

Appendix C: MCG Meeting Summaries

Appendix C presents each of the MCG-approved summaries from each MCG meeting.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #1 Summary

September 5, 2013

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Calaveras County	My Valley Springs
Calaveras County Water District	Pacific Gas & Electric
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County, Public Works
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
City of Lodi, Public Works	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
City of Stockton, Municipal Utilities	Sierra Nevada Conservancy
Delta Flyfishers	Stockton East Water District
East Bay Municipal Utilities District	
Foothill Conservancy	

Key Decisions

- Meeting start time: 9AM. Coffee, snacks, and mingling from 8.45 to 9AM.
- Meeting location: San Joaquin Farm Bureau with two future meetings held at a venue in the upcountry.
- Meeting dates: Second Friday of every month.
- Remote meeting participation: A phone number with 'listen-only' capabilities will be provided should an organization be unable to attend a meeting in-person.
- Meeting documentation: High level meeting summaries will be prepared and include discussion topics, key points made without attribution, action items, and decisions with key rationale.
- Late participation: ~~There will be a three month cut off period (November 2013) after which no additional stakeholder organizations will be admitted into the MCG~~ New members to the MCG will be considered until the February 2014 meeting. Late-comers will not be permitted to revisit decisions made prior to their joining the group. (revised December 13, 2013)

- Poor attendance: If poor attendance becomes an issue, the MCG will discuss it at that time. A clause to this effect will be written in the Process Design Technical Memorandum to be adopted by the MCG.
 - Media communication: Valley media outlets will be directed to Brandon and upcountry media outlets will be directed to Rob. If Pete Bell is approached by the media, he may also serve as a contact, while also referring to Rob or Brandon as appropriate. Any MCG stakeholder can talk to the media generally about their own interests as well as published documents and website content.
 - Public comments: Meetings are open to the public. However, public participation will be limited to a designated 16-minute public comment period to be held right after lunch and each speaker will be allowed four minutes to speak. The comment period is not intended to be a question-and-answer period, and the MCG will generally not respond to comments made during this time.
 - Process Design Technical Memorandum (TM): A Process Design TM will be drafted by RMC and submitted to a sub-committee consisting of 3 members of the MCG. Comments from the sub-committee will be addressed by RMC and then a revised draft submitted to the MCG at the October meeting for review and adoption.
 - Breakfast snacks: MCG organizations will take turns bringing breakfast snacks and coffee to the meetings.
 - Lunch: The Group will eat together on-site. Those who do not bring their own lunch will contribute money. Lunch will be 45 minutes.
 - Mailing/contact list: Jordie Bornstein will maintain and update the MCG stakeholder list as needed.
-

Action Items

- All MCG members: Contact Jordie Bornstein regarding contact info for potential new stakeholders. Rainwater & Associates, LLC (R&A), will conduct outreach to the stakeholders once the contact information is provided.
 - All MCG members: Complete and send Interest Statement to Katie Cole by Thursday September 12th.
 - Rob Alcott: Reach out to our grant representative Jason Preece regarding agencies tracking time spent for possible future reimbursement. Report back to Group.
 - RMC: Include a clause in the Process Design TM stating that MCG members are expected to attend meetings and that poor attendance will be handled on a case-by-case basis.
 - R&A: Provide breakfast snacks at the October meeting.
-

Summary

I. Introductory Comments

Rob Alcott and Brandon Nakagawa presented the history of the Mokelumne River Forum and provided context for the current MokeWISE process.

II. Project Overview

Dave Richardson presented on the project, giving a general overview of the IRWM program, the MokeWISE program purpose, the potential benefits of the program, and the schedule and organizational structure.

III. Process Design: Interview Results Overview

Marie Rainwater (facilitator) summarized the Process Design Report, outlining the interview results and answering questions.

IV. Unresolved MCG Process Design Issues

The facilitator went through the following list of identified areas which still needed group consensus after the interviews.

a. *Meeting Schedules & Start Times*

- *Discussed: meeting start time; meeting location; meeting day/date*
- It was decided that meetings should begin at 9 AM to allow additional travel time, though coffee will be provided beginning at 8:45 to allow some time for discussion in advance of the meetings.
- After some discussion, it was decided that every meeting will be held at the San Joaquin Farm Bureau, with two future meetings held at a venue in the upcountry. This will provide a more central meeting location for travel purposes, while ensuring that the group does travel to the upcountry during the course of the project.
- The 2nd Friday of every month was agreed to be the preferred schedule for future meetings.

b. *Remote meeting participation*

- *Discussed: the potential for organizations to remotely participate at meetings*
- It was decided that a phone number with 'listen-only' capabilities will be provided to allow organizations unable to attend meeting(s) in-person to listen in.

c. *Meeting documentation*

- *Discussed: if and how meetings should be documented*
- Meeting notes will include key decisions, a high level summary of discussions, and rationale for decisions. This will allow key decisions to be documented and reasoning for making specific decisions to be documented without requiring significant time for discussion and editing. Comments will not be attributed to specific MCG members to encourage a more honest and open dialogue.

d. *Late participation*

- *Discussed: if and how late stakeholder participation should be handled*
- Late-comers will be allowed to join the group [until February 2014](#)~~for the first three months of the program~~, but will not be permitted to revisit decisions made prior to their joining the group. Limiting late participation will ensure that the project continues to move forward with an engaged MCG that has the benefit of understanding decisions made and technical information presented throughout the process. However, allowing some time for additional participants to join provides time for MCG members to do additional outreach to ensure that all interested stakeholders with a clear interest in the project have the opportunity to participate. If potential stakeholders are identified, their contact information will be forwarded to Jordie Bornstein so the facilitation team may schedule and conduct stakeholder interviews. [\(revised December 13, 2013\)](#)
- Resource agencies will generally be involved as Tier 2 stakeholders, meaning that they will be consulted for feedback during specific points in the process, but will not be MCG members and thus will not be directly involved in the collaborative decision-making process. Many resource agencies approached indicated that they did not have resources to fully participate.
- Interested party status is for non-agency stakeholders who want to stay informed of the MCG progress but choose not to participate as a member.

e. *Poor attendance*

- *Discussion: how to handle MCG members whose participation dwindles over time*
- The Process Design TM will include a clause that states that participants are expected to attend meetings, and should poor attendance becomes an issue, the MCG may consider how to address it on a case-by-case basis. This provides flexibility for the MCG to address attendance issues, should they arise, while recognizing that members have committed to participate in this voluntary process.

f. *Media communication*

- *Discussed: the way in which MCG members communicate with the media*
- It was decided that if upcountry media outlets contact a MCG member, they should be referred to Rob, and if valley media outlets contact a MCG member, they should be referred to Brandon. If Pete is approached, he may discuss the project prior to referring the media to the appropriate contact. This will ensure that the media receives consistent information on the project from the contracting entities and provides clear points of contact for media inquiries. Any MCG member can talk to the media generally about their own interests as well as published documents and website content.

g. Public comments

- *Discussed: if meeting agendas will allow time for public comments and if meetings are open or public*
- Meetings will be open to the public and a designated 16-minute public comment period will be held immediately following lunch. Comments will be limited to four minutes per commenter. This will allow members of the public to listen to MCG discussions and understand which members may represent their viewpoints prior to commenting. The MCG will not respond to comments at that time, but comments will be taken under advisement by the group.

V. Next Steps – Process Design

The facilitator introduced the Process Design Technical Memorandum as the document which will outline the decisions made by the group during this meeting as well as the consensus items reached during the interviews. This document will serve to outline the process protocols of the group and be adopted by the MCG when completed.

- RMC will prepare a draft Process Design TM that summarizes the process decisions made by the MCG. This document will be provided to a sub-committee for preliminary review on September 20th, with comments back from the sub-committee by September 27th. The revised TM will be provided to the full MCG for review one week prior to the next MCG meeting, consistent with the standard review schedule.

VI. Schedule Overview and Project Work Flow

Dave Richardson presented the program schedule and work flow, going through the timeline for each task, the stakeholder meeting schedule, and how to access documents on the website. There were several fundamental questions raised including the following.

- a. How do the outcomes of this program fit into CEQA?*

The initial expectation has been that the MokeWISE program will be comparable to a planning feasibility document. In any case a CEQA legal review of the MokeWISE program resulting from the MCG process will be performed. Commonly used CEQA terminology (such as “preferred alternative”) will be avoided during the MokeWISE development process wherever possible.

b. What about modeling?

The project will use MOCASIM as a modeling tool, and assumptions and inputs to the model will be reviewed and vetted by the MCG and / or a sub-committee thereof.

c. Should agencies be tracking time for possible future grant reimbursement?

Rob Alcott will check with our DWR grant representative Jason Preece and report back to the group.

VII. Interest Statement Development

The facilitator introduced the Interest Statement Development sheet and explained that each organization is responsible for submitting one. The purpose of this exercise is for each organization to express their interests. There were two components of the exercise: formulating a general interest statement narrative and outlining potential program objectives that reflect those interests.

- **Formulating an Interest Statement Narrative:** Asks for a general statement about each organization’s interests/concerns in the Mokelumne River. What are the few things that each organization most cares about as it relates to the watershed?
- **Outlining Potential Program Objectives:** This asks organizations to brainstorm *initial* thoughts about MokeWISE program outcomes they would like to see and consequences they would like to avoid. This exercise is intended to be a starting point, not an exhaustive final exercise. The information will be collected, synthesized, and presented at October’s meeting to facilitate further discussion.

VIII. Logistics

The facilitator led discussion on who is responsible for providing breakfast snacks and lunch at future meetings. Logistics of mailing/contact list was also discussed. The results of this discussion are captured in the key decisions presented at the beginning of this summary.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #2 Summary

October 11, 2013

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Calaveras County	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County Water District	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	Pacific Gas & Electric
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin County, Public Works
City of Lodi, Public Works	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
City of Stockton, Municipal Utilities	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Sierra Nevada Conservancy
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Stockton East Water District
Foothill Conservancy	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	

Key Decisions

- Meeting materials: Jordie Bornstein will send out relevant documents as word document attachments to emailed meeting announcements. Copies of the documents will also be placed on the website.
 - Remote meeting participation: If primary and alternate representatives cannot be present, then phone-in participation is an option. Additionally, phone-in participants will be allowed to speak as well as listen. The protocols will be amended to reflect this change.
-

Action Items

- All MCG members: Review the Process Protocols TM by October 18, 2013. Make comments in MS Word showing track changes and send to kcole@rmcwater.com.
 - All MCG members: Review the Charter by October 18, 2013. Make comments in MS Word showing track changes send to kcole@rmcwater.com.
 - RMC: Post original interest statements for each agency/organization on the website.
 - RMC: Update Process Protocol Technical Memorandum to reflect that phone-in participation at monthly MokeWISE meetings will be allowed to speak as well as listen.
 - RMC: Post Department of Water Resources (DWR) Grant on the project website once it is finalized.
 - R&A: Send MCG documents needing review in MS Word (97-03) to MCG for redline/strikethrough edit capability.
 - Stockton East Water District: Provide breakfast snacks at the November meeting.
-

Summary

I. Stakeholder Interest Statements

Each MCG member spent 3-4 minutes summarizing the primary interests of their agencies/organizations in the MokeWISE program, including key areas of interest and concern in the watershed, and desired potential project outcomes. MCG members were encouraged to ask clarifying questions. The original statements from each agency/organization will be posted on the website.

II. Process Protocols Technical Memorandum (TM)

Marie Rainwater (facilitator) gave a brief overview of the development and status of Process Protocol TM and reiterated that written comments are due by October 18, 2013.

The MCG revisited the issue of phone-in participation to meetings. It was decided that phone-in participation should no longer be limited just to “listen-only” and instead allow full participation to the degree possible. Language in the Process Protocols TM will be revised accordingly yet will stress the importance and preference for in-person participation.

The facilitator also explained the role of the Charter (it is a requirement of the Department of Water Resources Grant that is funding this program) which was one of the documents that was posted to the website for the October meeting. The charter is a simple 1-page document that explains the purpose of the Process Protocols (outlining the means by which the MCG will be organized and make decisions) and explicitly states that the MCG members unanimously approve the

Process Protocols. The schedule requires that the MCG review the Charter by October 18, 2013.

III. Draft Outcomes and Measures TM

Dave Richardson summarized the Draft Outcomes and Measures TM, outlining the methodology RMC used to synthesize the “project outcomes and measures” input that was provided by each MCG agency/organization. Initial feedback included numerous changes to wording. MCG members were encouraged to submit all suggestions/comments to RMC as a word document with visible track changes. To facilitate this, Jordie will email the MCG and attach the Outcomes and Measures TM in Microsoft Word.

IV. Housekeeping Items and Next Steps

The MCG approved the September draft meeting summary which will be posted on the website as final.

