Friant Water Authority
Executive Committee Meeting Agenda

9:00 a.m., Monday, October 15, 2018
Conference Room
Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District
2975 Farmersville Rd., Farmersville, CA 93223

At the discretion of the Executive Committee, all items appearing on this agenda, whether or not expressly listed for action, may be deliberated upon and may be subject to action by the Committee. Order of agenda items is subject to change.

1. Call to Order.

2. Additions to and approval of the agenda. Items identified after posting of the agenda, for which there is a need to take immediate action, may be added to the agenda. Addition of an item requires a two-thirds vote of the Committee members (or if less than two-thirds of the members are present, a unanimous vote of the members present). [Government Code section 54954.2(b)]

3. Approval of the September 17, 2018 meeting minutes.

4. Public Comment. (Government Code section 54954.3) – This is the time set aside on the agenda where members of the public may comment on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee that is not on the agenda. Comments will be limited to 3 minutes per speaker, 15 minutes per subject and 30 minutes overall for the entire public comment period, unless otherwise approved by the chair of the meeting, to ensure that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak. The Committee cannot take action on items not on the agenda; and therefore, comments on such items may be taken under advisement, referred to the appropriate staff for response or directed to be placed on a future agenda. Public comment on items on the agenda will be allowed at the time the Board considers the item.

5. Chief Operating Officer’s Report. (30 minutes)
   A. Update on Capacity Correction Project.
   B. Draft Executive Committee Meeting Dates in 2019
      a. Determine if Thursday, November 15, 2018 meeting should be held.

6. Government Affairs Manager’s Report. (30 minutes)
   A. Update on Proposition 3 and upcoming outreach.
   B. Update on state and federal legislation, and communications activities.

7. Director of Water Policy Report. (45 minutes)
   A. Temperance Flat.
      i. Update on activities of the San Joaquin Valley Water Infrastructure Authority.
ii. Update on MOU, MOA, and JPA Group activities.

8. General Counsel’s Report. (5 minutes)

9. Chief Executive Officer’s Report. (45 minutes)
   A. Aquifer Recharge Legislation
   B. Water Quality Ad Hoc Group Update.

CLOSED SESSION (45 min)

10. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION [Government Code section 54956.9(d)(1)] –
    Name of matter:  NRDC v. Murillo, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California (Sacramento Division),
    Case No. 88-cv-1658-JAM-GGH.

11. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED LITIGATION: Significant exposure to litigation
    pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2): 2 potential matters.

12. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL—INITIATION OF LITIGATION [Government Code section
    54956.9(d)(4)]—Initiation of Litigation: 2 potential cases.


Public Participation Notice

A person with a qualifying disability under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 may request the
Authority to provide a disability-related modification or accommodation in order to participate in any public
meeting of the Authority. Such assistance includes appropriate alternative formats for the agendas and agenda
packets used for any public meetings of the Authority. Requests for such assistance and for agendas and
agenda packets shall be made in person, by telephone, facsimile, or written correspondence to Toni Marie, at
the office of Friant Water Authority, at least 48 hours before a public Authority meeting.
Friant Water Authority  
Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  

9:00 a.m., Monday, September 17, 2018  
Conference Room  
Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District  
2975 Farmersville Rd., Farmersville, CA 93223

1. **Call to Order.** Chair Kent Stephens called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Committee members present: Stephens, Camp, Loeffler, Tantau, Borba, Erickson (Alt.); Staff present: DeFlitch, Marie, Davis, Hickernell, Biering, Willard, Phillips, Biering, Payne. Others: Muhar, Collup, Wallace, Dalke, Geivet, Fukuda, Wright. Committee members absent: Borges

2. **Additions to and approval of the agenda.** The agenda was approved. (Loeffler /Camp); approved unanimously - Ayes – Stephens, Camp, Erickson, Loeffler, Tantau; Nays – none; Absent – Borba

3. **Approval of the July 16, 2018 meeting minutes.** The minutes were approved. (Borba/Camp); approved unanimously - Ayes – Stephens, Borba, Camp, Loeffler, Tantau; Nays – none; Absent – none

4. **Public Comment.** CEO Phillips announced that a farewell luncheon was being held in honor of David Murillo, the USBR’s outgoing Regional Director for the Mid-Pacific Region following the meeting.

5. **Chief Operating Officer’s Report.**
   
   A. **Update on Capacity Correction Project.** COO DeFlitch gave an update on the Capacity Correction project as outlined in the agenda report. A preferred project alternative selection by the Board will be done at the Board of Directors’ meeting being held on October 25, 2018.
   
   B. **Review and provide direction on recruitment for Senior Engineer Position.** COO DeFlitch reviewed and asked for direction on recruitment for the Senior Engineer Position. The Executive Committee concurred with COO DeFlitch’s suggestion to seek candidates through California Employers Association (CEA) since recruitment through ad placement services has not been productive.

6. **Government Affairs Manager’s Report.**
   
   A. **Update on Proposition 3.** GAM Biering gave an update on Proposition 3 as outlined in the agenda report. Ms. Biering also reported that a Proposition 3 media event will be held at the Friant Dam on September 20, 2018. Friant will continue to provide educational information about Proposition 3.
   
   B. **Update on state and federal legislation, SWRCB activities.** GAM Biering gave an update on current state legislation noting that the Governor has until September 30, 2018 to pass or veto bills. On the federal side, it was noted that S 3021 (America’s Water Infrastructure Action of 2018 / WRDA) did pass the Senate. The Bill includes authorization for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects and activities, funding for clean drinking water projects, energy/hydropower provisions and reauthorizes WIFIA.

   Eggs and Issues breakfasts are currently being organized for October 2018 and will seek assistance from the membership on extending invitations.

   Preparations are beginning to be developed for Friant’s annual meeting which will be held in Bakersfield in 2019.
Ms. Biering asked for and received voice approval to submit a joint comment letter with the Family Farm Alliance as well as a stand-alone letter for a federal rulemaking process that National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) are undertaking related to how both agencies implement the Federal Endangered Species Act. The letters’ express support for moving NMFS’ ESA responsibilities for anadromous fish to FWS.

CLOSED SESSION

7. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION [Government Code section 54956.9(d)(1)] – Name of matter: NRDC v. Murillo, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California (Sacramento Division), Case No. 88-cv-1658-JAM-GGH.

8. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED LITIGATION: Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(d)(2): 2 potential matters.

9. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL—INITIATION OF LITIGATION [Government Code section 54956.9(d)(4)]—Initiation of Litigation: 2 potential cases.

10. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT [Government Code section 54957(b)]
Title: Special Counsel

11. Announce reportable action taken during closed session as required by Government Code Section 54957.1. – No reportable action was taken during closed session.

12. 2019 General Member budget. CFO Willard presented the final draft 2019 General Member Budget which totaled $2,662,500. Subject to any comments provided, the Executive Committee approved the 2019 General Member Budget for consideration by the Finance Committee before final submittal to the Board of Directors. (Loeffler/Borba); approved unanimously - Ayes – Stephens, Borba, Camp, Loeffler, Tantau; Nays – none; Absent – none

13. Consideration of policy regarding reimbursement/compensation for Director attendance at FWA meetings and other Authority business. The Executive Committee approved a recommendation to draft a revised policy authorizing Director compensation or member agency reimbursement for meeting attendance and other FWA business up to $100 per day not to exceed 6 times a calendar month.

14. Director of Water Policy Report. (45 minutes)
A. Temperance Flat.
   i. Update on activities of the San Joaquin Valley Water Infrastructure Authority (SJVWIA). DWP Payne gave a brief update on current activities of the SJVWIA including completion of any outstanding business matters prior to handing off future responsibilities to a new JPA.
   ii. Update on MOA Group activities. DWP Payne gave a brief update on current activities of the MOA Group where the group reviewed and commented a newly developed JPA, the “Temperance Flat Reservoir Authority” at a meeting that was held on August 6, 2018.
   iii. Consideration of draft Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement and Bylaws for a new Joint Powers Authority to be known as the “Temperance Flat Reservoir Authority”. The EC considered a draft of a joint exercise of powers agreement that would establish a separate legal entity (JPA) and
proposed Bylaws which have been circulated among the proposed members and presented to the EC for consideration and direction. The EC directed staff to continue to work with the proposed members of the JPA and bring back a final version of the Agreement and Bylaws for Board approval.

