

CALFED OPERATIONS – SPECIAL MEETING

MEETING NOTES

February 7, 2002

Handout

1. Tools to Augment 2002 CVP Allocation, dated February 7, 2002; Chet Bowling, USBR.

Background Information

A House subcommittee hearing is scheduled for the week of February 11, 2002, in Washington, D.C. to discuss Reclamation's CVP operations for 2002 and beyond. Ken Calvert who introduced CALFED legislative to raise CVP allocation is heading the subcommittee. The Department of Water Resources is also testifying.

Reclamation developed a set of tools to augment allocations for the CVP this year that will be discussed at this hearing. These tools are to boost the CVP's allocation to the goal set in the ROD. The Project Agencies and the Management Agencies presented the list of tools to the stakeholders in order to give the stakeholders an opportunity to provide comments on the proposed options for increasing CVP allocations. This meeting is an attempt to determine where is Reclamation with the agreements and disagreements on implementing these actions in 2002 and beyond.

Discussion

Reclamation looked at increasing their allocations in early January. The tools for augmenting allocations were classified into the following four categories:

- Category I ? USBR action
- Category II ? Department of Interior action
- Category III ? Requires assistance from other agencies
- Category IV ? Costly to Implement

Reclamation discussed each category, the tools which increase or reallocate water, and about making changes in operations without impacting third parties (e.g.: south Delta diverters). Reclamation will address the impacts prior to implementation. Also, Reclamation will not make a decision on a tool without evaluating the risks, and will not choose a tool if it has a low chance of implementation.

The reason an amount of water was not included in each action in the table is that the quantity will vary depending upon implementation and the amount will change once the February forecast is completed.

Category I includes actions that are low risk, low cost and have a high probability that Reclamation can implement. These actions include: (1) Refining the Projection of South of Delta (SOD) Ag use pattern; (2) Surcharging of San Luis Reservoir; and (3) Refining Reclamation rescheduled demands. The question of who takes a risk if San Luis storage

CALFED OPERATIONS – SPECIAL MEETING

2/7/02 Meeting Notes

Page 2

falls too low due to inaccurate forecasts of water demands arose. Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) considers any interruptions in supply a problem and believes Reclamation must develop a contingency plan in the event demands are higher than projected. Such a contingency could be to pro-rate deliveries based upon the available water in San Luis Reservoir.

A concern arose regarding rescheduled water – Reclamation's allocation potentially could have been higher if not for rescheduled water that is considered neutral (neither increasing nor decreasing allocation). It was suggested that other reservoirs be used and not just San Luis Reservoir. Reclamation does not have any plans now, but if they could do it, it will be considered.

Category II encompasses b(2)-related actions and assumptions about how the Department of Interior (DOI) implementation policy is being administered. B(2) includes the EWA/b(2) interaction and discretion. Reclamation is working with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on b(2) and EWA. This tool will lessen the impact to South Delta diverters. A formal process was requested on who is looking and evaluating the use of b(2) and EWA actions, who is making the decision, and what determines the decision on why use b(2) or EWA for curtailments. Also, applying EWA to Reclamation may be questionable, given the unknown status of Offset/Reset. If DOI uses EWA/b(2) on the Stanislaus River, b(2) could be over the commitment. Reclamation curtailing water from San Joaquin County users would be a big hit on third parties.

Category III requires aid from other agencies such as the Department of Water Resources (Department), CALFED, contractors, etc. These actions include: (1) borrowing water from the SWP share of storage in San Luis to cover delivery of Level 2 supplies prior to the low point; and (2) SWP wheeling of Level 2 supply to refuges. Both produce about 25 percent of the total Level 2 refuge demand. The option for wheeling water is limited due to lack of capacity in wet years, unless the Department is willing to commit conveyance capacity to wheel Level 2 refuge supplies and forego pumping SWP water this summer. This option would put the SWP at risk of not meeting its deliveries in the event State Water Contractors (SWC) schedule deliveries on the forecasted pattern. The second option is similar because it also assumes the SWCs will not schedule as much delivery during the summer months prior to the San Luis Reservoir low point. The difference is the first option provides more conveyance capacity to the CVP during the year.

Reclamation will take care of the south Delta diverters when taking actions under Category III. The SWP may wheel water for Reclamation as long as it does not impact the SWP water contractors. If there is an impact, Reclamation will have to shift summer demands to cover SWP's low point. At issue is either storage or conveyance. If low point is an issue, and Reclamation wants to borrow water, then this does not require moving water or JPOD. However, a contingency plan is needed since the SWP forecasts to low point. And, if storage is unavailable in San Luis Reservoir, then Reclamation will need to provide water for the SWP contractors. The EWA cannot be squeezed out of conveyance capacity. The SWP may have to adjust its own pumping. And, if a curtailment occurs, then the EWA will be on the hook.