MCG members volunteered to be part of a group tasked with pre-reviewing the next TM which will be on Public and Disadvantaged Community Outreach. Volunteers included John Brodie, Scot Moody, and Tom Infusino.

Scot Moody volunteered to bring breakfast to the November meeting and requested a reminder one week prior. RMC distributed blank timesheet templates and explained their purpose: to track everyone’s time, coming up with reasonable estimates of dollars spent, and possibly getting credit in the future for grant matching funds. MCG members were encouraged to estimate their “burdened rates,” to include travel time, and to also track time for others in their agencies/organizations who may have attended the first meeting but not the second. NGO members who volunteer their time were asked to estimate a reasonable rate.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #3 Summary

November 8, 2013

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras County	Pacific Gas & Electric
Calaveras County Water District	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County, Public Works
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
City of Lodi, Public Works	Sierra Nevada Conservancy
City of Stockton, Municipal Utilities	Stockton East Water District
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Trout Unlimited
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Foothill Conservancy	
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
MyValleySprings.com	

Key Decisions

- Charter: Approved
- Protocols TM: Approved; minor edits required
- Outcomes and Measures TM: further edits will be made, then sent to the MCG. If no further edits from the MCG, TM will be assumed approved on November 22nd.
- Documents: Documents will be provided in both redline and clean versions so members can follow the editing process.
- Meeting Summaries: MCG meeting summaries will be posted to the public portion of the website.
- Public phone line: the public will not be permitted to listen-in on the phone line.
- Public comment period: will be moved to before lunch.

- Public Outreach Workgroup: East Bay MUD, Foothill Conservancy, UMRWA, San Joaquin County
 - 'Model-Heads' Workgroup: California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Amador Water Agency, Calaveras Public Utility District, the City of Stockton, and San Joaquin County/Groundwater Basin Authority
-

Action Items

- All MCG members: review Public Outreach Plan, return comments to Katie Cole by Friday November 15, 2013.
 - RMC: post CEQA TM on website and email MCG when posted.
 - RMC: incorporate section about moving approved documents to the public portion of the website into Protocols document and send to MCG.
 - All MCG members: review Protocols document, submit any edits to Katie Cole by Wednesday November 13, 2013.
 - RMC: post Charter and Protocols documents to website on November 13, 2013, pending no additional comments
 - RMC: combine socio-economic 'potential measure to avoid' to address duplicate.
 - Calaveras Planning Coalition: send Outcomes and Measures redlines to Katie Cole by Wednesday November 13, 2013.
 - RMC: send redlined Outcomes and Measures TM to MCG by Thursday November 14, 2013
 - All MCG members: review Outcomes and Measures TM, send comments to Katie Cole by Friday November 22, 2013.
 - RMC: If no comments on Outcomes and Measures TM, assume approved, send out to MCG and post to website.
 - RMC: add MokeWISE website address to Public Outreach Plan.
 - Rainwater and Associates: add Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Land Management, Army Corps of Engineers, City of Jackson, and City of Plymouth to Tier 2 list.
 - Rainwater and Associates: add Mary Beth from California Fish and Wildlife to Tier 2 stakeholder list.
 - RMC: make breakfast snack sign-up sheet.
 - RMC: include title of documents in header and page numbers in footer of documents.
 - Calaveras County: provide breakfast snacks at the December meeting.
-

Summary

I. October Meeting Summary, Brief Update, and December Meeting

Meeting #2 (October 2013) summary was approved by consensus. By approved consensus, meeting summaries will be posted to the public portion of the website pending summary approval by the MCG.

The MokeWISE grant representative from the Department of Water Resources (DWR), Jason Preece, was given access to the MokeWISE website so he may review MokeWISE documents.

Facilitator explained that she would not be present at the December meeting; the meeting is still scheduled, but arrangements will be made to prepare an additional facilitator.

II. CEQA Process

Rob Alcott summarized how CEQA will be addressed during the MokeWISE process. He explained that the product of the MokeWISE program will be a non-binding document not subject to CEQA and therefore no CEQA document will be prepared as part of the ongoing MokeWISE process. Any CEQA required to implement the MCG endorsed outcomes will be summarized in the MokeWISE implementation plan; any CEQA discussion will merely look ahead to see what each alternative portfolio might require during a CEQA process.

The Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) has produced a CEQA memorandum which explains how MokeWISE will address CEQA. This memorandum will be posted to the website. Any questions about CEQA should be directed by email to Rob Alcott who in turn will direct them to UMRWA Counsel.

III. MCG Protocols and Charter

Both the Charter and the Protocols documents were finalized by the MCG. The Protocols document had minor edits, which will be made, and sent out the MCG. If no further edits are proposed, the document is assumed approved on November 8, 2013.

IV. Draft Outcomes and Measures TM

Based on comments during MCG Meeting #2, the 'Attributing Stakeholder' column will remain in the document.

There was some discussion about additional comments on the document; these will be provided in redline to RMC by November 13th. RMC will address these comments and send out a redlined copy to the MCG by November 14th. If no

further comments are received by November 22nd, the redlined copy will be assumed to be approved on November 22nd.

V. Draft Public Outreach Plan

RMC introduced the Public Outreach Plan, explaining that the purpose is to guide outreach efforts to public and details six levels of stakeholders.

Facilitator suggested that the public not be allowed to listen in on the phone line; by consensus, it was agreed that the public will not be allowed to listen in on the phone line. The public may still attend MCG meetings in-person.

Proposed public outreach meeting locations were presented and additional suggestions were solicited; these included adding West Point, Railroad Flat, Lake Camanche Village, and Valley Springs and removing Pardee.

It was suggested that outreach be conducted at meetings which are already scheduled. Concern was expressed that selectively choosing meetings may be perceived as favoritism. It was suggested that the PowerPoint's made for the five MokeWISE public meetings be made available to the MCG members so they may present these at other meetings.

There was discussion regarding the underrepresentation of DACs within the Tier 2 stakeholder list. It was decided that cities generally viewed as DAC communities who are not represented on the MCG be directly solicited to be added as Tier 2 stakeholders; this includes the Cities of Plymouth and Jackson.

There was a general desire to create a document which would eventually replace the MokeWISE program backgrounder on the public portion of the website. This document will outline what MokeWISE is, what has been done, what the next steps are, and how individuals may get involved. An Outreach Workgroup was formed and includes representatives from East Bay MUD, Foothill Conservancy, UMRWA, and San Joaquin County.

VI. Hydrologic Modeling

RMC presented on the purpose and use of hydrologic modeling in the MokeWISE process. It was explained that the program will explore a wide range of supply alternatives and that each alternative requires a unique methodology for determining how much of that supply is available. The methodology used for evaluating Mokelumne River supply will incorporate the use of the MOCASIM model. Any questions about MOCASIM should be directed to Brandon Nakagawa. It was suggested that American River, Calaveras River, and Stanislaus River water be added as additional supply alternatives for consideration.

RMC will prepare a list of peer-reviewers available for reviewing the methodology and present this list to the MCG. The MCG will consider this list and recommend two peer-reviewers.

A 'Model-Head' Workgroup was formed and includes representatives from the California Sport Fishing Protection Alliance, Amador Water Agency, Calaveras Public Utility District, the City of Stockton, and San Joaquin County/Groundwater Basin Authority. This Workgroup will conduct preliminary consideration of MOCASIM modeling logic and inputs. They will meet three times between now and January, with follow-ups in spring 2014 and summer 2014.

VII. Housekeeping Items and Next Steps

Calaveras County will provide the breakfast snacks for the next meeting. RMC will prepare a sign-up sheet so organizations can sign-up for bringing breakfast snacks at future meetings.

Moving forward, all documents will have page numbers in the footers and document titles in the headers.

The public comment period will be moved to the 16-minute period before lunch.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #4 Summary

December 13, 2013

Organizations represented

Amador County	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Amador Water Agency	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras County Water District	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County, Public Works
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
City of Lodi, Public Works	Stockton East Water District
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Trout Unlimited
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Foothill Conservancy	

Key Decisions

- MCG membership: consideration for inclusion into the MCG will be extended until February, 2014.
 - Draft Portfolio and Assessment Criteria: projects will initially be screened by determining if they are feasible, beneficial, attainable, and compatible. At that point, they will be assessed against the objectives to determine if an objective is met. At that point, project groupings will be determined.
-

Action Items

- All MCG members: review Public Outreach Plan, return comments to Katie Cole by Friday December 20, 2013.
 - Rob Alcott: reach out to Native American communities letting them know about the January public outreach meeting.
-

- RMC: make edits to objective attribution table and send to MCG.
 - All MCG members: send further attributions to RMC.
 - All MCG members: send RMC additional names for peer reviewers by December 25th, 2013.
 - RMC: include CVs of all proposed peer reviewers in January meeting material packet.
-

Summary

I. November Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #3 (November 2013) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the Model-Heads Work Group and briefly summarized the last meeting which occurred on November 25th, 2013. Subsequent meetings will be held on December 20th, 2013 and January 13th, 2014.

Because no other comments were received on the Outcomes and Measures TM, it was approved on November 22nd, 2013 and posted to the public portion of the website.

Two additions/changes to the MCG membership list were proposed. Restore the Delta and the San Joaquin Farm Bureau were requesting membership. Because the cut-off date for new additions was November, 2013, there was some discussion about extending the cut-off date. It was decided that the cut-off date for inclusion into the MCG would be extended until after the first Public Outreach meeting (extended until February, 2014). Rainwater and Associates, LLC will re-notify organizations that have declined previously to alert them to this change.

II. Draft Public Outreach Plan

There were several minor edits to the document. These edits will be incorporated into the document and included in the packet for the January meeting. All other edits are due to RMC by December 20th, 2013. A call for approval will occur at the January meeting.

It was suggested that there be an addendum to the Plan in the future which will account for which organizations, communities, and individuals have participated in the outreach process. This would serve to track both who has participated and the level of participation.

Native American communities have been targeted for specific outreach by the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA). It was suggested that UMRWA circle back with these communities and alert them to the date of the initial public outreach meeting.

III. Environmental Conditions Overview

RMC provided an overview of the document, detailing both the current geomorphic and fishery conditions on the river, as well as opportunities and challenges for both of these areas.

A number of comments and edits were presented, which RMC will attempt to capture in the subsequent draft of the document. Written comments are due to RMC by Friday, December 20th, 2013.

IV. Draft Project and Portfolio Assessment Criteria TM

RMC explained both the process of creating the assessment criteria and the purpose of the assessment. It was proposed that through a poll, each category and objective be weighted so projects and portfolios could be scored. There was some unease about this ranking/scoring approach.

An advocacy approach was proposed, where scoring would occur once projects were suggested. After some discussion, it was decided that each proposed project will go through a 2-step screening process. The first step is to determine if each individual project is feasible, beneficial, attainable, and compatible. If a project makes it through the first pass, it will then be measured against each of the objectives to assess whether or not the project meets the objective. If all projects have been assessed, it should then be determined if some objectives are not met with the remaining projects. After this process, project groupings will be discussed.

It was noted that agricultural interests are not well represented in the current Program Outcomes and Measures. After some discussion, it was decided that an Agricultural Benefits category be added to the Program Outcomes and Measures, with new objectives. RMC will prepare this new document and send it to the MCG, where MCG members may further attribute their organizations to other objectives.

V. Preliminary Water Availability Approach

RMC explained the proposed process of determining available water for each of the proposed water sources, including groundwater, recycled water, and conservation.

Four peer-reviewers were suggested by RMC to review the water availability approach which will be determined by the MCG. CVs of each of these individuals will be included in the packet for the January meeting. Additional names may be provided to RMC by the MCG until December 25th, 2013 so that RMC may have time to solicit CVs.

VI. Logistics: Lunches and Snacks for Future Meetings

A list of all future meetings was passed around so each organization can sign up to provide breakfast snacks. This list will be posted on the website.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #5 Summary

January 10, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras County	Restore the Delta
Calaveras County Water District	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County, Public Works
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
City of Lodi, Public Works	Stockton East Water District
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Trout Unlimited
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Foothill Conservancy	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
MyValleySprings.com	

Key Decisions

- MCG membership: consideration for inclusion into the MCG will be extended until February, 2014.
 - Public Outreach Plan: considered approved, pending three edits.
 - Draft Portfolio and Assessment Criteria: projects will initially be screened by determining if they are feasible, beneficial, attainable, and compatible. They will then be assessed against the MCG-approved objectives to determine if an objective is met. At that point, project groupings will be determined.
-

Action Items

- RMC: incorporate edits to Public Outreach Plan and post to public portion of the website.
 - RMC: solidify date and meeting location for the first Public Outreach meeting and send details to MCG.
 - All MCG members: submit remaining comments on Environmental Conditions TM to RMC by January 17, 2014.
 - RMC: update Project and Portfolio Assessment Criteria TM to incorporate suggestions.
 - RMC: create and send out worksheet for initial brainstorming of concepts to MCG.
 - All MCG members: fill out worksheet and return to RMC by January 31, 2014.
 - All MCG members: send comments on the draft Methodology TM to RMC by January 17, 2014.
 - RMC: Coordinate with Bob Center for resume and send out to MCG.
 - Brandon Nakagawa: compile materials for presentation at February meeting.
-

Summary

I. December Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #4 (December 2013) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the Modeling Work Group and briefly summarized the last meeting which occurred on December 20th, 2013. A subsequent meeting will be held on January 13th, 2014.