15. General Counsel’s Report. GC Davis had no report.

16. Chief Executive Officer’s Report. CEO Phillips reminded the EC to respond as to their participation in the upcoming Board retreat.

17. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 12:18 p.m.
DATE: OCTOBER 15, 2018
TO: Executive Committee
THROUGH: Douglas DeFlitch, Chief Operating Officer
FROM: Janet Atkinson and Bill Swanson (Stantec)
SUBJECT: Friant-Kern Canal Subsidence Correction Project

SUMMARY:
The FKC Subsidence Correction Project (Project) is to correct the conveyance capacity problems caused by subsidence and original project design deficiency from MP 88 (Fifth Avenue Check) to MP119 (Lake Woollomes Check). We are working to correct this problem by studying a range of alternatives and taking such necessary actions that will allow for the expeditious design and construction of the Project. To expedite progress, the Project will include Immediate Repair Work between MP 103.6 and MP 107.4 to allow the canal to convey the greatest amount possible while the planning, design and construction of the long-term solution is completed.

The major elements of the work include environmental compliance, alternative analyses, and feasibility level investigations, engineering design, permitting, bidding and construction management services. Several alternatives to mitigate the capacity problem have been identified, including raising the canal lining, installing a pinch point pumping plant at approximate MP 109, and other alternatives to be developed during the analyses to be conducted. It is envisioned that the work will be executed through 3 separate Task Orders under this contract, with Task Order No. 1 consisting of the following: Project management through June 2019; portions of the formulate and evaluate alternatives task; portions of environmental compliance to support the Immediate Repair Work and environmental clearances for geotechnical investigations; and portions of the engineering and design task through a 30 percent level of design.

Schedule
The table below presents the Board- approved milestone schedule for key activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services Contract with Stantec</td>
<td>6/28/18 (completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Project Alternative Selection by Board</td>
<td>10/25/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Construction on Immediate Repair Area</td>
<td>12/3/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contractor Selection and Approval of Environmental Document</td>
<td>6/3/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBSIDENCE CORRECTION UPDATE: Work was started on June 28, 2018 upon the approval of a professional services contract with Stantec along with Task Order No. 1. The project goal is to bring forth a recommended alternative to the October 25, 2018 BOD meeting. Stantec has done extensive development and analyses of project alternatives as well as made significant progress on all critical items included in Task Order 1.
The Stantec team hosted Alternatives Workshop #2, which was attended by several Friant Division contractors, Friant Water Authority Directors, and representatives from the Bureau of Reclamation to discuss the Alternatives Formulation for the Friant-Kern Canal (FKC) Subsidence Correction Project. Approximately 30 persons attended. The PowerPoint Presentation from the workshop is included as an attachment to this project update. From the robust discussion during the workshop, several key points emerged:

1. Alternative 1 – Canal Enlargement and Alternatives 5A/5B – Parallel Bypass from Tule to White River/Parallel Bypass from Tule to Woollomes should be investigated further, and the other alternatives should not be considered.
2. Alternatives that include pumping stations are not preferred alternatives and should be dropped from further consideration.
3. Bypass alternatives along a new alignment should be dropped from further consideration.
4. Alternative 1 will require rights-of-way (ROW) for full implementation. Workshop participants expressed interest in defining how much capacity can be provided while still staying within the existing ROW. Stantec was asked to develop an approach to evaluate this through project phasing. Additionally, discussion with Reclamation should commence to identify requirements and procedures and schedule implications associated with ROW acquisition.
5. Preliminary alternative analysis has revealed that all alternatives would require a similar level of NEPA/CEQA, Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Section 106 (cultural and historic resource) compliance.
6. Schedule is critically important, and several issues have been identified that have the potential to negatively impact the desired schedule. Workshop participants requested that a schedule be developed based on known conditions and requirements from the work performed to date. Additional discussion on schedule risks are identified later in this update.
7. A turnout working group should be established to focus specifically on how the project will improve/impact water delivery at district turnouts.
8. Stantec is continuing evaluation of preliminary alternatives with future projected subsidence included. The results of this analysis are not expected to significantly change the ranking of preliminary alternatives presented in the workshop.

In addition to Alternatives Workshop #2, identified below are several key accomplishments in the past month.

- Continued to further develop project alternatives, including conducting hydraulic analyses, establishing conceptual alignments for bypass canal alternatives, developing typical canal sections, pumping plant requirements and layout, and conducting earthwork modeling to determine earthwork quantities.
- Prepared alternative analysis screening tool.
- Issued the Admin Draft Immediate Repair Area Feasibility Report to Reclamation and Friant for review.
- Issued draft Design Criteria Technical memorandum to Friant to review.
- Prepared draft engineering submittal for the Immediate Repair Area and issued to Friant for review.
- Conducted Phase 1 geotechnical investigation field work and prepared geotechnical Work Plan for the Phase 2 investigations.
- Completed environmental surveys/reports for the Immediate Repair Area and Phase 2 geotechnical investigations and submitted to Reclamation.
Identifying and mitigating schedule risk is a high priority item. As Stantec has worked to develop alternatives, environmental constraints and a better understanding of the work required, several items have been identified that constitute significant risks to schedule. The following describes items that present schedule risk and our initial mitigation approach.

1. **Rights-of-Way.** All preliminary alternatives will require ROW, ranging from about 200 acres to 700 acres. As the FKC is a federally owned facility, all ROW acquisition will need to follow Reclamation real estate requirements and procedures. Our mitigation approach is to initiate discussions with Reclamation to define the real estate requirements and process, while identifying potential strategies for schedule acceleration (i.e. Friant obtain ROW and transfer to Reclamation). In addition, we plan to evaluate Alternative 1 – Canal Enlargement in a phased manner to identify what capacity increase can be accomplished within the existing ROW. We also will improve the accuracy of the currently known ROW information.

2. **Historic/cultural resources.** The existing FKC and many bridges are eligible as historic features. The current programmatic agreement for cultural resources (PA) between Reclamation and SHPO only covers from embankment toe to toe and may have severely limited applicability to a major construction project. Reclamation is conducting a historic survey of the entire FKC with an estimated completion date of December 2018. Reclamation will then initiate discussions with SHPO to identify mitigation actions that would be applicable to any future project on the FKC. We would use the results of this in project definition and NEPA/CEQA process. In addition, cultural resources evaluation will be required on lands outside the existing embankment toes as well as any new ROWs to be obtained. We will initiate cultural resources investigations as soon as the project is sufficiently defined.

3. **Biological resources.** Our preliminary assessment is that potential San Joaquin Kit Fox (SJKF) habitat may be present along the embankments of the FKC. Our mitigation is to initiate discussions with the Reclamation and the USFWS to identify how habitat will be determined and what mitigation measures may be available that can minimize schedule impacts. We will also investigate the availability of mitigation banks for SJKF within the region.

4. **NEPA/CEQA.** Our initial assessment is that an 18-month schedule may be required to complete NEPA/CEQA (EA-FONSI/Mitigated NegDec) and associated cultural resources and ESA consultations described in items 2 and 3 above. We are identifying intermediate milestones in the NEPA/CEQA process in advance of a detailed discussion with Reclamation. Our objective is to prepare information that will allow for acceleration of intermediate milestones to the greatest extent possible.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** NONE, THIS IS A STATUS REPORT

**SUGGESTED MOTION:** NONE

**BUDGET IMPACT:** NONE

**ATTACHMENTS:** POWERPOINT PRESENTATION EXCERPT FROM THE OCTOBER 10TH ALTERNATIVES WORKSHOP #2
Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Workshop Goals and Objectives
3. Work Completed Since Workshop #1
4. Immediate Repairs Status
5. Alternatives Development
6. Alternatives Evaluation and Comparison
7. Risk Management
8. Review Action Items
Introductions
Driving requires your full attention. You can take charge of eliminating distractions to focus on the road ahead. Here are the American Automobile Association’s (AAA) top 10 tips to avoid distractions while driving:

#1 – Take care of any activity that might pull your attention away from driving before or after the trip.
#2 – If another activity demands your attention, pull over somewhere safe to address it.
#3 – If you have passengers, enlist their help so you can focus on driving safely.
#4 – Put aside your electronic distractions. Do not use cell phones while driving. Calls, texting, email functions, etc. should not happen when you are behind the wheel.
#5 – Secure children and pets before getting underway. If they need attention, pull of the road safely to care for them.

