

From: Patricia Schifferle
To: "Mosley, Michael"; "Larry Bauman"; "Joel.Trumbo@wildlife.ca.gov"; "Ellen Wehr"; "Stephen Farmer"; "Shu.Jeffrey@Wildlife"; "Ansel Lundberg"; "Regina Rieger"; "Dana Jacobson"
Cc: "Noah Gregory Oppenheim"; "Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla"; "Barbara Vlamis"; "Barry Nelson"; "Bill Jennings"; "Larry Collins"; "Lloyd carter at comcast"; "Carolee Krieger"; "Stephen Green"; "Hal Candeo"; "Gary Bobker"; "Doug Obegi"; "Jonas Minton"; "John Buse"; "john mcmanus at golden state salmon"; "Frank Egger"; "Caleen Sisk"
Bcc: "Miller, Ben"; "Edgerton, Vic"
Subject: RE: Meeting Availability for Cost Allocation Study listening sessions - August 19-23, 2019
Date: Tuesday, July 30, 2019 12:03:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[PCL et. al. Cmts Re Draft CVP Cost Allocation Study April 2019.pdf](#)

Dear Mr. Mosley

Thank you for your email suggesting a “discussion” and “listening session” regarding Reclamation’s proposed changes to the cost allocations for the Central Valley Project contractors and power users.

Back in April 2019, we requested answers to the questions below. In order to enhance any “discussions” or “listening sessions” we respectfully request Reclamation answer the specific questions that have been before Reclamation for four months.

Unfortunately giving folks less than two weeks notice in the middle of a summer vacation schedule, does not lend itself to successful participation.

Many would like to better understand how “listening” will lead to or facilitate “discussions” and understanding especially given the limited nature of the “listening sessions” and the fact that requested key modeling information has not been provided.

It is not clear from the request for limited ‘listening sessions’ how the proposed process will meet the lofty objectives. There appears to be a built in contradiction in process that is designed to perpetuate conflict rather than come up with solutions.

There are a number of process issues including the lack of comments’ transparency promised, but not provided. And a number of data issues that have been raised and remain unanswered. After all these years critical data that would allow people to make informed decisions this information is still not available.

Please provide the materials requested below. I am not sure what the summer vacation schedules are for those who were signatory to the comments provided. I can attend a listening session in September after the material below are provided. Please also provide copies of all the comments submitted and copies of the power user’s modeling comments.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Regards,
Patricia Schifferle

From: Patricia Schifferle [mailto:pacificadvocates@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2019 10:39 AM
To: 'Mosley, Michael'
Cc: 'Navarro, Lisa'
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Changes to the CVP Allocation Amounts

Dear Mr. Mosley:

1. Per the website instructions, please send me a copy of the public comments submitted.
2. Communication over the phone on April 11, 2019, was difficult due to the connection problems. My questions regarding new projects that modify old projects [Shasta] and new projects that modify old

projects, expand water supply and relate to seismic safety [San Luis Dam Project expansion & seismic safety] issues were not addressed in the comment provided.

For these specific categories how will the contract allocation methods be implemented. Please provide specific cost allocations associated with these project costs and how the new allocations would work:

1. **Modification of Existing CVP Project & Allocation of New Costs and Benefits**— Assuming Westlands Water District follows through with their agreement in principle to pay half the costs as required under the WIIN Act see § 4007(authorizations) and § 4011, how will the remaining \$650M in costs be allocated. Assuming the projected 73,000 AF in increased yield, under the new allocation proposed, who will pay the remaining \$650 million dollars in costs? Will the water supply benefits be spread out over all the users who will be required to pay or will they accrue first to Westlands?
2. **Modification of Existing CVP Project & Allocation of New Costs and Benefits Adding Seismic Safety & Limited Geographical Water Supply Benefits**: Similarly for the San Luis Dam project, there are both seismic safety issues for which the 85%-15% ratio would apply, but additionally the elevation of the dam would be done for water supply benefits. Arguably those benefits would accrue to the San Joaquin Valley irrigator and specifically to the San Luis Unit.