II. Draft Public Outreach Plan

RMC highlighted the edits that were made to the Plan, specifically the edits made to the DAC Outreach Table. There were several other edits suggested including:

- Adding a footnote to the Outreach Activities Table indicating that the MCG is not necessarily responsible for performing the activities, but may initiate them if they desire.
- Removing the City of Lathrop and City of Manteca as Tier 2 Stakeholder representatives in the DAC Outreach Table.
- Updating a column header in the Appendices.

The Public Outreach Plan was considered approved, pending the three above-mentioned changes.

The first Public Outreach meeting will be held either February 4th, 5th, or 12th, with a preference for the first week. The meeting will run from 7-9 pm to allow for the general working public to attend. It was decided that the meeting should be held in the up-country as there may be more attendance than if the meeting is held in the Valley. Location suggestions were solicited and RMC will reach out to those locations to check availability for the suggested dates and to reserve space for the meeting. RMC will draft a press release and send it out to allow the MCG to distribute it to their networks.

III. Environmental Conditions Overview Update

RMC provided an update on the progress of the document, indicating that edits had been passed onto Balance Hydrologics and Chuck Hanson, but that the deadline for further comments is January 17th. The revised document will be ready for review in February, with MCG approval in February or March. The document will be expanded to include analysis of the portfolios in late spring or early summer.

IV. Revised Project and Portfolio Assessment Criteria TM

RMC provided an overview of how the screening was incorporated and how each of the screens were defined. There was some concern that the feasibility screen definition was too limited and should be expanded to include more than just technical feasibility. After some discussion, it was decided that the definition will remain, but with an understanding that the process will be iterative and that the purpose of this screen is to remove the really bad ideas.

It was suggested that the compatibility screen be expanded to not only include compatibility of other MCG members, but to also be sensitive to those outside the MCG. After some discussion, it was decided that RMC would re-word the definition to better capture the purpose of the screen. There were additional edits suggested, which RMC will incorporate into the document.

To begin brainstorming concepts, RMC will create and send out a worksheet for MCG members to fill out. The worksheet is due back to RMC by January 31st to allow for compilation prior to the February meeting.

V. Draft Water Availability Analysis Methodology

RMC provided an overview of the process and the methodology drafted for each of the supply types. There was extensive discussion about the methodology for each supply type with a number of suggested edits. These edits will be incorporated and a revised methodology presented at a subsequent meeting.

One additional peer-review candidate, Bob Center, was proposed, which precipitated the need for a revised schedule. There was a general consensus that diversity and breadth of experience among the two peer-reviewers is important. It was determined that Karen Johnson will be included as one of the peer-reviewers and that the second peer-reviewer will be determined at the February meeting and will either be Steve Macaulay or Bob Center. RMC will collect Mr. Center's resume and send it out the MCG.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #6 Summary

February 14, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador County	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Amador Water Agency	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras County Water District	Pacific Gas & Electric
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
City of Lodi, Public Works	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
City of Stockton	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
East Bay Municipal Utility District	
Foothill Conservancy	

Key Decisions

- Public Outreach Plan: was approved by the MCG.
 - Project Assessment TM: was approved by the MCG.
 - Peer-reviewers: Karen Johnson and Steve Macaulay were selected.
-

Action Items

- MCG: continue to submit project concepts to RMC; deadline is February 28, 2014.
 - RMC: post press release, Public Outreach Plan, and Project Assessment TM to public portion of the website.
 - RMC: post San Joaquin County's presentation to the protected portion of the website.
 - MCG: submit redlines of Environmental Conditions Overview TM to RMC by February 28, 2014.
 - RMC: make change to attribution table in Project Assessment TM.
-

- RMC: update diversion table with JVID numbers.
 - MCG: submit redlines of Mokelumne Methodology to RMC by January 28th, 2014.
 - RMC: send out the concept list to the MCG, along with a table indicating which objectives are met by the projects.
 - RMC: distribute copy of Feb. 19 public workshop presentation to MCG organizations for potential use in briefing their members on MokeWISE progress.
-

Summary

I. January Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #5 (January 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the concept brainstorming and encouraged MCG members to continue submitting concepts for future consideration.

II. Final Public Outreach Plan

There were no further comments on the Public Outreach Plan. It was approved by consensus and will be posted to the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the first Public Outreach Meeting to be held on February 19th, 2014 from 7-9pm at Amador County Board of Supervisors Boardroom at 810 Court Street in Jackson, CA. A press release was drafted and distributed to four major papers in the region. A flyer was also drafted and posted to the website; it was suggested that the press release also be posted to the website.

III. Environmental Conditions Overview Update

RMC provided an update on the progress of the document, indicating that Balance Hydrologics and Chuck Hanson had edited the document per the comments received by the MCG. The MCG indicated a need for more time to review the document; the deadline for further comments is February 28th, 2014. The revised document will be ready for MCG approval in March. The document will be expanded to include analysis of the portfolios in late spring or early summer.

IV. Revised Project Assessment TM

There were no further comments on the revised Project Assessment TM. It was approved by consensus and will be posted to the public portion of the website. It was suggested that, under the recreation category, salmon, trout, and steelhead should be included together anytime fish are mentioned. RMC will make this addition.

RMC will send out the concept list to the MCG, along with a table indicating which objectives are met by the projects on the concept list. RMC will also re-send the

brainstorming template to allow MCG organizations to continue submitting concepts; the deadline for concept submittal is February 28th, 2104.

V. San Joaquin County Update

Brandon Nakagawa provided an overview of the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Authority (GBA), highlighting groundwater projects and programs implemented and currently being considered by the GBA. Stormwater and low-impact development (LID) practices were also presented. These presentations will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

Any MCG member organization is invited to present to the MCG on current organization activities. The City of Lodi has signed up to present during the March meeting; Foothill Conservancy also expressed interest in presenting at a future meeting.

VI. Revised Draft Water Availability Methodology

RMC provided an update on the Non-Mokelumne Methodology, indicating that all comments received were incorporated. There were no further comments and the Non-Mokelumne Methodology was approved by consensus.

RMC presented the Mokelumne Methodology, explaining the work of the Modeling Workgroup and outlining the tasks within the methodology. There was some question about the 2040 CCWD diversion number, specifically that there may be some projects moving forward which would increase that number. CCWD will verify this number internally and report back to the MCG and RMC. JVID diversion numbers have been unintentionally omitted from the presented table; RMC will add them back in.

There was discussion regarding the necessity of Task 2, indicating that a daily time-step in the lower river isn't necessary because it is so heavily regulated. It was also suggested that daily flows in the lower river may be of use when considering flood flows, as there are a number of tributaries which flow into the Mokelumne downstream of Camanche. Foothill Conservancy indicated that PG&E has a document which details roughly 60 years of historical record and may be of use to the Modeling Workgroup. It was decided that Task 2 will remain as it is currently written and that review of the historical record is necessary to determine which periods require a more directed focus.

It is anticipated that the MCG will approve the Mokelumne Methodology at the March meeting. Once the Mokelumne Methodology is approved, it will be combined with the Non-Mokelumne Methodology into one document which will be distributed to the peer-reviewers. After some discussion, Karen Johnson and Steve Macaulay were chosen as peer-reviewers.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #7 Summary

March 14, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador County	Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Banking Authority
Amador Water Agency	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Calaveras County	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District (NSJWCD)
Calaveras County Water District	Restore the Delta
Calaveras Planning Coalition	Pacific Gas & Electric
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
City of Lodi, Public Works	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
City of Stockton	Stockton Municipal Utilities
Delta Fly Fishers	Woodbridge Irrigation District (WID)
East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)	
Foothill Conservancy	

Key Decisions

- The Rate Payer Protection Alliance group will be encouraged to join the MokeWISE process as an interested party.
 - Environmental Conditions Overview TM: considered approved.
 - The April meeting will be located in the upcountry at Pardee; a second upcountry meeting will be scheduled in 2015.
 - A subgroup of MCG members agreed to serve on a newly-formed workgroup to collaborate with RMC to further develop and refine the preliminary project concepts list.
-

Action Items

- RMC/Rainwater and Associates, LLC: will contact the Rate Payer Protection Alliance and explain why the MCG thinks they are better suited to be an Interested Party rather than an MCG member.
- Environmental Conditions Overview TM: will be posted to the website.
- RMC: The City of Lodi presentation materials will be posted to the protected portion of the website.
- RMC: will incorporate new wording to Revised Draft Water Availability Methodology document and will solicit feedback/approval via email.
- April presentations: EBMUD (topic: lower Mokelumne fisheries), WID, City of Stockton, and San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District, and Foothill Conservancy. Other agencies/groups volunteered for subsequent months.
- The newly-formed preliminary project concepts workgroup will meet twice before the May MCG meeting.

Summary

I. February Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #6 (February 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC presented an overview of the initial public meeting held on February 19 in Jackson, CA and a discussion on philosophical aspects of the MokeWISE public participation process ensued. There was also a discussion on whether the Rate Payer Protection Alliance's interest in becoming a member of the MCG. This group requested to join the MCG during the public meeting. The MCG decided to encourage the Rate Payer Protection Alliance to join as an "Interested Party."

II. Environmental Conditions Overview Update

RMC provided a brief update on incorporation of comments in the Environmental Conditions Overview TM dated March 7, 2014. The MCG approved the document which will be posted to the MokeWISE website.

III. City of Lodi Update

Larry Parlin provided an overview of the City of Lodi's water resources management efforts and challenges. The presentation included a description of the water system and infrastructure, surface water treatment plant, historical water data, groundwater data and trends, wastewater treatment and recycling, and storm water systems. The presentation materials will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

MCG member organizations were solicited to present various components of

their organization's activities during future MCG meetings. The following assignments were made:

April: EBMUD (topic: lower Mokelumne fisheries), WID, City of Stockton, Foothill Conservancy, and San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District (overview of agency plus key initiatives)

May: EBMUD (upstream infrastructure), possibly also Calaveras Planning Coalition

June: Amador Water Agency, possibly also Calaveras Planning Coalition

July/Aug - NSJWCD

August: Jackson Valley (tentative, depending on staffing availability)

August/September: EBMUD (conservation program)

At the April MCG meeting, topics and dates for future MCG member presentations will be further developed and solidified.

IV. Revised Draft Water Availability Methodology

RMC led a discussion of remaining issues on the Revised Draft Water Availability Methodology document. The document is not yet ready for peer review due to concerns about wording in the bullets under "Task 4" on Page 5, specifically the words "deductible" and environmental "co-insurance" (file name on internal website: WA Analysis Moke Draft TM_7Mar14.doc).

Although the wording of these bullets were specifically included to address potential modeling flow scenarios, two MCG members raised concerns that the current wording does not clearly delineate that such tools are not regulatory or an implicit challenge to current water rights and associated regulations. RMC will add proposed qualifying language to clarify that the modeling option is not such a challenge. RMC will revise the language above the bullets on Page 5 of document, to address these concerns.

The group agreed that if the proposed RMC revisions are acceptable, or can be further developed to a version that is acceptable, the MCG may approve the revised document via email to expedite the submission of the document to the peer reviewers. It is understood that all peer reviewer comments will be submitted to the MCG for consideration and further changes to the document will only be made with approval of the MCG.

V. Preliminary Project Concepts

RMC presented a brief overview of the project concepts development to date. MCG members were then asked to break into four small groups for discussions. Each group was tasked to consider the 60 project concepts using the following four questions as guidance:

- Which, if any, concepts are unclear?

- Where is additional information either necessary or useful?
- Are there opportunities to combine or integrate projects?
- Are there additional projects or types of projects that should be added?

It was understood that this exercise was only part of an iterative process that will further develop, refine, and integrate the initial list of projects. It was also understood that each group would not have sufficient time to address all 60 project concepts. After the small group breakouts, each group reported on their progress to the full MCG. The RMC team took detailed notes regarding specific suggestions for project integration, data gaps, categorization, and refinement and will revise the list accordingly and submit to the MCG for further review and development.