#6 – Snack smart. Eat snacks or meals before or after your trip – not while driving.
#7 – Finish dressing and personal grooming at home – before you get on the road.
#8 – Make adjustments before you get underway. Address vehicle systems like GPS, climate controls, and sound systems before hitting the road.
#9 – Store loose gear and possessions that could roll around in the car to keep from being tempted to reach for them while driving.
#10 – Fully focus on driving. Don’t let anything divert your attention; scan the road for pedestrians, cyclists, and other vehicles.
Workshop Objectives and Outcomes

• Receive input on preliminary alternatives

• Discuss alternatives evaluations and criteria

• Receive input on alternatives comparisons

• Identify key issues to discuss at October 25 Board Meeting
Friant-Kern Canal Capacity Correction

Restore conveyance capacity of the FKC resulting from an original design deficiency and subsequent land subsidence

- FKC Upper Reach Capacity Correction Project
- FKC Middle Reach Subsidence & Capacity Correction Project
  - Immediate Repairs Project
- FKC Lower Reach Capacity Correction Project
Work Completed Since Workshop #1

1. Friant completed a flow calibration test on August 29th, data is currently being evaluated.
2. Produced results for potential subsidence using a groundwater flow model.
3. Continued development of preliminary project alternatives, including typical canal sections, modeling for earthwork quantities, pumping plant, and cost estimating.
4. Advanced the HEC-RAS hydraulic model and conducted alternative analyses.
5. Conducted Phase 1 geotechnical investigation field work and prepared Geotechnical Work Plan Memo for the Phase 2 investigations.
7. Completed environmental surveys/reports and project descriptions for the Immediate Repair Area and Phase 2 geotechnical bores and submitted to Reclamation.
Immediate Repairs
Immediate Repairs
Recommended Alternative

- Install temporary 45 MIL RPL on the FKC existing earthen embankment
- Apply elastomeric coating to the underside of 5 bridges and support systems
- Repair or replace broken supports on utilities crossings attached to impacted bridges
- Mud-jacking – assume 8 applications
Status

• Admin Draft Feasibility Study
  • Under Review

• Draft Engineering Submittal (Plans and Specifications)
  • Under Review

• Tulare County Memorandum of Understanding
  • In Draft Form

• NEPA Environmental Compliance Document
  • In Draft Form
Alternatives Development
Alternatives Development and Evaluation

1. **Identify and Screen Measures**
   - Measures are individual actions that contribute to increased capacity
     - Canal raise
     - Canal widen
     - Pumping plant
     - Bridge modification
     - New canal

2. **Formulate Alternatives Using Retained Measures**
   - Alternatives based on a primary action
     - Modify Canal
     - Pumping Plant
     - By-Pass Canal
   - Other measures added for completeness

3. **Evaluate and Compare Alternatives**
   - Evaluations and comparisons based on defined criteria
     - Constructability
     - Cost
     - Operations
     - Schedule
     - Environmental

Workshop #1

Workshop #2
Design Criteria

Flow Capacity and Freeboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canal Mile Post (MP)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Maximum Flow (cfs)</th>
<th>Max Flow Freeboard (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88.00 to 95.67</td>
<td>5th Avenue to Tule</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.67 to 112.90</td>
<td>Tule to White River</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.90 to 128.69</td>
<td>White River to Poso</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.69 to 151.60</td>
<td>Poso to Kern</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max Flow Freeboard: For water deliveries over a long period of time (i.e. Class 2 water) with no intention of evacuating the excess flows from the canal.

Flood Freeboard: Reduced freeboard allowed for short term flood flows that enter the canal from cross drainage and can be evacuated from canal using wasteways.

Subsidence

- CURRENT DESIGNS BASED ON EXISTING LAND SURFACE
- FUTURE SUBSIDENCE EVALUATIONS IN PROGRESS
Current Structural Configuration of FKC

Current Condition

Subsidence Capacity Reach

Generally Uniform Settlement ~3'
Friant-Kern Canal Profile

- Towill Bridge Soffits
- Towill TOL
- Towill Calc. Invert
- Trial TOL
- Trial HGL - Max Flow
- Trial Invert
## Initial Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Alternative</th>
<th>Widen and/or Raise Portions of Existing Canal</th>
<th>Pumping Plant</th>
<th>New Canal</th>
<th>Modify Turnouts</th>
<th>Modified or New Bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Enlarge Canal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Pump Station at MP 109</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Pump to Woollomes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A: Bypass – Tule to White River</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B: Bypass – Tule to Woollomes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A: Parallel Bypass – Tule to White River</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B: Parallel Bypass – Tule to Woollomes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FKC Existing Condition
Alternative 1
Baseline Canal Enlargement

LEGEND

- Existing Canal --- Existing Condition
- Baseline Canal Enlargement

Middle Reach
Alternative 1
Baseline Canal Enlargement
Middle Reach Subsidence Section

LEGEND
- Existing Canal --- Existing Condition
- Baseline Canal Enlargement
- Existing Canal with Operational Capacity Increased due to Subsidence and PS drawdown
- Bypass Canal to Woolomes PS
- Maintain Deliveries in Old Canal -- Use with bypass alternatives
- Bypass Canal
- Lining Raise
Alternative 2
MP 109 Pump Station

LEGEND
- Existing Canal — Existing Condition
- Baseline Canal Enlargement
- Existing Canal with Operational Capacity Increased due to Subsidence and PS drawdown
- Bypass Canal to Woollomes PS
- Maintain Deliveries in Old Canal — Use with bypass alternatives
- Bypass Canal
- Lining Raise

Alternative Development

Alt 2 - Pump Station at MP 109

4500 cfs
Check

Existing Canal will be used as much as possible - some turnout levels may need attention

Tule to MP 98.8
Lining Raise

Emerg. Reservoir

Bypass

Check

3500 cfs

Lake Woollomes

Check
Alternative 2 – MP 109 Pump Station Site Plan
Alternative 2 – MP 109 Pump Station Site Plan

~400 acre Emergency Reservoir
Alternative 2 – MP 109 Pump Station Cross Section
Alternative 3
Woollomes Pump Station

LEGEND
- Existing Canal — Existing Condition
- Baseline Canal Enlargement
- Existing Canal with Operational Capacity Increased due to Subsidence and PS drawdown
- Bypass Canal to Woollomes PS
- Maintain Deliveries in Old Canal — Use with bypass alternatives
- Bypass Canal
- Lining Raise

Existing Canal will be used as much as possible - some lining raise - turnout levels may need attention.
Alternative 3
Woollomes Pump Station Site Plan
Alternative 3
Woollomes Pump Station Site Plan

~ 350 acre Emergency Reservoir
Alternative 4A
Bypass – Tule to White River

LEGEND
- Existing Canal — Existing Condition
- Baseline Canal Enlargement
- Existing Canal with Operational Capacity Increased due to Subsidence and PS drawdown
- Bypass Canal to Woollomes PS
- Maintain Deliveries in Old Canal — Use with bypass alternatives
- Bypass Canal
- Lining Raise

**Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>5th Avenue</th>
<th>Canal Pool</th>
<th>Tule River</th>
<th>Canal Pool</th>
<th>Deer Creek</th>
<th>Canal Pool</th>
<th>White River</th>
<th>Canal Pool</th>
<th>Woollomes Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Existing Condition

Check

- 4000 cfs
- 3500 cfs
- 3000 cfs
- 4000 cfs
- 3000 cfs
- 3000 cfs (Limited to 1700 cfs)
- 3500 cfs

