

Tauriainen, Andrew@Waterboards

From: Evoy, Barbara@Waterboards </O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=EVOY, BARBARA@WATER0C556DE1-8FEA-4DD1-91A5-2BBA7A82D039430>
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 8:26 PM
To: O'Hagan, John@Waterboards
Subject: Re: demand

Wellllll, let's fix it and move on to the next piece

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 12, 2015, at 7:51 PM, O'Hagan, John@Waterboards <John.O'Hagan@waterboards.ca.gov> wrote:

Barbara,
I don't want to ruin your weekend but it appears we may have a problem with curtailment analysis on Sacramento side. I missed this email this afternoon.

John O'Hagan
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "O'Hagan, John@Waterboards" <John.O'Hagan@waterboards.ca.gov>
Date: June 12, 2015 at 7:47:08 PM PDT
To: "Mrowka, Kathy@Waterboards" <Kathy.Mrowka@waterboards.ca.gov>, "Coats, Brian@Waterboards" <Brian.Coats@waterboards.ca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: demand

Kathy and Brian,
I need to understand how this happen when we had previously made the adjustment to these Feather River diverters. I thought the only adjustments to the graphs was related to the revised DWR FNFs and removing supply and demand for Cache and Putah Creeks with North Delta demand.


Let Barbara and I know if our issued curtailments for the Sacramento River will need revision as soon as possible on Monday. To prevent further problems, assign another engineer to work with Jeff.

Jeff is doing a great job but we need someone to be able to verify his calculations and do the analyses when Jeff is out. Let me know who can take this task on.

John O'Hagan
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Coats, Brian@Waterboards" <Brian.Coats@waterboards.ca.gov>
Date: June 12, 2015 at 2:13:59 PM PDT



WSID CDO/BBID ACL
WSID0116

To: "O'Hagan, John@Waterboards"
 <John.O'Hagan@waterboards.ca.gov>
Cc: "Mrowka, Kathy@Waterboards"
 <Kathy.Mrowka@waterboards.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: demand

I called Gary over at MBK and he indicated it was the Feather River Contract adjustment we had in a previous version but didn't get migrated over to the current one. The adjustment was a net reduction in demand of about 138,000 acre-feet, 39,000 in June which is about 650 cfs.

Jeff is working on updating the WRUDS database with the changes; ETA half a day so maybe around Monday noon for the updates to the web graphs.

Here is the relevant email,

From: Yeazell, Jeffrey@Waterboards
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2015 9:08 AM
To: Coats, Brian@Waterboards
Subject: Joint Water Districts Board and Western Canal District Diversion

Brian,

Here are comparisons of the 2014 demands provided in the Informational Order responses to the 2015 projections provided by MBK for the Joint Water Districts Board and Western Canal Water District. Combined, there is a 138,380-acre-foot-reduction in diversions from May through December. In the supply/demand analysis, both rights were assumed to be Pre-14 only, based on eWRIMS information and that no riparian diversions were reported in the informational order response.


Joint Water Districts Board (S000480)

	May	June	July	August	September	October
Informational Order 2014 Diversions	98,255	91,481	99,165	78,824	35,799	52,087
2015 Projections From MBK email	81,075	53,571	68,054	55,311	22,881	18,796
Difference	-17,180	-37,910	-31,111	-23,513	-12,918	-33,291

Western Canal Water District (S000925)

	May	June	July	August	September	October
Informational Order 2014 Diversions	52,320	48,920	53,607	32,630	8,608	37,025
2015 Projections From MBK email	52,000	50,000	54,000	32,000	9,000	15,000
Difference	-320	1,080	393	-630	392	-22,025

Jeff Yeazell, P.E.
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Water Rights
Enforcement Section
(916) 341-5322



Brian

From: O'Hagan, John@Waterboards
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 1:51 PM
To: Yeazell, Jeffrey@Waterboards
Cc: Coats, Brian@Waterboards; Mrowka, Kathy@Waterboards
Subject: FW: demand

FYI

From: Grober, Les@Waterboards
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 1:39 PM
To: O'Hagan, John@Waterboards
Cc: Trgovcich, Caren@Waterboards; Evoy, Barbara@Waterboards
Subject: demand

On call now with David Guy and Mark VCamp; Mark said that Sac demand is back up to the (incorrect) 50% demand that was used in previous versions of the curtailment calculations—otherwise said is improvement over prior.



<image001.png>

<image002.jpg>