In addition to this effort at the MCG meeting, the MokeWISE planning team suggested developing a workgroup to collaborate with RMC to further develop and hone the concepts list. It was understood that whatever development happened in the workgroup would be submitted to the full MCG for further discussion and refinement. The MCG approved of this process and the following MCG members agreed to serve on the workgroup: John Brodie, Ron Forbes, Tom Infusino, Gene Mancebo, Brandon Nakagawa, Jerry Neuburger, Chris Shutes, and Richard Sykes (or Tom Francis). The workgroup will meet twice before the May MCG meeting. Outcomes of the workgroup will be presented to the larger MCG for consideration during the May MCG meeting.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #8 Summary

April 11, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador County	Foothill Conservancy
Amador Water Agency	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Calaveras County	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County Water District	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
City of Lodi, Public Works	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
City of Stockton	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
East Bay Municipal Utility District	
Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority	

Key Decisions

- Task 4: Language which was previously included as Task 4 in the Mokelumne River methodology has been removed from the methodology, with the understanding that the language will be retained and included at another point in the process.
-

Action Items

- RMC: Draft language clarifying that the table included in the 'Other Surface Water' section of the Water Availability Methodology is illustrative of the type of transfer opportunities involved.
 - RMC: Coordinate with the GBA to draft language for the 'Groundwater' section of the Water Availability Methodology.
-

- RMC: Coordinate with CCWD to draft language addressing groundwater in Calaveras County for the 'Groundwater' section of the Water Availability Methodology.
 - MCG: Submit comments on the Revised Water Availability Methodology to RMC by April 18th, 2014.
-

Summary

I. March Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #7 (March 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the Concept Focus Group, stating that the group has been consolidating and integrating the concepts. The next Concept Focus Group meeting is April 15, 2014.

The second public meeting was scheduled for July 10th at the San Joaquin Farm Bureau from 7-9pm. Based on feedback from the last public meeting, the MCG adopted the use of a tagline. Students from Argonaut High School in Amador County submitted taglines; the MCG ultimately chose one, with a slight modification: "It's your watershed, your future – your voice matters!"

II. City of Stockton Presentation

The City of Stockton provided an overview of work done by the City, including the Delta Water Supply Project and conservation efforts. Future projects, including a coordinated approach to recycled water, were also discussed. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

III. East Bay Municipal Utility District and Woodbridge Irrigation District Presentation

East Bay Municipal Utility District and Woodbridge Irrigation District provided an overview of lower Mokelumne fisheries, highlighting recent fisheries projects that the two Districts have implemented. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

IV. Draft Water Availability Methodology

RMC proposed several changes to the Water Availability Methodology, including the definitions of 'available water' and 'unallocated water.' It was proposed that unallocated water be used to describe Mokelumne River water, while available water would be used to describe all other sources. There was some concern that the proposed definition of unallocated water did not account for water rights reservations. It was explained that the Water Availability Analysis exercise is not intended to assign or diminish any rights to the water, but merely to quantify the water that is in the river. After some discussion, it was decided that the definition

of unallocated water be amended to specifically include pre-1914 water rights. No changes were made to the proposed definition of available water.

As a result of much offline work with various stakeholders, it was proposed that the Task 4 language under the Mokelumne River supply be removed from the Methodology and included at another point in the process. While the MCG approved the removal of the Task, the language contained therein has not yet been approved.

RMC then reviewed the comments submitted by peer-reviewers Steve Macaulay and Karen Johnson. Several suggestions were made, which were noted by RMC and will be incorporated into the Methodology.

It was suggested that the Modeling Workgroup be reconvened to review the modeling results. This meeting will be scheduled once the modeling has been done and results are available.

V. Foothill Conservancy Presentation

Foothill Conservancy provided an overview of their work, highlighting the Mokelumne Environmental Benefits Project, the Amador Calaveras Consensus Group, and the State Wild and Scenic River campaign. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

VI. San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District Presentation

The San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District provided an overview of their work, highlighting the Mokelumne River Watershed Owner's Manual, Lower Mokelumne River Partnership Fund, and education programs. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #9 Summary

May 9, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	Pacific Gas & Electric
Calaveras Public Utility District	Restore the Delta
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin County
City of Lodi, Public Works	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Foothill Conservancy	
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	

Key Decisions

- Draft Water Availability Methodology: was approved by the MCG and will be posted to the website.
 - Tier 2 Stakeholders: will be emailed the approved Methodology and given two weeks to provide comment.
-

Action Items

- RMC: edit the preliminary concept assessment based on MCG discussion.
-

Summary

I. April Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #8 (April 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

The MCG was made aware of a new participant for the City of Lodi.

The MCG was made aware of a response email from the Ratepayers Protection Alliance.

RMC provided an update on the July public meeting, stating that it will be held at the San Joaquin Farm Bureau from 7-9pm on July 10th.

RMC provided an update on the Concept Focus Group, stating that the group has met with the purpose of consolidating and integrating the concepts. The consolidated list of concepts will be presented and discussed at this meeting.

II. Draft Water Availability Methodology

There was brief discussion on the methodology, including one small edit. It was suggested that unappropriated Delta water be considered in the Other Surface Water category.

The Methodology was approved by the MCG pending the above changes and will be posted to the public portion of the website. The document will also be emailed to Tier 2 stakeholders and they will be given 2 weeks to comment. Any substantive comments received will be presented to the MCG at the June meeting.

III. East Bay Municipal Utility District Presentation

East Bay Municipal Utility District provided an overview of their facilities and operations, highlighting Camanche and Pardee Reservoirs, Freeport, and the Mokelumne Aqueducts. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

IV. Preliminary Concept Review Assessment

There was discussion regarding the Wild and Scenic River legislation (SB1199) currently proposed. It was decided that an MCG assessment of the Wild and Scenic River concept be tabled until the June meeting. The MCG was advised the existing bill language was expected to be revised within the next two weeks. An update on the legislation and the MCG's assessment of the Wild and Scenic concept will be taken up at the June meeting.

RMC presented an overview of how the preliminary concept assessment process fits into the larger MokeWISE program. RMC then explained to the MCG how the assessment process was structured, as well as reminded the MCG of the four

assessment criteria. There was some concern that a concept could only be placed in one of 3 “bins;” a “maybe” bin was added.

An MCG member suggested a new word format for the presentation of the concepts; the concepts will now be presented in both the table and word format.

The MCG discussed the preliminary assessment of each of the concepts and made changes. These changes were noted by RMC and will be incorporated and presented at the June meeting.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #10 Summary

June 13, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	Foothill Conservancy
Calaveras County	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Calaveras County Water District	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
City of Lodi, Public Works	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Stockton East Water District
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority	

Key Decisions

- *None*
-

Action Items

- **MCG**: Each MCG member will send July public meeting posting flier (previously sent via email) to their constituents and informal networks.
- **RMC**: RMC will develop a draft preliminary portfolio development approach that integrates MCG feedback; the conclusions of this integration will be presented at the next MCG meeting.
- **Revised Concept Action Items**: A variety of action items were assigned during the concept review discussion. Persons responsible and their tasks are listed in Section III below and sorted by concept number.

Summary

I. May Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #9 (May 2014) summary was approved and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

July public meeting posting flier has been emailed to MCG members.

Water Availability Analysis was sent to Tier 2 Stakeholders; no comments were received.

Wild and Scenic update: regarding potential implications of this pending legislation on the MokeWISE process, RMC reported that they will be writing a letter to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to inform them that the MokeWISE process will continue to move forward per the contract; if and when SB1199 is signed into law, the planning team may seek additional consultation from DWR on potential impacts to the MokeWISE process

II. Amador Water Agency (AWA) Presentation

The AWA provided an overview of the genesis of the agency, drinking water and wastewater systems/infrastructure, customer base, challenges, drought impacts, water reuse, recycling, and conservation efforts. Current and future projects, including a gravity supply project being conducted in conjunction with the USDA, were also discussed. This presentation will be posted to the password protected section of the website.

III. Revised Concept Review and Assessment

RMC led a discussion of the revised concept review. The discussion included reviewing the screening criteria, revisiting the process (including emphasizing that just because a concept gets a “yes” doesn’t mean it will get into a portfolio), and reviewing the list concept by concept to solicit additional feedback from the MCG. A number of action items resulted from the discussions:

Concept 1B: RMC, Rob Alcott, and Pete Bell will have an off-line discussion to better articulate step-wise tasks.

Concept 1D: Chris Shutes and Richard Sykes will contemplate language off-line and bring suggestions back to the group.

Concept 2B: Richard Sykes will contact Constellation Winery and Woodbridge Irrigation District to see if there is interest in potentially co-sponsoring the project.

Concept 5A: Calaveras County Water District doesn’t want to be a sponsor; Pete Bell and (Central Sierra) Larry Diamond (Calaveras County) will conduct

outreach to possible sponsors in the areas listed.

Concept 8F: Alyson Watson will attempt to rework language on this concept and will circulate to Larry Diamond, Tom Infusino, Rob Alcott, and Brandon Nakagawa for approval.

IV. Preliminary Portfolio Development Approach

RMC presented an overview of the preliminary portfolio development options. RMC reiterated that the purpose of portfolio development is to create portfolios of broadly-supported projects that meet MCG-developed objectives. The MCG discussed various approaches and provided feedback on the options presented. RMC will develop a draft preliminary portfolio development approach that integrates MCG feedback; the conclusions of this integration will be presented at the next MCG meeting.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #11 Summary

July 11, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	Foothill Conservancy
Calaveras County	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Calaveras County Water District	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras Planning Coalition	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
City of Lodi, Public Works	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Stockton East Water District
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority	

Key Decisions

- **Project Groupings:** there will be five (5) project groupings, including regional benefits, upcountry benefits, valley benefits, MCG member priorities, and objectives. A sixth grouping will include all of the policies and initiatives identified to date.
-

Action Items

- **AWA:** draft language for a new concept that helps with identifying erosion areas within the watershed.
 - **RMC:** send out two polls to MCG member organizations.
 - **RMC:** draft project groupings and present to MCG in August.
 - **RMC:** draft a template for presentation of project concepts.
-

Summary

I. June Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #10 (June 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the July public meeting, stating that it was held on July 10th and a new member was added to the Interested Parties list.

RMC provided an update on Wild and Scenic, indicating that a letter was sent to DWR. DWR acknowledged receipt, but did not indicate that there would be a response.

The MCG was made aware that a second meeting must be held upcountry. It was decided that pending availability, the January meeting would be held at Pardee.

II. Calaveras Planning Coalition Presentation

The Calaveras Planning Coalition provided an overview of the organization, including their purpose and goal, how the Coalition was developed, and what the Coalition hopes the MokeWISE process will yield. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

III. Revised Concept Review and Assessment

RMC reviewed each of the concepts to which there were edits. Concepts discussed include 1b, 2c, 4a, 4b, 4c, 7b, 7c, 7d, 8d, 9a, 9e, and 9f. MCG members suggested further edits, which were incorporated into the PowerPoint. CSPA indicated that Trout Unlimited, while no longer an MCG member, has offered to sponsor concept 1d regarding fish screens. Calaveras County removed their sponsorship from concept 6b regarding Mokelumne Hill stormwater. Because Calaveras County submitted that concept and has removed their sponsorship, the concept has been removed from the concept list.

It was noted that there was a lack of erosion control projects, specifically, that none of the projects focused on identifying erosion-prone areas within the watershed. AWA volunteered to work to draft a concept that would address this issue.

Next steps include discussing potential concept grouping and integration approaches. Concept integration will begin in late summer. Revision and further integration of concepts will occur in early fall after results from the Water Availability Analysis are released.

IV. Portfolio Development Approach and Preliminary Project Groupings

RMC presented the proposed process by which project groupings would both be developed and help inform the final portfolio. RMC reiterated the desire of the MCG to both maintain flexibility for funding and the need to adhere to the

MokeyWise scope, schedule, and budget. RMC proposed that the Concept List be used to develop project groupings, but that the Concept List be maintained for reference once the MokeyWise program is completed. It was explained that the purpose of the project groupings is to identify concepts which can be grouped together to allow for analysis.

MCG members expressed concern about how the Water Availability Analysis results would fit into the process. It was explained that the Water Availability Analysis and concept development are running in parallel and that the results of the Analysis would be included at a later stage in the concept development process. It was noted that some of the concepts may not require the results of the Water Availability Analysis; these concepts may be further developed prior to the results of the Analysis. It was clarified that draft portfolios would be developed after integration of the Water Availability Analysis results and that the MCG would be able to provide input on these portfolios prior to selecting a preferred portfolio.

RMC then proposed three potential project groupings, including implementation status, ease of implementation, and objectives. A number of MCG members expressed concern about these project groupings. After discussion, the MCG decided to form five different project groupings. These include:

- 1) *Regional Benefits*- concepts that have a regional benefit;
- 2) *Upcountry Benefits*- concepts that only have upcountry benefits;
- 3) *Valley Benefits* – concepts that only have valley benefits;
- 4) *MCG Member Priorities* – concepts that MCG member organizations have identified as important to their organization;
- 5) *Objectives* – concepts which best meet the most MokeyWise objectives.