Lake Woollomes

Alt 4A - Bypass Canal from Tule to White River

Check

- 4000 cfs
- 4000 cfs

Check

Deliveries

Check

Maintain Deliveries in Old Canal

Check

- 3500 cfs

Lake Woollomes
Alternative 4B
Bypass – Tule to Woollomes

LEGEND

Existing Canal — Existing Condition
Baseline Canal Enlargement
Existing Canal with Operational Capacity Increased due to Subsidence and PS drawdown
Bypass Canal to Woollomes PS
Maintain Deliveries in Old Canal — Use with bypass alternatives
Bypass Canal
Lining Raise

Alt 4B - Bypass Canal from Tule to Woollomes

4000 cfs

Check

4000 cfs

Check

4000 cfs

Check

3500 cfs

Check

Lake Woollomes

3500 cfs

Check

Lake Woollomes
Bypass Typical Canal Section

Bypass Section In Cut

Bypass Section In Fill
Alternative 5A
Parallel Bypass Canal
Tule to White River
Alternative 5B
Parallel Bypass Canal
Tule to Woollomes

LEGEND
- Existing Canal — Existing Condition
- Baseline Canal Enlargement
- Existing Canal with Operational Capacity Increased due to Subsidence and PS drawdown
- Bypass Canal to Woollomes PS
- Maintain Deliveries in Old Canal — Use with bypass alternatives
- Bypass Canal
- Lining Raise

**Alternative 5B - Parallel Bypass from Tule to Woollomes**

- Deliveries
  - 4000 cfs
  - 4000 cfs
  - 3500 cfs
- Lake Woollomes

- Deliveries
  - 3500 cfs
  - 3500 cfs
  - 3500 cfs
- Lake Woollomes

Deliveries
- 4500
- Maintain Deliveries in Old Canal
- Check

Check
- 3500 cfs
- 3000 cfs
- 2900 cfs

Check
- 4000 cfs
- 3000 cfs
- 3000 cfs

Check
- 4000 cfs
- 4000 cfs
- 4000 cfs

Check
- 2500 cfs
Parallel Bypass Typical Canal Section

Alternatives
Development

Existing Canal Section
Maintain Deliveries

Parallel Canal Section
# Construction Cost Estimating Approach

## Opinion of Probable Construction Costs (OPCC)

- Class 4 cost estimate per AACE guidelines.
- Accuracy range = -25% to + 25%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM3</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction/Mobilization/Temporary Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Enlargement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$169,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bypass Canal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnouts</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station and Reservoir</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Allowances</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Field Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$233,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Contract Cost</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Purchase ($25k/acre)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mitigation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$16,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Permitting/Design/Construction Management</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$23,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Administrative</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$4,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Non-Contract Cost**                |         | **$49,900,000**     |
| **Total Construction Cost**               |         | **$283,400,000**    |
## Summary of Preliminary Numerical Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Construction Cost ($M)</th>
<th>Annual OM&amp;R Cost</th>
<th>Material Balance</th>
<th>Required Land (acres)</th>
<th>Stream Crossings</th>
<th>Potential Kit Fox Habitat (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Canal Enlargement</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>-1,550</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – MP 109 Pump Station</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>-530</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Woollomes Pump Station</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>5,090</td>
<td>+950</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A – Bypass Tule to White River</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>+1,750</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B – Bypass Tule to Woollomes</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>+2,410</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A – Parallel Bypass Tule to White River</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>4,335</td>
<td>balanced</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B – Parallel Bypass Tule to Woollomes</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>balanced</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternatives Evaluation and Comparison
Alternatives Evaluation and Comparison Approach

**Evaluation Criteria**

Define criteria and metrics and apply to each alternative.

**Criteria**

1. Constructability
2. Operational Requirements and Flexibility
3. Cost
4. Construction Schedule
5. Environmental / Permitting

**Metrics for Each Criterion**

- Quantitative or qualitative
- Normalized for alternatives

**Alternatives Scoring**

Apply relative weights to criteria based on selection priority.

**Possible Selection Priorities**

1. Schedule
2. Cost
3. Durability

**Weighting**

- Define weights for each selection priority

**Alternatives Ranking**
Alternatives Scoring

Evaluation Criteria

Each criterion scored on scale of 1 to 5

- Qualitative criteria – scores based on judgement
- Numerical criteria – normalized to scale
## Constructability

*Ability to operate and maintain FKC during construction and appurtenances needed to construct the project*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Criterion</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complexity to maintain water deliveries during construction</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to conduct operation and maintenance during construction</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary bypasses and tie-ins needed to construct the work</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of dewatering of deep excavations</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow material</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated surplus material</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Operational Requirements and Flexibility

*FWA ability to operate and maintain project*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Criterion</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional O&amp;M requirements and expertise of FWA staff</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations of district turnouts</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to accommodate power outages</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost

*Addresses capital and annual costs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Criterion</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction cost</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contract cost</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M cost</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement cost</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule

*How long it will take to build the project and items that could affect the timeline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Criterion</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time to construction start</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction duration</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time until benefits are realized</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to phase construction</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Risk</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Compliance and Permitting

Addresses complexity, cost, and schedule risk to complete NEPA/CEQA documentation and obtain necessary permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Criterion</th>
<th>Score Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of required environmental compliance</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stream crossings</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bridges</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of modified existing embankment</td>
<td>Numeric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Environmental Constraints

## Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Constraint</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Potential Kit Fox Habitat (miles)</em></td>
<td>66 Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CWA Section 404 – river crossings</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>RWQCB 401 – river crossings</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CDFW 1600 – river crossings</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use &amp; Agricultural Resources</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation &amp; Circulation</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Alternatives Scoring Preliminary Results

#### I. Constructability

| ID | Alternative Name                          | Alternative Type | Complexity to maintain water deliveries during construction | Ability to O&M canal during construction | Temporary bypasses and tie-ins needed to construct the work | Borrow Material | Estimated Surplus | Additional O&M requirements and expertise of FWA staff | Operations of individual district agencies | Ability to accommodate power budgets | Construction cost | Non-contract cost | Annual O&M Cost | Replacement cost | Time to start construction | Construction duration | Time until benefits realized | Potential to phase construction | Schedule Risk | Complexity of required environmental compliance | Number of stream crossings | Number of bridge | Length of modified existing embankment (miles) | Constructability | Operational Requirements and Flexibility | Cost | Schedule | Environmental Compliance and Permitting | Average Scores |
|----|------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 1  | Canal Enlargement                        | G                | Q                            | Q                                       | N                                            | Q              | Q                | N                                                    | Q                                         | Q                                      | Q              | Q              | Q              | Q              | Q                      | Q                        | Q                           | Q                             | Q              | Q                                | Q              | Q              | Q                             | Q              |
| 2  | Pump Station at MP 109                   | PS               | 2.0                          | 2.0                                     | 1.2                                          | 4.0            | 1.5              | 3.4                                                   | 2.0                                       | 4.0                                   | 2.0            | 5.0            | 3.7            | 1.0            | 1.0                    | 2.1                       | 2.0                         | 1.0                           | 1.0            | 5.0                            | 5.0            | 5.0            | 3.3                           | 1.0            |
| 3  | Woolomes Pump Station                    | PS               | 3.0                          | 3.0                                     | 3.3                                          | 1.0            | 5.0              | 2.5                                                   | 1.0                                       | 3.0                                   | 1.0            | 1.0            | 1.0            | 1.0            | 2.0                    | 1.2                       | 1.0                         | 1.0                           | 1.0            | 3.0                            | 1.4            | 3.0            | 1.7                           | 1.7            |
| 4A | Bypass Canal: Tule River to White River  | G                | 4.0                          | 4.0                                     | 4.5                                          | 4.0            | 5.0              | 2.5                                                   | 4.0                                       | 2.0                                   | 5.0            | 4.2            | 3.1            | 5.0            | 5.0                    | 3.7                       | 2.2                         | 3.0                           | 1.0            | 3.0                            | 3.4            | 4.0            | 3.9                           | 4.3            |
| 4B | Bypass Canal: Tule River to Woollomes    | G                | 5.0                          | 5.0                                     | 5.0                                          | 5.0            | 5.0              | 1.0                                                   | 3.0                                       | 1.0                                   | 1.0            | 1.0            | 1.0            | 1.0            | 1.0                    | 1.0                       | 1.0                         | 1.0                           | 1.0            | 1.0                            | 1.0            | 1.0            | 1.0                           | 1.6            |
| 5A | Parallel Canal: Tule River to White River| G                | 4.0                          | 4.0                                     | 4.2                                          | 3.0            | 5.0              | 3.4                                                   | 4.0                                       | 2.0                                   | 5.0            | 3.7            | 3.9            | 5.0            | 5.0                    | 3.7                       | 3.7                         | 1.0                           | 1.0            | 5.0                            | 3.4            | 2.5            | 3.9                           | 4.4            |
| 5B | Parallel Canal: Tule River to Woollomes  | G                | 5.0                          | 5.0                                     | 4.4                                          | 4.0            | 5.0              | 3.4                                                   | 3.0                                       | 3.0                                   | 5.0            | 3.1            | 3.4            | 5.0            | 5.0                    | 3.2                       | 4.0                         | 1.0                           | 1.0            | 5.0                            | 1.0            | 3.0            | 4.5                           | 2.4            |

