

From POP2-Server@honcho Tue Oct 29 09:43:39 1996

Return-Path: <103063.2257@CompuServe.COM>

Received: from zephyr.water.ca.gov by honcho.water.ca.gov (4.1/EXEC-1.1)

id AA11601; Mon, 28 Oct 96 15:31:21 PST

Received: from arl-img-5.compuserve.com (arl-img-5.compuserve.com [149.174.217.135])

by zephyr.water.ca.gov (8.7.6/8.7.3) with SMTP id PAA05921 for <rickb@honcho.water.ca.gov>; Mon, 28 Oct 1996 15:19:20 -0800 (PST)

Received: by arl-img-5.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id SAA00894; Mon, 28 Oct 1996 18:15:55 -0500

Date: 28 Oct 96 18:13:46 EST

From: Jim White <103063.2257@CompuServe.COM>

To: Rick Breitenbach <rickb@honcho.water.ca.gov>

Cc: Pete Chadwick <chadwick@sonnet.com>,  
Jim White <103063.2257@CompuServe.COM>

Subject: Mokelumne River assumptions

Message-Id: <961028231346\_103063.2257\_IHB99-1@CompuServe.COM>

Content-Length: 1628

Status: 0

Rick:

Several weeks ago we were discussing the operations modelling assumptions CALFED should use for the Existing Conditions and No Action alternative. The table you distributed showed the EBMUD Lower Mokelumne River Management Plan (LMRMP) for Existing Conditions and a new agreement between DFG and EBMUD for No Action.

Based on the advice of staff and management at Region 2, my recommendation is that you use the LMRMP flows for both E.C and NAA. For the time being actual operations are carried out pursuant to the LMRMP, with some adjustments on a year by year basis when there is available water supply. Obviously there is no way to model annually-negotiated deviations from flows in the plan.

As you know the DFG has its own Lower Mokelumne River Fisheries Management Plan which formed the basis of our testimony in a hearing before the State Water Resources Control Board. To date the SWRCB has not come forward with a decision on the Mokelumne River. My view is that by agreeing to use of the LMRMP for modelling purposes, we are not making any judgement about whether DFG's or EBMUD's plan is more appropriate. That is for the SWRCB to decide.

With regard to using the "new proposed flows pursuant to agreement being negotiated" for the No Action alternative, those negotiations have been discontinued and no agreement has been reached. Hence, there is no basis for assuming any specific flow standards for the future different from those which are currently being used.

Sorry for the delay in providing this clarification. If you have any questions, please call or write.

Thanks

Jim W.

653-3540