It was also determined that there would be a sixth project grouping that would encompass all the concepts listed in the Policies and Initiatives category. Because the nature of this sixth grouping is different than the other groupings, it was decided that this grouping would move in parallel with the other groupings at a different level of analysis. RMC will propose concepts under each of these project groupings and present them to the MCG at the August meeting. After some discussion, it was decided that the Optimization of Calaveras Reservation concept would be moved out of Policies and Initiatives and into the Surface Water category to allow it to be analyzed at a level consistent with similar concepts.

After some discussion, it was decided that RMC will send out two polls to the MCG. It was explained that these polls are not a vote, but instead provide a 'pulse check' of the MCG to gain a better understanding of how MCG organizations are currently feeling about the concepts.

- 1) The first poll will help determine the MCG Member Priorities project grouping. It will ask MCG member organizations to identify, of the concepts submitted by that organization, which two (2) are their favorite.
- 2) The second poll will help the MCG see which concepts are currently most popular among all MCG member organizations. It will ask MCG member organizations to identify, of the concepts they did not submit, which five (5) they are most interested in pursuing for analysis.

Because the sixth project grouping consists of all concepts in the Policies and Initiatives category, it was decided that these concepts would not be included in the polls.

To allow for better presentation of the concepts, RMC will draft a concept template which will include information about funding, sponsorship, and if the concept requires results from the Water Availability Analysis.

V. Wrap-Up and Action Items

The Modeling Workgoup will be re-convened to discuss modeling results. The logistics of re-convening the group will be discussed at the next meeting.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #12 Summary

August 8, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	Lodi, City of
Calaveras County	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County Water District	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Trout Unlimited
Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin Authority	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Foothill Conservancy	
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	

Key Decisions

- Project Groupings: there will be five (5) project groupings, including regional benefits, upcountry benefits, valley benefits, MCG member priorities, and objectives. A sixth grouping will include all of the policies and initiatives identified to date.
-

Action Items

- RMC: send out new poll MCG members.
 - RMC: change concepts 1a and 7b to Regional Benefits Project Grouping.
 - RMC: add WID as co-sponsor to concepts 4c and 4d.
 - RMC: set up Policies and Initiatives Workgroup.
 - RMC: draft new language for concept 3a, renamed Desalination Study.
 - RMC: send out emails asking for additional concept co-sponsors.
-

Summary

I. July Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #11 (July 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

A new representative from Trout Unlimited was introduced to the MCG.

RMC updated the MCG on the status of communications with Ken Berry, a member of the Ratepayers Protection Alliance (RPA), including that a formal records request was submitted by Mr. Berry. In response to his request, a CD containing all documents provided to the MCG up to this point was sent to Mr. Berry.

RMC provided an update on Wild and Scenic, indicating that the legislation is currently in suspense due to the bill sponsor becoming injured while on vacation.

The MCG was made aware that the facilities at Pardee Reservoir have been reserved for the January meeting.

II. North San Joaquin Water Conservation District Presentation

North San Joaquin Water Conservation District provided an overview of the District, including a brief history of the District, the District's infrastructure, and projects being implemented by the District. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

III. Jackson Valley Irrigation District Presentation

Jackson Valley Irrigation District provided an overview of the District, including a brief history of the District, the District's infrastructure, and projects being implemented by the District. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

IV. Polling Results

RMC reviewed the polling request, specifically what each poll asked.

- 1) The first poll was intended to help determine the MCG Member Priorities project grouping. It asked MCG member organizations to identify, of the concepts submitted by that organization, which two (2) are their favorites.
- 2) The second poll was intended to help the MCG understand which concepts are currently most popular among all MCG member organizations. It asked MCG member organizations to identify, of the concepts they did not submit, which five (5) they are most interested in pursuing for analysis.

RMC explained that the polls were intended as “pulse checks” and results do not mean that any projects would be removed from the list or removed from the analysis phase. RMC explained the process by which the results for Poll 1 were completed. This included finding entities’ original concept submissions and tracking their evolution over the course of the MokeWISE process. Because some concepts were rolled into others and modified, there was some confusion regarding the accuracy of the results. Because of this confusion, it was decided that entities would not be attributed to their poll responses and Poll 1 would be removed from consideration as a Project Grouping for Analysis.

There was general interest in the results of the Poll 2, which lead to a discussion of facilitating a new poll. This is discussed further in the following section.

V. Preliminary Project Groupings

RMC presented the preliminary Project Groupings for Analysis. These included:

- 1) *Regional Benefits*- concepts that have a regional benefit;
- 2) *Upcountry Benefits*- concepts that only have upcountry benefits;
- 3) *Valley Benefits* – concepts that only have valley benefits;
- 4) *MCG Member Priorities* – concepts that MCG member organizations have identified as important to their organization;
- 5) *Objectives* – concepts which best meet the most MokeWISE objectives.

After RMC presented the geographic groupings, there was discussion about the merits of these groupings. It was suggested that project benefits be determined based on where the hardware is located instead of where potential benefits may be seen. A 20-minute caucus was called. After further discussion, the MCG decided that projects 1a and 7b be changed to the Regional Benefits Project Grouping. Pending these two changes, the MCG approved the geographic project groupings, Project Groupings 1 through 3.

Some concern was expressed about how project groupings would be analyzed, particularly where groupings included projects that were very conceptual in nature. After some discussion, two new project groupings were suggested in addition to the three geographic groupings. The fourth project grouping would include projects which required a low level of analysis and the fifth would include projects which required a high level of analysis. Those that require a low level analysis are expected to be the largely conceptual concepts and those concepts that will not alter demands and therefore will not require modeling. Those that require a high level of analysis are expected to include concepts that will alter demands and / or streamflows and will therefore require modeling.

There was general consensus that the results of Poll 2 were more representative of the MCG’s priorities, and that another polling effort would be beneficial. This poll would be similar to the previous Poll 2, with a slight modification: the new poll would ask each MCG entity to select its top five concepts to move forward for analysis. The results of this poll would be used to develop a new sixth project grouping.

Based on the discussion, the MCG decided on the following project groupings:

- 1) *Regional Benefits*- concepts that have a regional benefit (grouping approved by MCG);
- 2) *Upcountry Benefits*- concepts that only have upcountry benefits (grouping approved by MCG);
- 3) *Valley Benefits* – concepts that only have valley benefits (grouping approved by MCG);
- 4) *Low Level of Analysis* – concepts that have low levels of analysis, particularly ones requiring qualitative analysis or ones that do not alter demands and will thus not require modeling;
- 5) *High Level of Analysis* – concepts that have high levels of analysis, particularly ones that will alter demands and thus will require modeling;
- 6) *MCG Member Priorities* – concepts that MCG members have identified as important to their entities (informed by new poll);

The concepts within the Policies and Initiatives category are still moving forward under a different analysis method and are therefore not included in any of the above project groupings. A Policy and Initiatives Workgroup will be convened with representatives from the San Joaquin Farm Bureau, San Joaquin County, Calaveras Planning Coalition, Calaveras County, and East Bay Municipal Utility District to work on further developing these concepts.

The issue of sponsorship was discussed, as there are still three concepts with no sponsors. Because concept 9c is a policy and initiative, it is ok that there is no sponsor. Concept 6a has been removed since there was no sponsorship interest among the MCG. The MCG agreed that 3a should be revised to be a study which investigates all desalination opportunities available. RMC will draft a new description for this concept.

There was some question as to the role of a sponsor. It was decided that each concept can have both “Lead” and “Co-Sponsors.” RMC will send out an email defining these roles and ask that any MCG entities who wish to act in either of these roles respond to that email. These sponsors will work together to complete the concept request for information that was sent out.

The concept request for information was sent out to identified sponsors for each concept. These requests will help inform the analysis for the project groupings. RMC is hosting a webinar to review these requests on Thursday August 14, 2014. Responses are requested by Monday August 18, 2014.

VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items

None.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #13 Summary

September 12, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	Lodi, City of
Calaveras County	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County Water District	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	Restore the Delta
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Stockton, City of
Foothill Conservancy	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	

Key Decisions

- Concepts: Concept 2d has been removed from the list.
 - Project Groupings: Groupings 4 and 5 were approved by the MCG. Grouping 6 will go final on Friday September 19th, pending PG&E response.
-

Action Items

- RMC: fill in Information Requests for concepts 3a and 8c.
 - RMC: include operational scenarios language into Concept 7b.
 - RMC: revise Water Availability Analysis to add challenges sections and various edits per MCG discussion; send to MCG on Friday September 19th.
 - MCG: review WAA and submit redline edits and comments to RMC by Friday September 26th.
 - RMC: reach out to PG&E to determine status of involvement.
 - RMC: compile edits, respond to comments, and send revised WAA to MCG on October 3rd.
-

- Foothill Conservancy: determine whether to retain Mokelumne Wild & Scenic as MokeWISE project concept.
 - EBMUD: send Recycled Water and Other Surface Water sections to the appropriate groups within EBMUD to review.
-

Summary

I. August Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #12 (August 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

There is no further action on the Wild and Scenic legislation this year. Foothill Conservancy will determine and report back to MCG if they would like to pursue the Wild and Scenic policy within MokeWISE.

Concept 2d (Mokelumne Hill Sanitary District Reclaimed Wastewater) has been removed due to the sponsor removing sponsorship of the concept.

The first Policies and Initiatives Workgroup meeting is next Friday; entities with current policies and initiatives related to any of the MokeWISE policies and initiatives were encouraged to send them to RMC for consideration by the Workgroup.

II. San Joaquin Farm Bureau Presentation

The San Joaquin Farm Bureau provided an overview of the Bureau, including a brief history and challenges faced by the Bureau. A number of questions about the Bureau were answered. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

III. Revised Concept Groupings

RMC provided an overview of where the MCG is in the MokeWISE process, including that Groups 1 through 3 were approved at the August meeting, that RMC is looking for approval of Groups 4 and 5, and that Group 6 will be presented for initial review at this meeting.

Project Groupings 4 and 5 were approved by the MCG. Discussion ensued about including an operational scenarios component into Concept 7b (Raise Lower Bear Reservoir Feasibility Update and Preliminary Engineering). RMC will incorporate this idea into the concept description.

RMC presented the polling results, indicating that the concepts receiving 3 or more tallies were included in Project Grouping 6. Three of the four entities who had not yet responded to the poll responded during the meeting. After accounting for these tallies, one concept moved into the Project Grouping; Project Grouping 6 now includes 17 concepts. RMC will reach out to PG&E to

solicit their response to the poll. The Project Grouping will go final if they do not provide their response by Friday September 19th.

IV. Concept/Grouping Assessment Format

RMC presented on the overall process, including how the Concept Information Requests will be incorporated into the process. The sponsors of four concepts, including concepts 1e, 2b, 4a, and 4d, have not yet submitted the information requests. Concepts 3a and 8c have no sponsors, so RMC will complete these requests.

Once all Information Requests are received, RMC will review and augment the requests where possible. The information requests will be submitted to Balance Hydrologics and Hanson Environmental for their use in analyzing the benefits and impacts of each concept. RMC also reviewed the timeline; in September, Balance and Hanson will begin assessing concepts which do not require results from the Water Availability Analysis by using the Information Requests. In October, Balance and Hanson will continue to assess concepts based on Information Requests and Water Availability Analysis findings.

V. Water Availability Analysis

RMC provided an overview of the results from all sections of the Water Availability Analysis, except for Mokelumne River. It is anticipated that Mokelumne River results will be presented to the MCG at the November meeting. The Modeling Workgroup will reconvene to review the MOCASIM results prior to the MCG reviewing the Mokelumne River portion of the Water Availability Analysis.

Comments and suggestions on each of the sections were noted by RMC and will be incorporated into the revised document. There was discussion about the challenges associated with potentially using some of the water that is noted as available in the analysis. Because of this, it was decided that RMC will include a challenges sections in each of the supply types to outline the various challenges associated with using the potentially available supply.

Due to the addition of the challenges section, the timeline was revised. RMC will draft these new sections and incorporate edits that were noted during the discussion. RMC will send this revised version to the MCG on Friday September 19th. The MCG will have one week to review, with redlines due to RMC by Friday September 26th. RMC will compile edits, respond to comments, and send the revised draft back to the MCG on Friday October 3rd. The revised analysis will be reviewed at the October 10th MCG meeting. EBMUD will send the current versions of the Recycled Water and the Other Surface Water sections to the respective groups to receive feedback which can be incorporated within this new schedule.

VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items

None.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #14 Summary

October 10, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras County Water District	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin County
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Stockton, City of
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Foothill Conservancy	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
Lodi, City of	

Key Decisions

- *None.*
-

Action Items

- RMC: begin drafting language for a resolution process.
 - RMC: include potential outreach opportunities on agenda for November meeting.
 - Facilitator: reach out to PG&E and Amador County to encourage active MCG participation.
-

Summary

I. September Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #13 (September 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

Foothill Conservancy indicated that they are not interested in sponsoring the Wild and Scenic Policy. The other entities who have indicated an interest in including a wild and scenic policy within the MokeWISE program have been asked if they are interested in sponsoring. If these entities are not interested in sponsoring, the concept will be removed from the list. If a sponsor is identified, the concept will begin the assessment process.