#### II. Operational Requirements and Flexibility

- Additional O&M requirements and expertise of FWA staff
- Operations of individual district agencies
- Ability to accommodate power budgets

#### III. Cost

- Construction cost
- Non-contract cost
- Annual O&M Cost
- Replacement cost

#### IV. Schedule

- Time to start construction
- Construction duration
- Time until benefits realized
- Potential to phase construction

#### V. Environmental Compliance and Permitting

- Complexity of required environmental compliance
- Number of stream crossings
- Number of bridge
- Length of modified existing embankment (miles)

**Average Scores**

- Constructability
- Operational Requirements and Flexibility
- Cost
- Schedule
- Environmental Compliance and Permitting

**Scores**

- 1 Canal Enlargement: 2.3, 4.8, 4.8, 2.6
- 2 Pump Station at MP 109: 2.3, 2.7, 2.7, 2.9
- 3 Woolomes Pump Station: 3.0, 2.0, 1.9, 1.7
- 4A Bypass Canal: Tule River to White River: 3.9, 3.7, 4.3, 2.0
- 4B Bypass Canal: Tule River to Woollomes: 4.3, 3.0, 3.2, 1.0
- 5A Parallel Canal: Tule River to White River: 3.9, 3.7, 4.4, 2.5
- 5B Parallel Canal: Tule River to Woollomes: 4.5, 3.7, 4.1, 2.4
Alternatives Ranking
Alternatives Ranking Through Criteria Weighting Based on Selection Priority

**Unweighted**
All criteria of equal importance

**Schedule**
Prioritize alternates with shorter schedule

**Cost**
Prioritize alternates with lower cost

**Durability – In progress**
Requires design and operations based on subsidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Alternative Name</th>
<th>Constructability</th>
<th>Operational Requirements and Flexibility</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Environmental Compliance and Permitting</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Alternative Ranking</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Alternative Ranking</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Alternative Ranking</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Alternative Ranking</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Alternative Ranking</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Alternative Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canal Enlargement</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pump Station at MP 109</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Woollomes Pump Station</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Bypass Canal: Tule River to White River</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Bypass Canal: Tule River to Woollomes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Parallel Canal: Tule River to White River</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Parallel Canal: Tule River to Woollomes</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sensitivity to Future Subsidence for Durability

- Thomas Harder applied the Tule Sub-Basin groundwater model
  - Includes subsidence module

- Four scenarios of groundwater pumping “ramp down” by 2040
  - Include variable hydrological conditions

- Simulated a 50 year period
  - 20 years to achieve SGMA compliance by 2040
  - 30 additional years with residual subsidence to 2070
Groundwater Pumping Assumptions in Subsidence Scenarios

Hydrology Assumptions
- 50 years average

Current

SGMA

Scenario 2

Scenario 1

Scenario 3

Scenario 4

Hydrology Assumptions
- 18 years dry
- 12 years wet
- 20 years average
Subsidence Criteria

Group 1
Additional 2 ft

Group 2
Additional 4 ft

Group 3
Additional 8 ft

Group 4
Additional 12 ft

RECOMMENDED
Preliminary Durability Findings

Applied Group 3 Subsidence to Alternative 1 – Modify Canal

• 1.4 mcy additional embankment material – all additional borrow
• May not fit in ROW – more ROW will be needed
• Increases embankment cost by about $25M
• Additional lining cost not yet calculated
• Trapezoidal bridge section can accommodate pressure flow

Other Alternatives
• All canal options will require additional embankment material
• Pumping plants will be used more frequently as gravity flow capacity will decrease
Canal Enlargement Phasing To Accommodate Subsidence
Trapezoidal Bridge
Risk Management and Action Items
Risks to Schedule

ROW will be needed for most alternatives
   Received CAD files from Reclamation with many disclaimers
   Typically address ROW specifics in final design
   May be possible to manage first stage of construction within ROW
   Construction easements may still be needed
   Acquisition and permitting can affect schedule

Constructability
   • Linear construction project will require about 3 million cubic yards
   • Sequencing for materials and hauling affects cost and permitting
Risks to Schedule

Reclamation coordination and review

• Engineering, environmental, feasibility review and approval

Environmental

• Biological Resources
  ◦ New BO for project to address potential Kit Fox habitat (burrows)
  ◦ Current BO only covers O&M activities

• Cultural Resources
  ◦ Reclamation collecting additional data – December 2018
  ◦ SHPO will review after Reclamation reviews and submits
DATE: October 15, 2018

TO: Executive Committee

FROM: Toni Marie, Executive Secretary

SUBJECT: 2019 Executive Committee Meeting Dates

SUMMARY:

This is the time of year that Committee and Board meeting dates are adopted for the coming year through their respective Committees and Boards. This year, the EC will adopt a draft set of dates for 2019 in anticipation that the November EC meeting might be canceled due to the scheduled Board Retreat. The dates will remain in draft form until after the Board Retreat as the Board may decide to change the dates and or times to better reflect their needs going forward. A final set of dates will be issued with the 2019 Board of Directors meeting dates at Friant’s December Board meeting.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

It is recommended that the EC adopt the dates in draft form as outlined in the attached memo understanding that the dates and times may be updated through further action at the Board Retreat.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

That the EC adopts the dates in draft form where they will be formalized following the Board Retreat.

BUDGET IMPACT:

There is no budget impact.

ATTACHMENTS: MEMO OUTLINING THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING DATES FOR 2019
DATE: SEPTEMBER 2018
TO: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FROM: TONI MARIE, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
SUBJECT: DRAFT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING DATES FOR 2019

The Executive Committee meets the Monday before the 4th Thursday of the month (the week prior to the Board of Directors meeting) at 9:00 a.m. except as noted. Below is a schedule showing dates, times and locations for the coming year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>January 14</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>February 11</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville, President’s Day is on February 18th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>June 17</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>August 12</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>November 18</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dec Mtg</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>KDWCD Farmersville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change due to President’s Day on February 18th

Dates to Remember:
Mid-Pacific Regional Conference, January 23-25, Reno
Family Farm Alliance Conference, February 20-22, Reno
ACWA Spring Conference, May 7-10, Sacramento
ACWA Fall Conference, December 3-6, San Diego
November BOD will be combined with the December 13 BOD meeting
DATE: October 15, 2018
TO: Executive Committee
FROM: Alex Biering
SUBJECT: Government Affairs Manager’s Report

SUMMARY:
Update on Proposition 3; status of state and federal legislation; other updates related to communications.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
None; informational only.

SUGGESTED MOTION:
None; informational only.