Category IV are actions that have high costs associated with their implementation. These actions include: (1) Temporary Intertie; (2) Lining repair to Recover Freeboard; (3) Level 4 refuge supply transfers; (4) Source Shifting; and (5) Joint Point of Diversion.

Further details were supplied during the explanation of the use of Category IV's actions. Reclamation's use of the temporary Intertie would allow the CVP to use all of the capacity (4,600 cfs) of Tracy Pumping Plant and would be implemented by June/July 2002. A 2,500-foot reach is proposed to be repaired and will increase canal conveyance capacity by 150 cfs. Tracy Pumping Plant would then be able to pump about 4,500 cfs. However, a siphon with limited capacity could reduce Tracy Pumping Plant's capacity to 4,200 cfs. This lining repair would only bring the canal back to its original level and Reclamation views this action as maintenance of existing CVP operational capacity¹. The Intertie and the lining repair are considered temporary fixes that would increase the capacity. However, both can have long-term impacts.

Another option in Category IV proposes to acquire additional Level 4 refuge water that would be delivered after the San Luis Reservoir low point is reached. The amount of Level 4 refuge water that could be purchased would be subject to water availability, conveyance capacity and funding. The option would allow Reclamation to increase deliveries this year; however, the impact would be that the CVP would start the next delivery year with lower storage in San Luis Reservoir. CALFED may have money for Level 4 Refuge or environmental purposes, but not to fund source shift. Reclamation does not see any benefits to source shifting.

During the Ops Group meeting, it was noted that the DOI's Secretary can impose a deficiency of up to 25% in the quantity dedicated to b(2). This would be a major change in policy and would apply when agricultural users were taking less due to hydrology. This is not on the list of tools, but would fit under the b(2)/EWA interaction. The DOI may choose not to exercise it. However, it was mentioned the amount used would be less than 800 TAF if not for fish. Another way deficiencies could be implemented would be if DOI determined the current level of b(2) use would increase public safety.

It was pointed out that these tools benefit those contractors on the west side, and not the east side contractors (i.e.: Stanislaus users), and does not address replacement. The allocation for contractors on the east side is 8.5 percent.

Additional comments were received about the limited use of the tools except through Offset/Reset and that there is a limited range of opportunities aside from the Secretary's decision. Also, the American River flows are based upon D-893 which is based on hydrology.

If the offset is gone, in the 90% hydrology, Reclamation may be at risk under the Endangered Species Act and may use EWA for CVP.

¹ The South Delta Water Agency believes any increase in conveyance capacity (regardless of means) will hurt them and should be subject to requirements to protect south Delta water users from additional exports by the CVP/SWP.

CALFED OPERATIONS – SPECIAL MEETING

2/7/02 Meeting Notes

Page 4

At the Ops Group meeting, Reclamation noted it had performed an analysis to determine the delivery capacity for the CVP assuming it was allowed to operate Tracy Pumping Plant at its capacity through the end of 2002². The analysis showed that the CVP could deliver about 60 percent; thus suggesting the CVP could not obtain 65 percent to 70 percent for an allocation regardless of hydrology.

If the analysis accurately portrays the CVP capability, then the 65 percent allocation target contained in the CALFED Record of Decision would be unobtainable. However, it was also noted the original framers of the ROD anticipated increases through other tools. For example, they expected JPOD could be used to increase the CVP allocations by 5 percent on average; another 5 percent would be made available through changes to the DOI policy on Offset/Reset; and the remaining 5 percent would be obtained from other tools.

Other tools discussed, but are not on Reclamation's list include (1) buying down demand, and (2) land retirement. Neither option appears favorable due to either high cost or interpretation of benefits³.

There is hardly any change in the 90% hydrology for the water year type. However in the 50% hydrology, the classification changed from above normal to below normal. The carryover in Shasta is less than 3.5 MAF in September.

The next CALFED Ops meeting is February 20, 2002. An update will be provided of the problems encountered. However, there was conditional support on some of these tools.

² VAMP was the only reduction that would occur; other b(2) actions such as ramping after VAMP or export reductions in June were ignored.

³ The water users do not believe land retirement should count toward meeting the 15 percent increase in allocation goal.