RMC provided an update on the Policy and Initiatives Workgroup, indicating that they have met once and will be meeting again on October 23rd to review progress made on individual policies and initiatives.

RMC provided an update on the Modeling Workgroup, indicating that they had met to review the MOCASIM model preliminary outputs of the two base cases. Some of these results were later presented that day.

Calaveras Planning Coalition cautioned that the MokeWISE process should not wait until near the end for MCG stakeholders to identify areas of concern about project concepts. The schedule provides time for boards and other decision making bodies to review the preferred alternative. Challenges associated with board approval were discussed, including board turnover. The process of reaching out to newly elected officials was briefly discussed and tabled for the next meeting. The question of “what does support really mean?” was brought up; RMC will draft language for a resolution of support that will outline the definition of support.

II. MyValleySprings.com Presentation

MyValleySprings.com provided an overview of the organization, including history of Calaveras County and the work in which MyValleySprings.com has been involved. A brief question and answer period followed. The handout provided as part of the presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

III. Water Availability Analysis

RMC gave an overview of the peer-review comments submitted on each section, as well as the specific comments where RMC took a different approach than was suggested in the comment.

Comments from the MCG about the proposed response to comments were solicited. Some of these comments included adding an opportunities section to each supply type to capture potential use opportunities and cite page numbers in the in-text citations. All comments stated during the meeting were captured by RMC and will be included in the revised version of the document. MCG members were encouraged to submit further comments through email and redline.

IV. Water Availability Analysis – Mokelumne River Supply

RMC reviewed preliminary results from the MOCASIM modeling effort. Information of interest to the MCG includes average unallocated flow over period of record, seasonal flows, and a comparison of JSA required and modeled flows. RMC will begin drafting the Mokelumne piece and send to the MCG later in October.

V. Preliminary Concept Assessment Information

RMC presented the preliminary environmental concept assessment from Balance Hydrologics and Hanson Environmental. General comments included presenting an explanation of the scale and adding a column to discuss the mitigation measures that could be used to capture more project benefit. These comments will be passed on to Balance and Hanson Environmental for incorporation into the revised version.

VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items

RMC presented a master schedule, highlighting each of the deadlines over the month of October.

Outreach to PG&E will continue to be conducted to potentially identify a new representative. Additionally, outreach to Amador County will be conducted to encourage the County to attend meetings and provide comments on process and documents.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #15 Summary

November 14, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador County	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Amador Water Agency	Restore the Delta
Calaveras County	San Joaquin County
Calaveras County Water District	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Calaveras Public Utility District	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Stockton East Water District
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Foothill Conservancy	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
MyValleySprings.com	

Key Decisions

- Include brief discussion of EBMUDs current stormwater study.
 - Include a quadrupled implementation level in the conservation section.
 - Include a daily hydrograph from 1998 forward in the Mokelumne River section. Show monthly graphs for wet years and yearly for all other years.
-

Action Items

- RMC: post EBMUD Board presentation after EBMUD December Board meeting.
 - RMC: secure location for January 8th public meeting.
 - RMC: develop a list of resource agencies and points of contact for invitations to the March public meeting.
 - MCG: comments on WAA to RMC by Wednesday November 26th.
 - Amador County: provide breakfast snacks at January meeting
-

Summary

I. October Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #14 (October 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC presented an update on the Policies and Initiatives Workgroup, including that the members are working on fleshing out those concepts. The final meeting is in January and drafted products will be presented to the MCG in February. The Modeling Workgroup is working with the MOCASIM model and will meet again in December to review project results.

Amador County indicated that it will be increasing its level of participation in MokeWISE by more frequently attending meetings. Foothill Conservancy and CSPA are working with PG&E to encourage them to increase their participation level.

RMC reviewed the MokeWISE process, including where the MCG is currently and the outcomes for the MokeWISE program. Additionally, RMC reviewed the schedule, including the major decision points for each of the remaining 7 months.

II. Outreach Opportunities

RMC presented on the different outreach opportunities available. RMC reiterated that the January meeting at Pardee will be a good opportunity to bring elected officials and introduce/update them on the process. CCWD stated that they have hired a new General Manager and have several new Board members; invitations will be extended to these individuals.

RMC suggested the formation of an Outreach Workgroup, which would help coordinate outreach to elected official, support public meetings, and coordinate additional outreach activities. There was no interest in forming this group. EBMUD did state that they would be updating their Board in the beginning of December and would be willing to make this presentation available to the MCG.

There are three remaining public workshops: January, March, and May.

- The January meeting will be focus on the Water Availability Analysis and the preliminary assessment of concepts. This meeting will be held on January 8th in Calaveras County. RMC will secure a location and develop meeting materials.
- The March meeting will focus on analysis of portfolios. RMC suggested that this meeting, in addition to being a public meeting, target resource agencies. There was a concern that the public is generally available at night and resource agencies are generally available during the day, which would make scheduling this joint meeting

difficult. RMC will compile a list of resource agencies and points of contact.

- The May meeting will focus on the preferred MokeWISE program.

RMC provided a general overview of the draft Resolution of Support and explained that this does not need to be the same resolution for each MCG entity; members can tailor it their entity, but it needs to indicate support for the process. The Resolution would be appended to the final document, but it is understood that the final Board update process will likely happen in June/July. DWR understands this and final Board adoptions will not jeopardize the DWR agreement. MCG members were encouraged to provide comments on the draft Resolution.

III. California Sportfishing Protection Alliance Presentation

California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA) provided an overview of the organization, including its history and the work in which CSPA has been involved. A brief question and answer period followed. The presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

IV. Water Availability Analysis – Non-Mokelumne Supply

RMC gave an overview of the comments and provided a study hall period for MCG members present to review the proposed response to comments. MCG comments are due to RMC by Wednesday November 26th.

One of the comments on the stormwater section questioned why stormwater potential in the EBMUD service area was not calculated. EBMUD explained that they are currently investigating stormwater potential and will have a technical memorandum in January 2015 with this information. After some discussion, it was decided that to address this comment, information about EBMUD's current effort would be summarized. Several comments on the conservation section expressed a desire to see additional, more aggressive levels of conservation to determine potential savings. It was decided that expanded implementation level currently shown (which is double current levels) would be expanded further to double the expanded levels (or quadrupled the current levels). Additional comments were expressed at the meeting, which were catalogued by RMC and will be incorporated.

V. Water Availability Analysis – Mokelumne River Supply

RMC explained that the implemented methodology differs from the original work plan due to disagreements on the definition of available water. Ultimately, a mutually-agreed upon definition of unallocated water was chosen and fisheries and geomorphology impacts will be considered in conjunction with projects. This history has now been captured in the Mokelumne section. Comments that and concerns that were expressed during the meeting were addressed in the latest version of the section; MCG members were encouraged to read it and provide any further comments or concerns.

RMC reviewed general comments on the Mokelumne section and explained the proposed process for creating a daily hydrograph. There was some concern about creating a daily hydrograph prior to 1998, because historical flow prior to 1998 does not reflect current operating conditions on the River. The MCG decided that from 1998 forward, daily unallocated/allocated flow will be provided with the caveat that it is only shown to provide information about monthly variability and is not meant to provide information on pulse flows and geomorphic work. For the wet years from 1998 to 2010, present graphs that show daily unallocated/allocated by month; for all other hydrologic year types, show daily unallocated/allocated by year. Comments are due to RMC by Wednesday November 26th.

VI. Revised Concept Assessment Approach

RMC reviewed the changes that were made to the environmental assessment, including that an additional column explaining how additional benefits could be captured was added and that a general qualitative explanation of the 1-5 scale was added. No additional comments were provided at the meeting.

RMC explained the concept cut-sheets, including that each cut-sheet would include the concept name, description, and other relevant information. The assessment will be based on the MokeWISE program objectives and include an open, closed, or half circle for each objective with an explanation for the assessment.

VII. Wrap-Up and Action Items

Amador County offered to bring breakfast snacks to the January meeting.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #16 Summary

December 12, 2014

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	Jackson Valley Irrigation District
Calaveras County	Lodi, City of
Calaveras County Water District	MyValleySprings.com
Calaveras Planning Coalition	Restore the Delta
Calaveras Public Utility District	San Joaquin County
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Stockton, City of
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Foothill Conservancy	

Key Decisions

- Water Availability Analysis (without the Mokelumne and Stormwater sections) was approved.
 - Update Stormwater section to remove qualifying text and include analysis on average single family potential stormwater use.
 - Update Environmental Assessment of Concepts to include both viewpoints.
-

Action Items

- RMC: send EBMUD Board update materials to the MCG.
 - RMC: update Stormwater and Mokelumne sections based on discussions at the meeting.
 - RMC: update Environmental Concept Assessment to include both viewpoints on revised concepts; send to MCG by December 15th
 - MCG: review Environmental Concept Assessment and provide comments by December 19th.
-

- RMC: complete remaining concept assessments and send to MCG by Friday December 19th
 - MCC: review concept assessments and provide comments to RMC by Tuesday December 30th.
-

Summary

I. November Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #15 (November 2014) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the Modeling Workgroup, including that the group has met and discussed preliminary modeling results for one of the concepts. The group will meet again in January to review more results.

Sierra Club volunteered to present at the February meeting. EBMUD offered to present on its reservoir operations if the write-up that is to be included in the Mokelumne section of the Water Availability Analysis is not sufficient. There was a strong interest among the MCG for this presentation and EBMUD agreed to internally discuss the possibility of a presentation.

The January 8th public meeting will be at the CCWD Boardroom. RMC will be preparing a flyer to distribute to MCG members. Additionally, a press release will be sent out prior to the meeting. Electeds are encouraged to attend if they are not able to attend the MCG meeting on the 9th. EBMUD has made available their presentation to the EBMUD Board that other entities can use a starting point to begin discussions with their respective Boards.

The MCG is to send in comments on the draft Resolution of Support letter. Comments are wanted now, but the document will be revisited in the spring when MokeWISE program outcomes are more formulated.

San Joaquin County provided a summary of the Settlement Agreement between the County and EBMUD. In a dry year, NSJWCD will get up to 6,000 AF when EBMUD's projected end of September (EOS) total system storage (TSS) is greater than 550 TAF and up to 3,000 AF when EOS TSS is greater than 525 TAF but less than 550 TAF. In wet years, NSJWCD will receive up to 8,000 AF.

RMC reviewed the MokeWISE process, including where the MCG is currently and the outcomes for the MokeWISE program. Additionally, RMC reviewed the schedule, including the major decision points for each of the remaining 7 months.

II. Water Availability Analysis – Non-Mokelumne Supply

RMC presented an overview of the non-Mokelumne edits, including additions to the Groundwater and Other Surface Water sections. RMC summarized discussions held with Foothill Conservancy regarding the Conservation section, including that the expanded program levels of implementation were still not aggressive enough. In an effort to respond to these concerns, an additional level of conservation implementation has been added to the analysis in the Conservation section. This additional level assumes that each agency is able to achieve 85 gallons per capita per day (gpcd). It was made clear that this maximum theoretical level is not something that is being advocated for at this point, but that it is acting as a reference point to examine what is theoretically possible.

There were additional comments from Foothill Conservancy on the Stormwater section. These were discussed over lunch with RMC and a resolution presented to the MCG. There were no objectives to removing the discussion on the Camanche Area Regional Water Supply Plan (CARWSP) and the other qualifying language in the Potential Stormwater Programs section. In place of this, the section will include an analysis of the amount of potable water that an average single family home could offset with stormwater.

III. Water Availability Analysis – Mokelumne River Supply

RMC presented an overview of the comments that were received and summarized the comments that had not yet been incorporated. It was explained that these comments would not affect the model output, but would address formatting and language. After some discussion, it was decided that more results should be moved to the appendices and that more explanation of the results should be included. Additionally, include a description of what each of the appendices are at the beginning of the Mokelumne section and at the beginning of each of the appendices.

The MCG approved the Water Availability Analysis (without the Mokelumne and Stormwater sections). These two sections will be revised and presented to the MCG in January. It is anticipated that the Mokelumne and Stormwater sections will be ready for final approval by February.

IV. Revised Environmental Assessment of Concepts

RMC presented the changes to the environmental assessment of the concepts. There was a general concern that concept 7b (Raise Lower Bear) had been “green-washed” and that the edited concepts had originally presented one viewpoint, but now present another. It was ultimately decided that both viewpoints be included.

RMC will make these changes and send back out to the group by the end of the day on Monday December 15th. The MCG will have until Friday December 19th to provide comments. If no comments are received, then it will be assumed final.