DISCUSSION:
1. Proposition 3
   • Recent press and editorial endorsements (attached)
   • Letters to the editors – ongoing
   • Opinion pieces – week of 10/15
   • Survey results – week of 10/22


3. Communications Activities – Current activities intended to support awareness of Friant activities, growth of the Friant brand, and educational efforts:
   • Logo/branding rollout (web, letterhead, collateral, business cards)
   • eNewsletter
   • Media outreach
   • Public attitudes survey Phase I
   • News-style videos

4. Upcoming Events
   • 10/16 – Eggs & Issues in Bakersfield (Camp Family Tractor Museum)
   • 10/23 – Eggs & issues in Tulare (Salles Café)
   • 10/30 – Eggs & Issues in Madera (The Vineyard)
   • 11/16 – PPIC “Water Priorities for California’s Next Governor” event in Sacramento
BUDGET IMPACT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS:

Selected recent endorsements and articles on Prop. 3.
Water bond flowing with Valley solutions
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Proposition 3 is first water bond filled with funds to irrigate crops and clean drinking water in the Valley

By Reggie Ellis
@Reggie_SGN

TULARE COUNTY – This November’s election will, for the first time, ask Californians to put their money where their mouth is. After decades of watching food appear at the grocery store, in restaurants and at mini marts, voters statewide will finally have to weigh the price tag of growing food and the price of poverty for those who pick it.

On Nov. 6, California voters will have to think about where the majority of their food comes from when they decide
Prop. 3 will provide $750 million to fix subsidence issues caused by overpumping during the drought. Near the Tulare County, Kern County border, bridges crossing the Friant-Kern Canal have sunk 3 feet in as many years. Submitted photo.

To vote yes or no on Proposition 3. Titled the Water Supply and Water Quality act of 2018, Prop. 3 is the first in a never-ending stream of water bonds to tackle major issues unique to the Central Valley. If passed, Prop. 3 would make available $8.9 billion in general obligation bonds to fund projects for water supply and quality, watershed restoration, fish and wildlife protection, sustainable groundwater management and repair of existing dams and canals. More importantly, the bond would provide $750 million specifically to repair the primary canal conveying water to 15,000 farms and subsidizing supply for several cities along the Valley’s eastside.

At the height of the drought in 2014 and 2015, FWA did not have enough surface water behind the dam to meet the needs of its members, forcing cities, water districts and farms to rely heavily on pumping water out of the ground.

Alex Biering, communications director for FWA, said the pumping left a void between the groundwater and the land on top causing the land to sink, a problem known as subsidence. Biering said the problem was most pronounced in the Deer Creek region between Terra Bella and Pixley. At one point, the canal dropped five inches in five months, illustrated by canal water almost lapping up against the bottom of a bridge on Avenue 96. This is a huge obstacle for the gravity-fed canal because FWA must slow the flow of water down the canal to ensure the water doesn’t overflow onto the banks. The more than 3 foot drop in as many years reduced the flow of the canal by an average of 60% from a max capacity of 4,000 cfs (cubic feet per second) to 1,700 cfs, effectively cutting off supply to the lower third of the canal’s water users.

“Proposition 3 includes $750 million to repair or improve water conveyance infrastructure in the valley, $750 million for water and wastewater treatment for lower-income communities, and $640 million for projects to implement California’s groundwater regulation,” said Jason Phillips, CEO for FWA. “Especially for the valley’s Eastside, these three issues are interrelated. The people who live and work in our communities need a reliable water supply to continue supporting our agricultural economy; at home, they need water that is safe for their families to drink, and many rely on groundwater.”

The $750 million for disadvantaged communities allocates $250 million for wastewater treatment improvements and $500 million for safe drinking water projects. This is also an issue effecting Valley residents at a much higher rate than the rest of the state. Of the 2800 violations of drinking water standards across the state in 2017, most occurred in the Central Valley and the Central Coast. There were more than 815 violations in Kern County, 413 in Tulare, 328 in Fresno and 282 in Monterey. Tulare County had 124 violations for nitrates alone, more than double the nearest county, Kern County, with 59 violations. These included small water companies in every corner of the county including the Soult’s Mutual Water Company outside of Tulare, Lemon Cove Water Company, East Orosi Community Service District, and Teapot Dome Water Company near Porterville.

The two most prevalent contaminants found in California drinking water are nitrates and arsenic. Nitrite changes the normal form of hemoglobin, which carries oxygen in the blood to the rest of the body, into a form called methemoglobin that cannot carry oxygen. At high enough concentrations nitrate can result in a temporary blood disorder in infants called “blue baby syndrome.” In severe, untreated cases, brain damage and eventually death can result from suffocation due to lack of oxygen, according to the National Institute for Health. Drinking water with high levels of arsenic can cause diabetes, cancer, as well as heart, lung, liver, immune, nervous or reproductive system disorders.

The bond has been opposed by the San Diego Union-Tribune and San Francisco Chronicle because it was not crafted by impartial lawmakers or citizen committees. Those statements would be true if Valley lawmakers had an equal seat at the table on which their constituents provide produce. Nearly every non-partisan, local government official that Tulare County has elected to represent them are in favor of the bond because, for the first time in recent memory, there is finally something on the ballot that directly benefits Tulare County rather than something local taxpayers will have to deal with that was decided in Southern California and the Bay Area. The bond has...
been endorsed by the Dinuba, Exeter, Farmersville, Lindsay, Tulare, Visalia and Woodlake city councils, as well as the Tulare County Board of Supervisors. It has also been endorsed by the Lindmore, Lindsay-Strathmore, Porterville, and Tulare irrigation districts, who are elected by their constituents and are residents of Tulare County. In their resolutions of support for the bond, Exeter, Farmersville, Lindsay, Woodlake, and Dinuba all cited the implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act as a major financial concern as the deadline draws closer for local Groundwater Sustainability Agencies to submit plans to solve the overdrafted Kaweah Basin. Prop. 3 will provide those cities with $640 million fund to help with that implementation, the first of its kind in the history of the state!

The Legislative Analysts Office (LAO) estimates the bonds will increase the state’s annual budget by $430 million for the next 40 years to pay off the principal and interest on the bonds but it is also likely to save local governments in the Central Valley a few hundred million per year over the next few decades for needed water infrastructure improvements. Water districts, cities and counties already spend about $25 billion each year on projects to provide clean drinking water to residents, irrigation water for farmers, and flood protection projects, according to the LAO.

Opponents also argue that the subsidence was caused by over pumping from the aquifers by local farmers who then should foot the bill for repairs. Except that farmers aren’t the only ones pumping out of the ground. With the exception of Fresno, Orange Cove and Lindsay, cities in the Central Valley rely exclusively on groundwater to fill bathtubs and flush toilets for 4 million people residing here.

Many of those residents also depend on agriculture for their livelihoods. In its letter of support, Tulare stated, “The City of Tulare, and much of the Central Valley, is dependent on agriculture and the availability of water, providing for jobs and economic activity.”

Another argument is that only 10% of the bond would go directly toward repairing contaminated water systems in disadvantaged communities. That’s still better than the zero dollars that state lawmakers put toward solving the problem in rural towns such as Lemon Cove, Lindsay, Toulit, and Orosi when they failed to approve SB 623 last fall and then failed to approve an identical budget trailer bill for the 2018-19 state budget this summer. Prop. 3 is supported by the Community Water Center, a Visalia-based non-profit that has tirelessly fought for the right of rural residents to have access to clean water.

Among those who attended the kickoff for the Yes on Prop. 3 campaign on Sept. 20 near Friant Dam were Farmersville Mayor Paul Boyer and Tulare County Senator Andy Vidak. Boyer has spent a career working to help rural communities in Tulare County find funding to repair aging water and sewer systems as a community services specialist with Self-Help Enterprises. Vidak, who co-authored SB 623, recently co-authored similar sister bills SB 844 and 845, to create a statewide fund for clean water projects in rural areas.

“This isn’t a partisan issue, it’s a human health issue, it’s an environmental issue and it’s a jobs issue,” Vidak told reporters at the event.

The Sierra Club condemns the bond because it would have negative environmental effects, yet $2.5 billion (more than a quarter of the bond) would be spent on improving watershed lands such as forests, meadows, wetlands, and areas near rivers. Another $1.4 billion will be set aside for fish and wildlife habitats, including increasing water flows to wetlands and rivers, and buying undeveloped land for preservation. That’s why 119 local, regional, state and national conservation and environmental justice organizations have endorsed the measure.

