

Policy Committee Summary
Mokelumne River Water and Power Authority
Monday, June 23 2003

Special Note: A description of any alternative project for consideration must be submitted to Dr. Lytle no later than July 31, 2003. Any project must:

- **Meet the “Purpose and Need”**
- **Exhibit no environmental “fatal flaws” (endangered species jeopardy, existence of readily available less damaging practical alternative.)**

Attendance:

The MRWPA Policy Committee met at 9:30 a.m. on Monday, June 23 2003 at the San Joaquin County Public Works Office, Conference Room A. Those in attendance are listed on the sign-in sheet, which may be requested by contacting Judi Snyder at (209) 468-9360.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

I. Discussion Items:

A. Update on MORE WATER Project Activities

After self-introductions, Dr. Lytle reminded the group of its purpose; to oversee the project and to determine the governance structure. He also stated the agreement with the consulting firm had been finalized and they were meeting today to continue Phase I efforts.

i. HDR Team Introduction

Dave Peterson introduced the attending members of the consulting team, Sue Fry (Deputy Project Manager) and Byron Buck (Byron Buck & Associates). Mr. Peterson will provide the project management. Both Ms. Fry and Mr. Buck will be assisting with Phase I of the Feasibility Assessment.

ii. Project Schedule

Phase I of the Feasibility Assessment, the Reconnaissance Study, will take place in 2003. Additional Feasibility work will be concluded during Phase II and run through mid 2004. The Alternatives Analysis, compliance with Section 404 (b)(1), will include determining the least environmentally damaging project practical to meet the project purpose, and should also conclude mid 2004. The PEIS/EIR should be conducted during 2005-2006.

B. Fiscal Year 2003-2004 Draft Budget

The budget will go to the Board of Supervisors July 3, 2003. \$318,490 has been carried over from the last budget. The breakdown of contributions is \$175,000 from the City of Stockton, \$150,000 from the City of Lodi, \$385,000 from Zone No. 2, and \$300,000 in federal contributions for a balance request of \$1,328,490.

The objectives for this budget cycle are: to complete Phase I of the engineering feasibility studies and environmental analysis, revise the JPA (and consider additional membership), initiate Phases II and III, work toward addressing all protests to the Water Right filing, facilitate consensus building, and work with FERC to complete requirements to obtain a Preliminary Permit. An overview of the Services and Supplies was also given.

Ginger Bryant (Bryant and Associates) gave an update on the federal appropriations. Ms. Bryant stated \$300,000 was appropriated by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation under Water and Energy Management and Development for Fiscal Year 2003. The Bureau of Reclamation has yet to release any dollars bureau-wide. The \$3.5M request this year should be out of the subcommittee prior to the August recess. Ms. Bryant is offering a tour to Congressman Pombo's office. She also suggested someone from the County be present and plan to travel to DC in the fall.

C. Development of Subcommittee for Authority Governance and Membership

Dr. Lytle suggested to the group a subcommittee be formed to develop recommendations for governance and additional membership. The group unanimously agreed to a subcommittee of representatives from the County and the Cities of Stockton and Lodi. It was mentioned the City of Stockton could determine the necessity of including representatives from their water agencies in the subcommittee.

Break

A break provided an opportunity for dismissal of those who were not able to stay for the following technical committee meeting.

D. Technical Review Workshop - Draft Purpose and Need Statement Review

The consultants reviewed the proposed "Purpose and Need Statement." The statement includes a "Background" section citing the doubling of population by 2040, the diverse water management problems, and the need for integrated strategies. It also references the "Water Management Plan," its mission, and the stakeholder agencies. Some concern was voiced regarding the reference to the AWC as the body that would be screening the results of the various feasibility studies of the Tier I and II projects and maintaining and revising the WMP as necessary.

While discussing the importance of the "Purpose and Need Statement" it was underscored the key to regulatory success is the Clean Water Act section 404c referencing the least damaging practicable alternative must be selected that meets the project's purpose. Alternatives that do not meet the purpose are not available for consideration. Also, NEPA and CEQA are key to defining alternatives under NEPA.

The project location map indicates alternatives at Pardee Reservoir, Camanche Reservoir, potential Middle Bar Reservoir, and potential Duck Creek Reservoir. In discussing options, the screening criteria applied in the WMP were:

- Cost per ac/f
- Legal feasibility
- Political feasibility
- Financial feasibility
- Environmental impacts
- Water quality
- Benefits-degree to which problems are addressed

It was mentioned it is important to include projects that can be ruled out to demonstrate many alternatives were considered. The consultants will develop a list of projects considered at one time but rejected in order to meet this point. Additional projects may be considered if a description is submitted no later than July 31, 2003.

The purposes of any Mokelumne River project to be considered are as follows:

- Capture Mokelumne flood flows
- Use flows conjunctively
- Meet water resource (overdraft) needs in conjunction with other WMP projects while sustaining San Joaquin County's current and future economic, social and environmental sustainability.