V. Draft Assessment of Selected Concepts

RMC reviewed the assessment approach, including the rating system and the justification of the rating. There was a comment that the concept summary page be re-formatted to include more abbreviated titles; this will help maximize space. RMC will send the remaining concept assessments and the assessments on the project groupings by Friday December 19th. MCG comments on the concept assessments are due back to RMC by December 30th.

RMC will prepare and send out a template that MCG members can use to document concerns about individual concepts. The MCG is to return it to RMC by January 2nd.

VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items

At the next meeting, RMC will provide a 15 minute overview of MokeWISE for electeds and include a brief discussion of what will be expected of electeds at the end of the process.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #17 Summary

Located at Pardee Center

January 9, 2015

Organizations represented

Amador County	MyValleySprings.com
Amador Water Agency	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras County	San Joaquin County
Calaveras County Water District	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Calaveras Public Utility District	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Stockton, City of
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Foothill Conservancy	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
Lodi, City of	

Key Decisions

- Mokelumne and Stormwater sections of the Water Availability Analysis were approved.
- Environmental assessment on concept 7b (Raise Lower Bear Feasibility) was approved.

Action Items

- RMC: make final changes to Mokelumne section and finalize; post to website
- Foothill Conservancy, CSPA, AWA, Amador County: Discuss language on concept 1a (Anadromous Fish Restoration) and come to February meeting with proposal.
- MCG: provide comments on how generic planning language applied to concept 7b may apply to other planning concepts.

- RMC: draft new Benefit Allocation methodology based on discussion.
 - RMC: compile new portfolios to send to MCG; schedule webinar to discuss portfolios prior to February meeting.
-

Summary

I. MokeWISE Overview

It was determined that because there were no elected officials present at the meeting, the MokeWISE overview was not needed.

II. December Meeting Summary and Brief Update

RMC read the one change to the meeting summary that clarified the San Joaquin Agreement. San Joaquin County clarified that the 6,000 acre-feet in a dry years is in a dry-year sequence. This was added and the summary was approved by consensus; it will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC summarized the key points from the January 8 evening public meeting, including that the Amador Calaveras Consensus Group offered to do a presentation to the MCG. An MCG member commented that SPI's involvement is significant. SPI will have increased involvement if the ACCG presents to the MCG, as SPI is a member of the ACCG.

RMC discussed soliciting comments on the draft Resolution of Support letter and explained that the draft will be revisited at a later date. The purpose of discussing the draft now is to get MCG members thinking about what support for MokeWISE may mean for their particular organization.

RMC reviewed the MokeWISE process, including where the MCG is currently and the outcomes for the MokeWISE program. Additionally, RMC reviewed the schedule, including the major decision points for each of the remaining 6 months.

III. Water Availability Analysis – Mokelumne and Stormwater

RMC presented an overview of Mokelumne and Stormwater revisions, including the new stormwater language on percentage of losses. There were a few remaining comments on the Mokelumne section, including questions on unit conversions and language clarifications. These changes were noted during the meeting and will be made to the document. Given these changes, both the Mokelumne and Stormwater sections were approved by the MCG. Once the Water Availability Analysis is compiled, it will be posted to the public portion of the website.

IV. Revised Environmental Assessment of Concepts

RMC explained that the environmental assessment on concept 7b (Raise Lower Bear Feasibility) was returned to the geomorphologists to revise the assessment given the sensitivities and concerns expressed at the December meeting.

There was a concern about the new assessment under General Comments, particularly that there are a number of generalizations about mitigation and about the potential benefits. It was suggested that the project description be revised to state what the proposed benefits of the project would be, particularly what potential benefits would be evaluated in the study.

Given the discussion, the project description was revised during the meeting to include the following: *The study would include evaluation of the proposed beneficial uses of the project and clarifying operational parameters. It would also identify benefits, impacts, and constraints in the following areas: technical, political, environmental (including both species-related and geomorphic), economic, legal, and recreation – recognizing that a more detailed Environmental Impact Report would be required prior to implementing a project. The study will include consultation with members of the MokeWISE MCG.* After this new description was approved, the environmental assessment was revised to combine assessments from previous revisions. In addition, a sentence explaining that operations would drive benefits and impacts was added at the end of each paragraph. This assessment was approved by the MCG.

There was then discussion on adding the language that was added to the project description of concept 7b to other planning study concepts. RMC sent an email to the MCG with the language that was added to concept 7b with the request that MCG members provide comments on how the language might apply to the other planning concepts. Comments are due back to RMC by February January 23rd.

V. Draft Benefit/Cost Allocation Methodology

RMC presented an overview of the methodology, explaining each task involved. There was a general concern that if a cost is attributed to an agency, that agency may find it difficult to approve the final portfolio. It was further agreed that this methodology would involve many value judgments that would likely be difficult to come to agreement.

RMC suggested a qualitative approach, explaining the general benefits, beneficiaries, and a discussion on the general magnitude of benefits received by beneficiaries. There would also be a general discussion on cost, without apportioning the cost to any beneficiaries. It was suggested to conduct a high-level of costs analysis and clearly state assumptions. It was also suggested that

there be a discussion of allocated benefits between entities and between the two regions, as well as a discussion of general public beneficiaries.

RMC will revise the methodology to outline this new approach and send it out prior to the February meeting.

VI. Assessment of Concepts and Concept Groupings

RMC presented the changes resulting from MCG feedback, including the conflicting comment on concept 1a (Anadromous Fish Restoration). The MCG decided to remove objective D-21 (which pertains to data for UWMPs) from the assessment as it pertains more to the MokeWISE program than it does to any one concept. It will remain as an objective, but not be used in the concept assessment. There was a proposal to remove objective E-28 (which pertains to wild and scenic legislation) as no concepts meet that objective. The MCG elected to leave the objective in the assessment. Concept 3a (Solar Powered Desalination Study) does not have a sponsor; it was suggested that this concept be removed for lack of sponsor. The MCG elected to leave it as a concept.

There was concern that concept 1a (Anadromous Fish Restoration) may potentially result in a reduction in flow for water agencies. There was a proposal to remove the sentence about reduction in water supply from the environmental assessment. A counter-proposal suggested adding a sentence that explains that proponents of the concept do not anticipate an impact to water agencies. It was suggested that language added to concept 7b (Raise Lower Bear Feasibility) could also be added to concept 1a. It was ultimately decided that those entities most interested in the language (Foothill Conservancy, CSPA, AWA, Amador County) would discuss language changes offline and bring back a proposal to the MCG in February.

VII. Preliminary Portfolio Proposal

RMC presented the preliminary proposed portfolio, including how the portfolio was compiled. There was a general concern that the modeling results would be helpful in putting the portfolios together. The MCG broke into three groups to discuss the proposed portfolio and each of the concepts. After a period of time, the MCG came back together and each of the groups reported on their discussion. RMC took note of these discussions.

Based on the discussions, RMC will prepare a new set of portfolios to send to the MCG. In an effort to stay on schedule, it was decided that a webinar would be held prior to the February meeting to approve the portfolios so assessment on the portfolios could be presented, reviewed, and discussed at the February meeting. The date and time of the webinar will be determined via email.

VIII. Wrap-Up and Action Items

None.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #18 Summary

February 13, 2015

Organizations represented

Amador County	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Amador Water Agency	San Joaquin County
Calaveras County	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Calaveras County Water District	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Calaveras Planning Coalition	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Stockton, City of
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Foothill Conservancy	
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
MyValleySprings.com	

Key Decisions

- Mokelumne and Stormwater sections of the Water Availability Analysis were approved.
 - Environmental assessment on concept 7b (Raise Lower Bear Feasibility) was approved.
-

Action Items

- RMC: edit Concept 1a title to read “Re-Introduction of Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Upstream of Pardee Reservoir.”
 - Climate Change Workgroup: convene to discuss distilling available information on climate change.
-

- San Joaquin County: present in March about groundwater recharge and in-lieu recharge work performed for the Eastern San Joaquin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.
-

Summary

I. January Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #17 (January 2015) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the Modeling Workgroup, including that the group has discussed the concepts that have been modeled and incorporated comments on the modeling.

RMC also provided an update on the Policies and Initiatives Workgroup, including that the workgroup has compiled proposed policies which are ready for the MCG's review. It was requested that the groundwater policy (Policy 9d) not be reviewed by the MCG as there is not yet consensus among the workgroup on this policy. Once consensus within the workgroup has been reached, the policy will be submitted to the MCG for review.

RMC provided an update on Concept 1a (Anadromous Fish), including that discussions with Amador Water Agency, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, and Foothill Conservancy led to consensus on the updated project description. One edit was recorded during the meeting and the title will be changed to read "Re-Introduction of Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Upstream of Pardee Reservoir." It was noted that AWA requested that an analysis of the project under climate change conditions be included. CSPA remarked that climate change extends beyond this one particular concept and that other concepts may require a similar analysis. It was suggested that available information regarding climate change from Integrated Regional Water Management Plans (IRWMPs) from the Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras Region and the Eastern San Joaquin Region be summarized and included in MokeWISE. After some discussion, it was decided that representatives from East Bay Municipal Utility District, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Foothill Conservancy, Calaveras Planning Coalition, San Joaquin County, and the California Department of Water Resources would convene to distill available information and further discuss climate change as it relates to MokeWISE.

RMC provided an update on Concept 4c (San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking and Exchange), including that discussion with San Joaquin County, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, and Foothill Conservancy led to consensus on a proposal for moving the concept forward. It was proposed that

Concept 4c be moved to a parallel track to allow additional development. This parallel track would include additional modeling and further discussions of the concept with MCG members that are interested in participating. It was explained that the concept would not be included in the preferred MokeWISE portfolio, but that a new concept (4e) would be considered for inclusion. Concept 4e (San Joaquin Groundwater Banking and Exchange Conceptual Modeling and Feasibility Work), as stated in the proposed description made available to the MCG, would continue the work that would begin in the parallel track. In response to a suggested edit, a sentence has been added to the description that articulates that storage would provide a regional benefit. It was suggested that concepts 4a and 4e be combined to ensure that one feasibility study captures all potential sources. San Joaquin County offered to present in March explaining the work that was done in the Eastern San Joaquin Integrated Regional Water Management Plan regarding source water for groundwater recharge and in-lieu recharge.

A new concept submitted by the Calaveras Planning Coalition was discussed by the MCG. The concept proposes assessing the feasibility of transporting wastewater from the East Bay and Contra Costa County to the San Joaquin Valley for irrigation and/or groundwater recharge. After some discussion, it was suggested that each individual breakout group discuss and decide if the new concept should be added to Concept 4a as a supply source.

II. Portfolio Breakout Discussion

RMC presented an overview of the portfolio breakout discussion process, including the new proposed approach for conducting preliminary engineering. RMC explained that the purpose of the breakout discussion group is to identify a list of projects that would under further development. The concepts selected for further development would undergo preliminary engineering which may include scope definition, mapping, and conceptual engineering plans for some infrastructure. RMC explained that the level of preliminary engineering will depend on the number of concepts selected for focused work.

A revised schedule was presented showing how the proposed preliminary engineering would be incorporated. In March, draft preliminary engineering for each of the concepts selected during this meeting will be presented to the MCG, with finals prepared for the April MCG meeting.

RMC explained during the small group breakout, each group would be given a worksheet to identify concepts that the group feels have low, medium, and high value, as well as projects that the group “can live with.” There was discussion about the subjective nature of the word “value” and RMC provided several considerations for the small groups, including the extent to which a concept meets MCG objectives, how the concept might be positioned for funding, and

how well the concept reflects a regional balance of benefits. Under the “can live with it” category, the group could live with it as-is, could live with it if additional refinement is completed, or could not live with it under any circumstances.

RMC re-iterated that the process should be completed by consensus and should not include voting of any kind.

III. EBMUD Presentation on Reservoir Operations

East Bay Municipal Utility District provided an overview of the District’s reservoir operations, including how and when the District makes decisions about releases from Pardee and Camanche Reservoirs, as well as the requirements mandating those releases. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

IV. MCG Decision on Portfolio

Each of the three small groups met to discuss each concept and complete the worksheet provided by RMC. After each group had completed the exercise, RMC presented the concepts that received a high value by any group and a “yes, can live with it” by all groups.

Concepts in group 4 (Groundwater Management) and concepts in group 7 (Surface Water) were addressed by the group in an effort to reach consensus. After some discussion, it was decided that Concept 4c (San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking and Exchange) be moved to the parallel track and that Concept 4a (Groundwater Banking within the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin) and Concept 4e (San Joaquin Groundwater Banking and Exchange Conceptual Modeling and Feasibility Work) be combined into one concept that would evaluate multiple sources for groundwater banking and exchange. Additionally, it was decided that the proposed concept submitted by the Calaveras Planning Coalition be revised to a feasibility study looking at potential uses for wastewater from the East Bay and Contra Costa County. After further discussion, it was decided that this concept would be combined with concepts 4a and 4e.