The opposition also points out that Californians seemingly approve a water bond every year. Since 2000, California voters have approved about $31 billion in water bonds. Of this amount, roughly one-third was still available to pay for new projects as of June 2018. Proposition 68 was just passed in June but woefully underfunded the need for water infrastructure with just $1.5 billion marked for water. Proposition 1, the last water supply and water quality bond, was passed in 2014 and provided $7.5 billion in funding. The League of California Cities estimates that nearly all of that bond will be allocated by the end of the current fiscal year.

There are some points of Prop. 3 on which even its opponents to the north and south can agree. It will provide $200 million for Sierra Nevada watershed restoration, $20 million for San Joaquin River Conservancy, $60 million for habitat and natural community conservation plans, $210 million for waterfowl and fish habitat restoration, $100 million for San Joaquin River fisheries, $100 million on screens to prevent fish from being drawn into intake pipes, and $50 million for post-fire watershed restoration.

That’s why agencies supporting the proposition also include Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District, Sequoia Riverfunds Trust, San Joaquin Valley Water Infrastructure Authority, and the South Valley Water Association. And despite its sister newspaper’s condemnation of the bond, the Fresno Bee supports Prop. 3.
Valley leaders are all but unanimous in their support of Prop. 3, a telling sign that the latest water bond will be the first to put the Valley first.
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Of the 11 propositions on the Nov. 6 ballot, we found Proposition 3, an $8.9 billion water bond, to be the closest call. California has no shortage of water needs, but voters approved a $4 billion parks, environment and water bond in June.

The case against Proposition 3: Unlike the June bond, which was placed on the ballot by the Legislature, this measure is a product of the initiative process. It was drafted and bankrolled by organizations that stand to benefit from its approval.

The case for Proposition 3: California's severe drought exposed widespread problems with the state's water supply that can only be fixed with investments in watershed protection, conservation, groundwater recharge and infrastructure repairs.

What tips the balance? Much of the money will be distributed as grants by state agencies, and Sonoma County Water Agency officials anticipate funding from several categories, including wastewater recycling, urban and agricultural water conservation, flood control and storm water management. Small water systems throughout the region also could qualify for funding.

It's a close call, but with the expectation of funding for local water projects, we say thumbs up to Proposition 3.

You can send a letter to the editor at letters@pressdemocrat.com
Bay Area would get millions for water

$8.9 billion ballot measure aims to fix systems in state

By Kurtis Alexander

Photos by Jessica Christian / The Chronicle
Water from the Mallard Reservoir moves through the final steps at the Ralph D. Bollman Water Treatment Plant in Concord.

Greg Dixon is crew leader at the Bollman Water Treatment Plant, where a new region-wide desalination plant might be built with funds from Proposition 3, if it is approved in November.

The biggest ticket item on California’s November ballot, tucked between the governor’s race and local elections, is $8.9 billion in bonds to help modernize California’s sprawling waterworks.

The measure, which was authored by a former state water director, would fund scores of projects, from shiny new desalination plants to upgrades of old dams and aqueducts to restoration of tainted watersheds, including San Francisco Bay.

The initiative, Proposition 3, comes as a historic drought has exposed the vulnerabilities of California’s water infrastructure, and it has become apparent that hotter, drier times ahead will test the adequacy of state supplies.

Among the proposition’s greatest outlays are $750 million to fix the 150-mile Friant-Kern irrigation canal in the San Joaquin Valley, $200 million for repair work at Oroville Dam and $250 million for yet-to-be-determined improvements to Bay Area water systems.

“We’re in a climate-driven situation now where droughts will be part of our future forever,” said Jerry Meral, former deputy director of the California Department of Water Resources and author of Prop. 3. “We’ve got to make our water supply more reliable, and this is going to help.”
While the numerous projects that would benefit from bond dollars are the measure’s chief selling point, they’re also the concern of critics who see the initiative as a boondoggle.

“There’s some good in here, but there’s too much bad stuff,” said Kathryn Phillips, director of the California chapter of the Sierra Club, which has come out against the proposition. “The money is going to benefit certain interests while it’s not going to benefit people, say, in San Diego or Redding or other places.”

Prop. 3 is among 11 state ballot measures facing voters next month, and it’s the costliest of four that seek to authorize billions in new borrowing.

Still, dozens of farming organizations, environmental groups and social justice advocates have joined with water agencies to support the bonds. They’ve put up nearly $5 million to campaign for the measure — compared to no reported contributions by opponents — and they say the initiative’s many expenditures are a necessary down payment on a more secure future.

Meral traveled extensively across the state to determine what to include in the measure, hearing from farmers who want more water to grow crops, cities looking for ways to survive the next dry spell and small towns seeking money to clean up dirty supplies. The measure reflects a mix of these interests.

No money would go to construction of new dams or the state’s proposed tunnel project in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, both of which have been controversial, in large part because of their high price tags.

The $250 million for Bay Area water infrastructure could revive a push for a new region-wide desalination plant. The money is earmarked for a group of eight agencies, known as the Bay Area Regional Reliability partnership, which is looking at ways to get more water.

A proposed facility in Contra Costa County, near the delta, that would turn brackish water into drinkable reserves is one of the projects up for consideration. One proposal would put the operation at the site of Contra Costa Water District’s Boll-man Water Treatment Plant.

The partnership is also looking to build new pipelines to link their water supplies, which would be necessary for sharing, whether it’s new desalinated water or other sources.

“Historically, I think the Bay Area water agencies had not been a model of cooperation,” said Steve Ritchie, assistant general manager for water enterprise for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. “But with time and with pressure building, these types of interconnections could be very useful.”

The measure also includes $200 million for flood protection in the Bay Area, adding to the $25 million a year that’s already being spent through the region’s voter-approved Measure AA.
The flood money, like much of Prop. 3 funding, would be given out in grants, in this case to those combatting floodwaters through such efforts as restoring wetlands.

“The scientists tell us the sooner we can get tidal marsh (projects) started, the better chance we have of keeping up with sea level rise,” said David Lewis, executive director of Save the Bay and a supporter of the proposition.

Another $100 million from the measure would go to protection of additional Bay Area watersheds.

The initiative also makes provisions for poorer communities in California, giving them priority for competitive funds and guaranteeing at least $750 million of investment in disadvantaged areas.

Prop. 3 comes on the heels of two other water-related ballot measures. In June, voters approved Proposition 68, a $4.1 billion bond that funded water projects as well as parks and land conservation. In 2014, voters approved Proposition 1, which committed $7.5 billion of state borrowing exclusively to water, including new dams and reservoirs.

Since the 1970s, more than a dozen propositions have helped fund water infrastructure. Bonds are commonly used by governments to pay for ventures they can’t immediately afford. They’re basically loans that must be paid back, with interest, and in California, such borrowing requires voter approval.

Unlike the two previous water measures, Prop. 3 was not put on the ballot by the Legislature, but by Meral, who collected the requisite 365,880 signatures to do so.

The Sierra Club argues that the measure is simply not worth the expense and that the private interests funding the campaign, such as agriculture, are the ones that would disproportionately gain.

“It’s a pay-to-play measure,” Phillips said.

Phillips also took issue with how the money would be doled out. She said the many state agencies that would be awarding grants would face sparse oversight.

Little polling has been done on Prop. 3. But with drought and water supplies a well-documented concern of state residents, a survey over the summer by the Public Policy Institute of California indicated strong support.

Kurtis Alexander is a San Francisco Chronicle staff writer.
Email: *kalexander@sfchronicle.com* Twitter: @kurtisalexander
SUMMARY:

Informational updates on:

1. Update on activities of the San Joaquin Valley Water Infrastructure Authority.
2. Update on MOU, MOA, and JPA Group activities.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

None; informational only.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

None; informational only.

DISCUSSION:

1. Activities of the San Joaquin Valley Water Infrastructure Authority (WIA)

On October 12 the WIA held a board meeting to discuss future activities of the WIA and the transition the Temperance Flat to a new water user-led JPA. The WIA adopted a new mission statement that will refocus its energies on new projects (initial thoughts are focused on forest management) that would collectively benefit water users in the region. The new Mission Statement will result in a reduction in the level of activity by the WIA, reduce frequency of BOD meetings to quarterly, and reduce in staff capacity to part-time.

