

April 14, 2000

TO: Federal-State Management Group

FROM: Mary Selkirk

SUBJECT: Meeting Outcomes, April 11, 2000

The following is a brief summary of outcomes from the CALFED Federal-State Management Group meeting held on Tuesday, April 11, 2000.

1. Announcements and Followup

- Report back on CALFED Science Program Wendy Halverson Martin, CALFED member of the Science Oversight Team, reported they had met to develop the initial set of performance measures for the program, which is due April 17.

Outcome: Perry Herrgesell, DFG, said SOT will bring back 8-10 points to the next Management Group meeting.

Report on Federal-State discussions - The previous evening Steve Ritchie, Patrick Wright and Steve Macaulay returned from top-level management meetings held in Washington, D.C. It appeared the agency heads were comfortable with where CALFED is going, but wished to focus on baseline issues. The next meeting is scheduled for April 26 and 27, and they will go back with as much of the requested information as possible.

Outcome: David Hayes and Mary Nichols would be contacted whether to include EWA on the April 19th Policy Group agenda.

Alf Brandt, Club FED coordinator, said Federal staff has prepared one-page summaries of each of the issues.

Outcome: Alf would email the summaries to Steve Macaulay.

There was discussion on the development of one page summary on the regional strategy and the interconnection of the actions statewide. Alf suggested the one-page summary should come after the Bay-Delta Advisory Council meeting on April 13th.

April 19 Policy Group meeting

- A. Preferred Program Alternative (Report/recommendations from BDAC). Eugenia Laychak, BDAC coordinator, explained Mike Madigan, BDAC Chair; and Sunne McPeak, Co-Chair, have been working closely with all the Councilmembers to draft language which will express the consensus of the members on CALFED's Preferred Program Alternative. She expected the majority of the April 13th BDAC meeting would be spent in lively discussion.

- B. Water Management Strategy Evaluation Framework: Preliminary Report Card. Steve Ritchie suggested "Report Card" be changed to "Conclusions"
- C. Briefing on Propositions 12 and 13 - Patrick will highlight the high visibility projects which are ready to go. The summary of CALFED actions contained in Propositions 12 and 13 produced by Dan McCarroll, CALFED Legislative Director, will be distributed at the Policy Group meeting.

2. **Process for assessment of Delta cross channel operation and Hood-Mokelumne connector.** Ron Ott, CALFED staff, explained the Delta Cross Channel - Hood to Mokelumne Team had carefully considered and written the following language on the process:

Study and evaluate a screened diversion structure on the Sacramento River at Hood with a range of diversion capacities up to 4,000 cfs as a measure to improve drinking water quality in the event that the Water Quality Program measures do not result in continuous improvements toward CALFED drinking water goals.

The Hood diversion contingent on three assessments:

- A thorough assessment of Delta Cross Channel operation strategies and confirmation of continued concern over water quality impacts from Delta Cross Channel operations.
- A thorough evaluation of the technical viability of a Hood diversion facility.
- Satisfactory resolution of the fisheries concerns about a diversion

These evaluations will start immediately and will be completed within three years following the CALFED's programmatic EIS/EIR Record of Decision. If these evaluations demonstrate that a Hood diversion facility is necessary to address drinking water quality concerns and can be constructed without adversely affecting fish populations, design will commence and a project specific EIS/EIR will be prepared. The facility will be constructed as soon as the environmental documentation and permitting are completed.

Interagency Ecological work team

Hydrodynamics and water quality

1. What schedule of operations of the DCC would provide the greatest amount of water quality protection for varying levels of gate closure?
2. How do changes in gate operations at the DCC affect flows through Georgiana and (perhaps) Three-mile slough?
3. How do different Sacramento and San Joaquin River flows affect the conclusions?
4. How do export operations affect the conclusions?
5. Are field studies necessary to confirm model results?

Biology

1. What schedule of operations of the DCC in the fall would provide the greatest amount of protection to outmigrating salmon for varying levels of gate closure?
2. How do changes in exposure at the DCC affect exposure at Georgiana and Three-mile sloughs?
3. What conclusions can the available data from Chuck Hanson, USFWS and DFG support about the sensitivity of outmigrating salmon to different DCC operations?
4. What field studies should be performed to reduce critical uncertainties?
5. What schedule of operations of the DCC in May and June would provide the greatest amount of protection to recently spawned striped bass?

Delta Cross -Channel Hood-Mokelumne Team

- Develop a work plan for the assessment of DCC operations and a diversion at Hood.
- First meeting Wednesday, April 12, 2000
- Work plan presentation to Federal-State Management Group, April 25

DCCHM team Members to draft the workplan: Jim White - DFG, Mike Fris - USFWS, Dan Odenweller - DFG, Bruce Herbold - EPA, Victor Pacheco - DWR, Paul Fujitani - USBR, Rick Sitts - MWD, Ron Ott and Pete Chadwick - CALFED.

Outcome: Larry Smith, USGS, would like to have Rick Oltmann added to the team because of his extensive hydrodynamic experience in that region. Gary Sterns, NMFS, will nominate an additional member. Steve Shaffer suggested the Delta Protection Commission also have a representative. Ron Ott asked if there should be a member of SOT.

Steve Ritchie asked Ron how much money he felt this endeavor would cost per year. Ron answered it could run \$10 million per year. Steve Macaulay emphasized the need to do this job well.

4. **Regional Approach to California Water Management - Westside San Joaquin Valley, San Joaquin River and South San Joaquin Valley.** Steve Ritchie presented an audio-visual production created for use with top management in Federal-State discussions to explain the variety of actions being taken in the five California regions. This week's presentation dealt with Westside San Joaquin Valley, San Joaquin River and South San Joaquin Valley.

The Westside San Joaquin Valley is primarily an agricultural region. The management goals are to improve reliability of water supply to agriculture/refuges, improve groundwater recharge and improve water quality. Water management actions are to fund locally controlled groundwater banking, fund agricultural water use efficiency, implement the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, develop full water supply for refuges and managed wetlands, and implement control of runoff into the California Aqueduct.

San Joaquin River and South San Joaquin Valley water management goals are to improve instream flows, water quality and habitat in the San Joaquin River and its tributaries; improve

groundwater recharge and reliability of water supply to agriculture and refuges; improve flood management; provide exchanges and transfers that promote water quality and overcome drought crises; e.g.; provide Delta water to Friant Water Users in exchange for the Sierra water which would have been delivered to FWU.

The actions for that area are to reestablish San Joaquin River flows, improve San Joaquin River riparian habitat, improve tributary flows, restore tributary habitat, screen diversions, implement flood management, enlarge Friant Dam (or equivalent) up to a 144 foot enlargement to increase storage from 520 TAF to 1,240 TAF; and fund locally controlled groundwater banking such as the Kern Water Bank.