

## Meeting Summary Existing Conditions and No-Action Alternative

**Attendees:** John Davis, Harlan Glines, Doug Brewer, Kathy Kunysz, Dan Steiner, Kaylea White, Brian Campbell, Jim Martin, Rick Breitenbach, Dan Fults, Jeff Jaraczski, Pierre Stephens, Terry Erlewine, Stein Buer, Tom Zuckerman, Chet Bowling, Terri Anderson, Andrew Hamilton, Karra Harrigfeld, Cynthia Koehler.

### Summary

A meeting was held on Friday, November 15, 1996 to discuss seven assumptions needing further clarification or definition for either Existing Conditions and/or the No-Action Alternative. The assumptions were described in a three-page memorandum that was provided to the meeting attendees. A copy of the memorandum is provided as an attachment to this summary. Each of the assumptions were described by CALFED staff and comments were solicited from the meeting attendees. This memorandum summarizes the comments and questions raised by the group at this meeting. Also attached to this memorandum are several items requested by meeting attendees.

### Questions, Comments and Information Requests

#### Water Demands

Questions were raised about what "demands" really represented in DWRSIM. The issue of upstream demands and how they are represented in the model (water use and demand upstream of major storage facilities). Participants stated that CALFED work needs to be consistent with demands in DWR Bulletin 160. CALFED agreed to check and ensure that water demands in DWRSIM input files are consistent with DWR Bulletin 160.

George Barnes of DWR verified that upstream demands in DWRSIM are based on Bulletin 160.

#### Drinking Water Regulations

Participants stated that the No-Action Alternative should include anticipated drinking water quality standards that may affect SWP exports. Participants suggested CALFED talk to Ray Wolfe, Rick Woodard at DWR, or Byron Buck at CUWA. Rick Breitenbach spoke with both Rick Woodard and Byron Buck and requested a copy of the work on standards being developed by CUWA. CALFED will review the work and as appropriate, propose an approach for inclusion in the No-Action Alternative.

Concerns were raised about the effect of bromides on THM concentrations in water supplies. EPA has been considering more stringent THM standards. Participants asked whether

DWRSIM has bromide modeling capability. DWR has developed a separate THM model that could be used but is not linked with DWRSIM. CALFED was asked to obtain a copy of the model report and distribute it to attendees. A copy of this report is attached for review.

There was a request for information about how Stockton East's water demands are modeled in DWRSIM. Paul Hutton of DWR provided the following response.

Stockton East demands are modeled in DWRSIM in accordance with criteria provided by USBR in an April 26, 1996 letter to SWRCB. A maximum of 155 TAF/yr is delivered to Stockton East and Central San Joaquin Irrigation District. Deliveries are a function of Delta standard and the New Melones water supply term: (February end of month storage + remaining water year forecasted inflow) as follows:

Stor+Inf	D-1485	WQCP
0-1700 TAF	0 TAF/yr	0 TAF/yr
1700-2000 TAF	25 TAF/yr	0 TAF/yr
2000-2300 TAF	60 TAF/yr	0 TAF/yr
> 2300 TAF	155 TAF/yr	155 TAF/yr

The 155 TAF/yr maximum is comprised of the following demands:

49 TAF/yr firm to Central San Joaquin  
31 TAF/yr interruptible to Central San Joaquin  
75 TAF/yr interruptible to Stockton East  
-----  
155 TAF/yr total

Therefore, deliveries are made to Stockton East only when Stor+Inf is greater than 2000 TAF. When it is between 2000-2300 TAF, delivery to Stockton East is 11 TAF/yr (60-49) under D-1485 and 0 TAF/yr under WQCP. When Stor+Inf is greater than 2300 TAF, delivery to Stockton East is 75 TAF/yr under both Delta standards.

### **Agricultural Subsidies**

Participants generally concurred that the No-Action Alternative should include phasing out of agricultural subsidies. However, phasing out subsidies could affect water demands. CALFED was asked to check DWR Bulletin 160 to determine how it addresses agricultural subsidies and to check with the folks preparing the CVPIA PEIS for information about the affect of subsidies on water demands.

Nasser Bateni of DWR indicated that Bulletin 160-93 assumes subsidies will decrease over time

and would be quite low by 2020. Upcoming Bulletin 160-98 will assume that subsidies are eliminated by 2020.

Gwen Bucholz of Montgomery Watson indicated there has been no evaluation in the CVPIA PEIS on how curtailment of subsidies might impact water demands. If this information becomes available in the future we will provide the analysis to meeting participants.

### **Mokelumne River Instream Flows**

There was continued discussion regarding the appropriate instream flow assumptions to use for both existing conditions and the No-Action Alternative. No consensus was reached at the meeting. Subsequently, the primary interested parties concurred that the appropriate flow assumptions to use are the existing 1961 DFG agreement under existing conditions, and POA flows under the No-Action Alternative. A copy of a EBMUD's letter to Lester A. Snow is attached.

### **Sacramento Valley Water Demands**

In general, the group concurred with the CALFED proposal to use full contract entitlement for the Tehama Canal water users and suggested expanding this approach to all Sacramento River water users. The group also stated that CALFED needs to recognize that when reviewing historical data, in some years, water use and deliveries in the valley are based on the timing of water forecasts by Reclamation. Substantial delays in water supply forecasting can have a major affect on the types of crops that are grown and, the resulting crop value. Higher value crops are generally planted when Reclamation forecasts full water deliveries. There are competing demands for water quality and water conservation in the valley.

### **800,000 Acre-Foot CVPIA Dedication**

The group generally concurred with the approach by CALFED, to recognize that substantial work is proceeding on this issue and that CALFED will monitor and develop a strategy when the ongoing efforts are complete. CALFED's proposal will be distributed for review and comment at that time.

### **Water Quality Standards at Vernalis**

In general, participants concurred with CALFED's proposed approach. SWRCB is in the process of preparing its EIR process on the Water Quality Control Plan. One outstanding question is whether the Bureau of Reclamation's practice of limiting non-flood control releases from Goodwin Dam to 1,500 cfs is part of DWRSIM modeling assumptions. This limitation has been the standard practice of Reclamation because of downstream flooding and seepage concerns that arise when flows in excess of 1500 cfs are in the stream.

George Barnes of DWR indicated that the 1500 cfs limitation was currently not part of DWRSIM modeling assumptions. Further, the SWRCB decided not to use the 1500 cfs limitation in their Water Quality Control Plan EIR because the flooding and seepage concerns are not documented.

Attachment