After some discussion, there was a proposal to combine concepts 7b (Raise Lower Bear Reservoir Feasibility Update and Preliminary Engineering), 7c (Surface Storage Regional Assessment), 7d (Re-operation of Existing Storage), and 7e (Optimization of Calaveras County Reservation) into one concept titled “Water Supply Reliability for Amador and Northern Calaveras Counties.” It was further suggested that Concept 7d not be combined and be developed as a stand-alone concept.

The following concepts were approved for preliminary engineering by the MCG:

- 2a: Municipal Recycled Wastewater Recharge Program

- 2b: Constellation Winery Wastewater Reuse
- 2c: Amador County Regional Reuse
- 4a: Groundwater Banking within the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin
- 4b: Amador and Calaveras Counties Hydrologic Assessment
- 4d: North San Joaquin Water Conservation District Infrastructure Improvements
- 5a: Regional Urban Water Conservation Program
- 5b: Regional Agriculture Conservation Program
- 7b-7e: Water Supply Reliability for Amador and Northern Calaveras Counties
- 7d: Re-operation of Existing Storage
- 8a: Jeff Davis Water Treatment Plant Replacement
- 8b: Rehab of Transmission Main
- 8c: Barney Way Septic System Conversion
- 8d: Lake Camanche Village Recycled Water Project

V. Revised Benefit Allocation Methodology

This discussion was postponed to the March meeting to allow more time for small group discussion.

VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items

None.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #19 Summary

March 13, 2015

Organizations represented

Amador Water Agency	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Calaveras County	San Joaquin County
Calaveras County Water District	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Calaveras Public Utility District	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Stockton, City of
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Foothill Conservancy	
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
MyValleySprings.com	

Key Decisions

- Convene Institutional Arrangements workgroup to provide recommendation to MCG during April meeting.
 - Hold fourth public meeting at San Joaquin Farm Bureau with targeted invitations to resource agencies.
 - Develop problem statements and MokeWISE stakeholder interest statements for select Projects as discussed
 - Approve RMC moving forward with implementation of the benefit allocation methodology
-

Action Items

- MCG: send in redlines on policies and initiatives to RMC by Friday March 20th.
 - RMC: distribute public outreach materials and reach out to resource agencies.
-

- RMC: correct statements regarding WID's water right and upload corrected Water Availability Analysis.
 - Institutional Arrangements Workgroup: meet to determine recommendation to present to the MCG at the April meeting.
 - RMC: email Project workgroup list to MCG and individual emails to workgroups.
 - MCG: work with agreed-upon MCG entities to revise preliminary engineering (expanded project descriptions) and add interest statements where decided for review during the April meeting.
 - RMC: revise preliminary engineering (revised project descriptions) for review during the April meeting.
 - RMC: implement benefit allocation methodology and distribute to the MCG for review at the April meeting.
-

Summary

I. February Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #18 (February 2015) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

Prior to the last MCG meeting, write-ups on the policies and initiatives were distributed. At that meeting, RMC indicated that the workgroup had not yet reached consensus on policy 9d. At this meeting, RMC provided an update on policy 9d, indicating that the workgroup was unable to reach consensus and as such, policy 9d is not moving forward. The MCG was instructed to send in any redlines on the remaining policies and initiatives by Friday March 20th.

RMC reviewed corrections made to the Water Availability Analysis, including a correction of Woodbridge Irrigation District's water rights and inclusion of the conversion factor from acre-feet per year (AFY) to cubic feet per second (cfs). During the meeting, it was further clarified the Woodbridge Irrigation District's water rights total 414.4 cfs. This will be corrected in the document; this version will be uploaded to the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the Climate Change Committee, indicating that the Committee met and decided to address climate change programmatically. The climate change section is currently being drafted, which will be shared with the Committee and be distributed to the MCG for review at the April meeting.

RMC also provided an update on Project 1a (Re-Introduction of Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Upstream of Pardee Reservoir), including that Amador Water Agency, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA), and Foothill Conservancy reached consensus on the objective assessment and environmental assessment. Foothill Conservancy reiterated that the need for the project is to lead a pilot

project, which has more immediate funding needs. Foothill Conservancy and CSPA will propose language for an updated project description, which could include incorporating phases.

At previous meetings, the MCG discussed holding the fourth public meeting in Sacramento and tailoring it to resource agencies. Given that the projects are less capital intensive than originally anticipated, RMC suggested that there may not be the same interest from resource agencies. RMC proposed that the meeting be held at the San Joaquin Farm Bureau on April 9th at 6:30pm and that resource agencies receive personal invitations. The MCG approved the proposal. RMC will draft a flyer and press release to be distributed to local papers and to MCG member agencies so they may distribute to their constituencies.

On Tuesday March 10th, 2015, RMC distributed a draft technical memorandum summarizing potential options for final MokeWISE project implementation governance and stakeholder coordination. RMC explained that this is a required portion of the Final Report and that the MCG will make a final determination on the institutional arrangement during the April meeting. RMC proposed that a workgroup convene to discuss the options and prepare a recommendation to the MCG during April's meeting. Entities involved in this workgroup are: the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority, San Joaquin County, Amador Water Agency, Calaveras Planning Coalition, East Bay Municipal Utility District, and the City of Stockton.

RMC reviewed the schedule for April, May, and June.

II. Sierra Club Presentation

The Sierra Club provided an overview of the Club, including its history, mission, and current projects. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

III. San Joaquin County Presentation

San Joaquin County provided information focusing on efforts the County has pursued in terms of alternate water supplies to the Mokelumne River. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website.

IV. Preliminary Engineering (Expanded Project Descriptions)

RMC explained the concern that was expressed by some of the MCG members at the end of the February meeting regarding Project 1a (Re-Introduction of Fall-Run Chinook Salmon Upstream of Pardee Reservoir) not being added to the list of projects. Because Project 1a was the only project that was on the cusp of making onto the list, it was added.

The California Sportfishing Protection Alliance (CSPA) presented an overview of the work the environmental caucus had completed after the draft scopes of work were distributed on Friday March 6th. The environmental caucus recommended using the revised scope for Project 7d as a template for reworking some of the other scopes. Recommended changes included: replacing each abstract with a problem statement and summary of MokeWISE stakeholder interests, and adding more specific information to some of the scopes, including adding specificity to phrases such as “legal issues.” It was also decided that RMC would add a climate change as an item as part of the climate change overview section indicating that each project completed as part of the MokeWISE program should address climate change as applicable.

The MCG agreed that this exercise is beneficial and has merit and that the preliminary implementation plan should be pushed from April to May. RMC indicated that doing this means that the MCG will see less material up front (and will instead see some items for the first time when they appear in draft form in the Draft Plan in May). The MCG approved this revised approach and schedule.

During the meeting, each Project was discussed and the MCG determined whether an interest statement was needed. For those Projects that the MCG deemed an interest statement necessary, a workgroup with an assigned lead was identified. This group was tasked with developing a problem statement and stakeholder interest section for the Project; RMC will take the lead on addressing changes to the Project scopes. RMC will email out the final list to the MCG, with individual emails to each workgroup to begin facilitating the discussion. Revised scopes must be completed in time for review during the April meeting.

It was also decided that project 1g, which was not identified for further development in the February meeting, should be further developed and a scope of work prepared. All remaining projects without expanded scopes were discussed, and this was the only project recommended to be expanded.

V. Revised Benefit Allocation Methodology

The MCG agreed to allow RMC to implement the methodology. RMC will bring the implemented methodology back to the MCG for comment in April.

VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items

None.

Mokelumne Collaborative Group (MCG) Meeting #20 Summary

April 10, 2015

Organizations represented

Amador County	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Amador Water Agency	San Joaquin County
Calaveras County	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Calaveras Planning Coalition	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Calaveras Public Utility District	Sierra Club, SF Bay Chapter
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance	Stockton, City of
Delta Fly Fishers, Inc.	Stockton East Water District
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority
Foothill Conservancy	Woodbridge Irrigation District
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	
Lodi, City of	
MyValleySprings.com	

Key Decisions

- Final decision made on Implementation Plan projects (see Section IV for more information).
 - Authority given to project workgroups to make a final determination regarding the assigned project and its inclusion in the Implementation Plan.
-

Action Items

- RMC: make discussed changes to Institutional Arrangements Memorandum.
 - RMC: make discussed changes to project scopes.
 - MCG Project Workgroups: meet to discuss projects and come to consensus.
-

Summary

I. March Meeting Summary and Brief Update

Meeting #19 (March 2015) summary was approved by consensus and will be posted onto the public portion of the website.

RMC provided an update on the fourth public meeting, held April 9th, 2015 at the San Joaquin Farm Bureau. In attendance were six members of the public. The meeting included discussion of the MCG's progress and next steps, including that the MCG was working through determining which projects would be included in the implementation plan.

To date, there have been no comments received on the policies and initiatives. Comments are due by Friday April 17th; the MCG will be discussing endorsement of these policies and initiatives at the May MCG meeting.

Project 8a (Jeff Davis Water Treatment Plant Replacement Feasibility Study) has been removed from the project list because that study has already been completed.

RMC reviewed the schedule for the remainder of the project.

II. Institutional Arrangements

RMC provided an overview of the Institutional Arrangements workgroup process for determining a proposal for the MCG to consider. The workgroup's proposal was presented, which included an MOU between UMRWA and the GBA to support project implementation and a stakeholder workgroup and public workshops for stakeholder coordination and public outreach.

The MCG approved the workgroups proposal with two edits. RMC will incorporate these edits, which include being more specific about who the signatories of the MOU are and allowing individual members of the public to be members of the stakeholder group.

III. Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG) Presentation

The ACCG provided an overview of the Group, including its history, mission, and current projects. This presentation will be posted to the protected portion of the website pending approval from the ACCG.

IV. Preliminary Engineering (Expanded Project Descriptions)

RMC reviewed the goal and process for the meeting, including that the MCG needed to decide which projects would be included in the Implementation Plan. Projects included in the Implementation Plan are projects that are generally

supported and that the institutional structure will focus on funding projects in the Implementation Plan.

RMC reviewed the two list approach. List 1 includes projects which are supported by the full MCG, that is, projects that all MCG members agree should be included in the Implementation Plan. List 2 projects are projects that are supported by an overwhelming majority of the MCG, but that have some remaining issues that are articulated. Projects which are not included in List 1 or List 2 are not a part of the Implementation Plan.

Projects 1g (Soil Restoration), 7d (Storage Reoperation), 7b (Raise Lower Bear), 7f (Blue and Twin Lakes), 4a (Groundwater Banking), and 7a (Storage Recovery) were discussed at length and live edits were made where needed. RMC recorded these edits and other comments and will incorporate them as directed by the MCG. The following table summarizes the MCG’s final decision on each of the projects:

Project	Final MCG Decision
1a: Re-Introduction of Fall Run Chinook Salmon Upstream of Pardee Reservoir	List 1
1b: High County Meadow Restoration Program	List 1
1c: Mokelumne River Day Use Area Floodplain Habitat Restoration Project	List 1, few small edits from the San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
1d: Fish Screens for Riparian Diversions in the Lower Mokelumne	List 1, add Lower Mokelumne River Stewardship Council
1f: Riparian Restoration Program – Below Camanche	List 1, included real time edits
1g: Mokelumne Water Quality, Soil Erosion, and Sedimentation Inventory/Monitoring	List 1, use version agreed upon by workgroup
2a: Municipal Recycled Wastewater Recharge Program	List 1
2b: Constellation Winery Wastewater Reuse	List 1

2c: Amador County Regional Reuse	List 1, include district-wide financial planning language
4a: Groundwater Banking within the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin	Workgroup to meet the week following the meeting
4b: Amador and Calaveras Counties Hydrologic Assessment	List 1
4d: NSJWCD Infrastructure Improvements	List 1
5a: Regional Urban Water Conservation Program	List 1
5b: Regional Agriculture Conservation Program	List 1, San Joaquin Country Resource Conservation District would like to have their interests include in interested statement; if any changes to environmental interests, a call will be required to discuss
7a: PG&E Storage Recovery	Workgroup to meet the week following the meeting
7b: Raise Lower Bear Reservoir Feasibility Update and Preliminary Engineering	List 1, include pertinent universal changes from 7d
7d: Re-operation of Existing Storage	List 1, included real time edits
7f: Reliability and Replacement Assessment for Dams at Blue and Twin Lakes	Workgroup to meet the week following the meeting
8b: Rehab of Transmission Main	List 1
8c: Barney Way Septic System Conversion	List 1
8d: Lake Camanche Village Recycled Water Project	List 1

For all projects that required further work by a workgroup, the MCG gave authority to those workgroups to make a final determination regarding the project and its inclusion in the Implementation Plan.

V. Draft Climate Change Section

This was pushed back to allow more time for discussing the expanded project descriptions. The draft section will be included and presented to the MCG in the draft Final Plan in May.

VI. Wrap-Up and Action Items

None.