The WIA had formed a sub-group to determine the process for transitioning the “applicant status” they hold with the California Water Commission to a new entity. The WIA had a proposed resolution presented by staff, which was reviewed and edited by the water users in the MOA Group prior to the WIA meeting. This resolution proposed conditions for the transfer that included (a) a request for a voice in the new JPA, (b) assurances that the initial five MOA entities to be allowed to become members of the new JPA, and (c) a commitment to prioritize improvements in the San Joaquin Valley as a first order outcome of Temperance Flat. After some discussion, the friendly amendments were unanimously accepted by the WIA. (see Attachment 1.)
2. **Activities of the MOU, MOA, and new JPA**

**MOU:** On October 12, the MOU Group (Technical Activities) met to get an update on both model development and the Reclamation Feasibility Report. The consultant (Stantec) reported that all modeling needed has been submitted and the first model run with both east and westside participants will be completed within the next few weeks. Reclamation reported that an official review of the Feasibility Study is being accommodated for the water users to help resolve issues that were identified through previous interactions with the MOU Group. Comments are requested by October 23, and FWA is consolidating comments from MOU water users to expedite the review and assure completeness in the review. Steve Ottemoeller will be performing these duties. Reclamation is hosting working sessions on October 29 and November 5 to present their proposals for resolving issues that have already been identified.

**MOA/JPA:** On October 12, both Friant and the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors had submitted signature pages for the creation of a new JPA to guide Temperance Flat activities. With these two members, the JPA will be able to form. Formation is expected within the next weeks, upon adoption by the California Secretary of State.

Initial activities by the JPA include: (a) transitioning applicant status of the Prop 1 proposal from the WIA, (b) entering into a MOU with Reclamation to become the lead agency in coordination on Federal activities, and (c) development of Goals and Principals that will guide the development of the project.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. SJVWIA Resolution 2018-1
RESOLUTION NO. 2018-1

WHEREAS, the San Joaquin Valley Water Infrastructure Authority (SJVWIA) is comprised of representatives from Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings and Tulare counties; the Cities of Avenal, Orange Cove and Fresno (on behalf of other cities and communities within these counties); the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority; the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority; the Friant Water Authority; and the Region at Large; and

WHEREAS, the SJVWIA was established to advance regional collaboration in water infrastructure development in the San Joaquin Valley, including serving as the applicant for State of California funding available through the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014, or other similar State of California and Federal statutes or programs; and

WHEREAS, the SJVWIA in collaboration with its member agencies applied for and received approval for funding from the California Water Commission and State of California Water Storage Investment Program (WSIP) for the proposed Temperance Flat Reservoir Project on the San Joaquin River to provide additional water supplies to a wide variety of potential water users, improve statewide water system operational flexibility, and produce numerous public benefits; and

WHEREAS, potential stakeholder and beneficiary water agencies that are members of the SJVWIA have advised the SJVWIA of their interest, desire and intention to initiate a JPA to engage in and assume full responsibility for the local administration of the Temperance Flat Project; and

WHEREAS, subject to certain conditions, the SJVWIA Board of Directors has agreed to in principle with the transfer of said WSIP application and Temperance Flat Project accountability to the stakeholders group under its memorandums of understanding and agreement, and upon creation of a new Joint Exercise of Powers Authority currently known as the Temperance Flat Project JPA (“TFPJPA”) that the stakeholder group water agencies have developed or is in the process of developing; and

WHEREAS, said conditions proposed by the SJVWIA shall include, but may not be limited to, agreement by the TFPJPA to (A) include membership by those water agencies that are represented on the SJVWIA at this time, at a minimum, the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, the Friant Water Authority, and the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority (or any of the SLDMWA’s member agencies) within the TFPJPA’s membership; (B) provide for at least one seat on the JPA to be filled by the Chairperson of the SJVWIA regular voting member of the SJVWIA with a seat as a regular voting member of the TFPJPA’s Board of Directors; (C) maintain within the TFPJPA’s activities goals and objectives of the Temperance Flat Project that are consistent with the original regional operational and benefit goals and objectives set forth by the SJWIA and demonstrate that the principles being developed by the JPA to guide project implementation will appropriately protect the San Joaquin Valley as a first order responsibility; and (D) enter into an
agreement with the SJWWIA Board of Directors addressing the above matters and any other considerations defined and considered by the parties during negotiations Chairman.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Joaquin Valley Water Infrastructure Authority does hereby declare its intent to enter into an agreement negotiations with the TFPJPA, the objective being to for the transfer of from the SJVWIA to the TFPJPA said the application status for Temperance Flat Project WSIP funding under jurisdiction of the California Water Commission in order to obtain 2017 Water Storage Investment Program funds pursuant to Title 23, Division 7, Chapter 1 of the California Code of Regulations; and be it further

RESOLVED, that Boards of the Directors Chairman of the SJVWIA and TFPJPA shall achieve, acknowledge and adopt by resolution full agreement on these and any other conditions of authorization prior have the authority to furnish the final approval of any transfer of said WSIP application from the SJVWIA to the TFPJPA.

INTRODUCED, PASSED AND ADOPTED at a Regular Meeting of the San Joaquin Valley Water Infrastructure Authority Board of Directors at Fresno, California, on October 12, 2018.

Authorized Original Signature:

J. Steven Worthley
President

Clerk/Secretary:

Mario Santoyo
Executive Director
DATE: October 15, 2018
TO: Executive Committee
FROM: John Bezdek, Special Counsel
SUBJECT: Meeting with Reclamation on Groundwater Recharge

---

Introduction

FWA has a meeting scheduled with Reclamation on October 18th to follow-up on an earlier meeting in August to discuss how Reclamation will view groundwater recharge actions by Friant Division Contractors. Specifically, our contractors are looking to use any available water—whether contract water, section 215 water or flood releases—to recharge groundwater basins either by direct recharge on project lands or through direct or in-lieu recharge on white lands. Currently, Reclamation views any delivery of water outside of project lands as a transfer that is subject to transfer rules under section 3405(a) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA). In our previous meeting with Reclamation, it was agreed that Reclamation will evaluate our concerns and provide a proposal at the meeting on the 18th. In addition to working through administrative channels with Reclamation, FWA has also been pursuing a legislative remedy to streamline the process.

Administrative Process

In the October 18th meeting, we anticipate Reclamation to take the position that actions to recharge the aquifer, either by direct recharge on project lands, or by direct or in-lieu recharge on white lands, not to be considered a transfer under the CVPIA. Reclamation will require, however, a showing that the project water used for recharge will ultimately be “returned” to the project for use by the project sometime in the future. In other words, according to Reclamation, if it can be shown the water will ultimately be used by the project, it will not be deemed a transfer. Conversely, we also anticipate Reclamation taking the position that water used for groundwater recharge and not returned to the project in some form is a transfer and must be evaluated and approved according to the CVPIA transfer rules. Thus, it appears that Reclamation will be able to provide some, but not all, of what has been requested by FWA regarding streamlining the approval process for groundwater recharge.

Legislative Process

FWA has also been pursuing a legislative remedy to this issue. In the Senate, we were able to gain approval of language from key members that would remove some of the current process requirements for evaluating transfers under the CVPIA, but unfortunately, not all of them. In addition to removing some of the criteria for transfers as they relate groundwater recharge, the Senate version of the legislation also includes language directing the Secretary to undertake a study and report back to Congress on actions it will take to help facilitate compliance with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). In drafting legislation for the House to introduce, FWA staff held a conference call with several GMs and the general sense of those participating on the call is that that FWA should not be pursuing legislation at this time but instead focus on
working with Reclamation to streamline the process.

**Issue for Discussion**

Once we hear back formally from Reclamation on the issue of the criteria they will use in determining whether groundwater recharge on white lands is a transfer, should FWA continue to pursue a legislative solution to facilitate groundwater recharge?