The "Pass/Fail" criteria to be used in looking at MORE alternatives are:

- Meets "Purpose and Need"
- No environmental fatal flaws
 - Endangered species jeopardy
 - Existence of readily available alternative with less environmental damage that meets project purpose

Additional screening criteria would be used to help determine the appropriate alternatives for further study. The group began discussions around the criteria, but will continue discussion at a later meeting. In weighting the criteria, one should use the assumption; assuming equality of information upon which to judge, what would the biggest factor be? Some indicated they are most comfortable looking at the overall dynamic of each project. The criteria listed at this point are:

- Quantity
- Average Cost per Acre-Foot (yield)
- Use Affordable Approaches
- Minimize Land Use Impacts
- Protect Existing Water Rights
- Increase Groundwater Levels
- Decrease the Rate of Salinity Intrusion
- Protect Water Quality
- Develop New Supplies for SW County
- Support Beneficial Water Conservation Programs
- Provide Reliable Water Supplies
- Minimize Biological and Cultural Impacts
- Implementability

There are several projects to be considered. They are categorized as "on-stream" reservoir concepts, "off-stream" reservoir concepts, and direct diversion concepts.

They currently include:

- On-stream---New Pardee (402 ft. high), Middle Bar (420 ft. high 434,000 ac/f), 12 ft. tunnel and two 108 inch pipelines (620 cfs), reop Pardee Dam
- Off-stream---16 ft. tunnel and three 108 inch pipelines (1,000 cfs), Duck Creek Reservoir (130 ft. high, 150,000 ac/f)
- Direct diversion--- (no new storage) divert up to 620 cfs, 12 ft. tunnel and two 108 inch pipelines (620 cfs)---conveyance from Pardee or Comanche Dams.
- Suggested by Mr. Kevin Kauffman---Middle Bar or Pardee to New Hogan/South Gulch alternative instead of Duck Creek. Advantages per Mr. Kauffman are: reservoir site has been studied more so more data is available, high enough to get Calaveras and Stanislaus water, reoperate New Hogan within existing operation plan and lower level. He will submit description.

- Also mentioned were: direct diversion downstream of Camanche Reservoir, NSJWCD-Mokelumne Water Right and Agreement with EBMUD for storage, WID use of additional flood flows off Mokelumne River, Flat Leaky Canal (K. Kauffman will provide additional information.), additional delta diversion and reliance on “area of origin” status, brackish water desalinization (well field with centralized treatment plant and possibility of substituting brackish water to Delta through the EWA and then maintaining the water currently in discussion for delivery to EWA)
- *Outside-the-box* alternative suggested by the Mr. Buck for consideration uses the County’s police powers (similar to the Sacramento Groundwater Authority) to assess a per ac/f pump fee. This revenue would then be used to assist local agencies to implement conjunctive use with either existing facilities or new facilities resulting in improvement of aquifer conditions. To consider in this alternative is although this is viewed as a new cost, any project built, unless totally funded from outside sources, would result in the pass-through of costs. In other words, an analysis needs to be done to compare this to the economic impact of local share without this fee. There also would be a need to demonstrate that projects could bring “new” water. It was added much creativity can be used to spread costs and benefits according to urban/agriculture, etc.

In answer to the question, “Why is an agency proceeding with a Mokelumne project prior to completing Tier I projects?” the answer is even if all Tier I projects were completed, there would still be additional need as the 200,000 ac/f need would not be completely met.

The group then assisted the consultant in updating the chart “Status of San Joaquin County Water Management Plan Tier I and II Options.” The following was offered:

- WID Transfer to SEWD---contract executed, completion 2004, avg. yield 6 taf
- Farmington GW recharge and wetlands---pilot project completed, avg. yield up to 35 taf, applied for Prop 13 grant, yield 4900 EWA, 4900 SE (pending agreement with EWA)
- SSJID/OID Transfers to SEWD---completion target mitigation meeting 7/03, court process target 2006, avg. yield 23 taf
- Stockton Delta Diversion---environmental review just begun, will meet with consultant to help with consistency of reports, completion date 2009, avg. yield 30 taf in Phase I (takes through 2015)
- NSJWCD GW Recharge Project---check with E. Steffani on election results 7/18, completion 2007
- Agricultural Water Conservation---check with CDM on supply yield number
- Freeport Diversion---Completion 2010
- Urban Wastewater Recycling---marketing study showed no interest---HDR needs report

II. Communications:

The Advisory Water Commission will receive a summary of today’s meeting along with a presentation. There was a suggestion to hold a technical workshop after the AWC meeting.

Possible Future Agenda Items:

- Discussion of JPA Amendments-Authority Governance
- Further Discussion of Weighting Screening Criteria
- Presentation of Suggested Projects for Consideration

Next Meeting: November 24, 2003, 9:30 a.m.
San Joaquin County Public Works-Conference Room
A, 1810 East Hazelton Avenue, Stockton, CA

Submitted by:
Carolyn Ratto, Facilitator
The Carlon Group