be dropped.
- Why do we keep trying to make reoperation work when we have done a lot and there is little left to get out of it. Will we carry these limited potential actions into next phases?

**CATEGORY 2 - MIXED NEW FACILITIES AND REOPERATION
ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION**

Good features of these alternatives:

- conjunctive use and groundwater storage
- upstream storage (commentor added "in their dreams")
- new facilities (reoperation won't work without them)
- small isolated facility good for M&I uses
- some water will still move through Delta - good for Delta water users
- more flexibility, maximum operational flexibility; allow skimming off more water; ability to better manage operations in dry years
- least costly
- in-Delta storage does something useful with islands; doesn't leave them a burden to water supply
- Alternative 10 is better than 14: less engineering problems, cost.
- Alternative 10 is cheaper than 12, but less advantages.
- Alternative 13 is too radical, while 10 is not.
- Alternative 14 does better job of taking Sacramento flood flows.

What is missing or wrong with these alternatives:

- What is the configuration of the upstream storage: could be a problem depending on configuration.
- Priorities? Doability? Economics? Details?
- Next iteration should be more specific about upstream storage options. At least provide priority list of alternatives.
- Levee setbacks and meader corridors are a concern for landowners; where will money come from to buy land and build these; indirect impacts; local government concerns; loss to local economies.
- Guarantees for protection of uses with isolated facility are an issue. Need regulatory shelf-life.
- Problem with water quality in Delta with isolated facility.
- Alternative 13 does not help south Delta or South Bay water users. Need connection added for M&I.
- Not enough emphasis on meeting long-term water supply needs. We should not remain in the dilemma of fighting over limited water supply.
- System integrity-vulnerability focuses too much on levees. Should consider further flood control measures such as upstream flood control storage. Levees are not best bang for buck for Delta flood control problems.

2/27/95

T. Cannon

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

CATEGORY 3 - NEW FACILITIES ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION

Good features of these alternatives:

- The new facilities are good.
- Alternative 8 takes care of water quality in chain-of-lakes by lining lakes
- Alternative 15 may not have tech solution.
- Alternative 16 is best: least technical problems.
- These alternatives are long-term solutions.
- Upstream storage provides flexibility, water supply, water quality, and system vulnerability benefits.

What is missing or wrong with these alternatives:

- All have cost, cost allocation, and payment issues. These problems must be addressed before an intelligent assessment of their potential is made.
- Water banking - too generally treated.
- New storage and distribution facilities need to be identified.
- Need more guarantees to protect other uses (i.e. water quality and environment), or provide for sufficient mitigation.
- Need more new technology such as Georgianna acoustic barrier to try to solve tough problems.
- More emphasis needed on role of real-time monitoring and adaptive management.
- Need more emphasis on non-flow problem solutions.

OPEN DISCUSSION

- Alternative 1's 800,000 acres of fallowed lands would have significant redirected impacts and is too costly. Too much land!
- Is CALFED going beyond Bulletin 160?
- Need to better describe the intent of these alternatives.
- Alternatives need to bring together stakeholders with common interests.
- We need alternatives that do not cause mutual terror.
- Screening down should be based on cost, institutional constraints (doability), rationale.
- Expand core elements to include actions that may vary in level of implementation depending on facilities.
- Other core options:
 - drought water bank
 - water transfers
 - more aggressive pollutant source control
 - more intake screening
 - expand other program funding
 - drinking water quality
 - better coordination of reservoir releases
 - salinity influx controls
- Instead of core, add common or basic elements that can vary in implementation.
- Category 1 can't meet solution principles, because of durability.