[http://www.usbr.gov/mp/sllpp/docs/2013_11_19_DRAFT_San_Luis_Expansion_Appraisal_Report.pdf

How would the new costs and old costs of the facility which are also shared with the State of California be allocated? How would the new water supply related construction costs be repaid? By all federal contractors even though the benefits go to only a select few?

In reviewing the modeling in the study for the differences between D-1485 and D-1641, please provide me the assumptions used for the modeling inputs to arrive at the conclusions provided.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Patricia Schifferle

From: Mosley, Michael [<mailto:mmosley@usbr.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 12:53 PM
To: Patricia Schifferle
Cc: Navarro, Lisa
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Changes to the CVP Allocation Amounts

Dear Ms. Schifferle,

Thank you for your questions, a goal for the Cost Allocation Study team is to present reasonable and balanced results. You can find information regarding the increases, decreases and results of the study in the Executive Summary, tables ES-1, ES-2 and ES-3. It is also important to know that the study merges historic and prospective conditions to create the final cost allocation. This information is displayed by purpose, including water supply and the irrigation and M&I components of water supply. Assumptions utilized to develop the study are further described in Chapter 5, including the assumptions used in relation to environmental concerns. For more information regarding the study, including frequently asked questions, please visit the study website at: <https://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvp/cvp-cost-allocation.html>

Sincerely,
Michael

On Tue, Apr 9, 2019 at 3:49 PM Patricia Schifferle <pacificadvocates@hotmail.com> wrote:
Dear Mr. Michael Mosely:

With regard to the Draft CVP Final Cost Allocation Study [<https://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvp/cvp-cost->

[allocation.html](#)] Could you provide me with the following information before the meeting on April 11th.

Thanks in advance for your assistance.

1. By how much did the allocation to each project purpose increase or decrease as a result of the Study? The answers to this question will let you know whether the cost share to the taxpayer increased or decreased.
2. Within the project allocation to Water Supply, by how much did the cost allocation to Irrigation and to M&I increase or decrease as a result of the Study?
3. How were costs calculated and attributed to Environmental Mitigation and Environmental enhancement?

Regards,

Patricia Schifferle

Patricia Schifferle
530 550 0219 v

Pacific Advocates

--
Michael Mosley

Water Supply Planning Branch Chief, Division of Planning
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region
916-978-5119 (phone) | 916-978-5094 (fax)
mmosley@usbr.gov

From: Mosley, Michael [mailto:mmosley@usbr.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2019 11:32 AM
To: Larry Bauman; Patricia Schifferle; Joel.Trumbo@wildlife.ca.gov; Ellen Wehr; Stephen Farmer; Shu, Jeffrey@Wildlife; Ansel Lundberg; Regina Rieger; Dana Jacobson
Subject: Re: Meeting Availability for Cost Allocation Study listening sessions - August 19-23, 2019

Just a reminder if you have not already replied, Thank You!

Michael

P.S. Looks like we will be having a session on August 21 and 22, 2019

On Thu, Jul 25, 2019 at 9:29 AM Mosley, Michael <mmosley@usbr.gov> wrote:

Good Morning,

I am writing to request each recipient's availability to meet during the week of August 19-23, 2019 regarding the CVP Cost Allocation Study comments you have submitted. Reclamation wishes to have three listening sessions to help identify the most critical comments to improve the study while still meeting the December 31, 2019 date to complete the study. We are currently targeting the week of August 19-23 to have three meetings, and invite each stakeholder who has submitted comments to attend one meeting time. This will ensure each party has ample time to discuss and explain their comment

submission, and also identify the most important points.

We intend to share all comment letters received before the meeting so that everyone is aware of the comments Reclamation has received. Thank you for your attention and please let me know your availability during the week of August 19-23 as soon as possible.

--

Michael Mosley
Water Supply Planning Branch Chief, Division of Planning
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region
916-978-5119 (phone) | 916-978-5094 (fax)
mmosley@usbr.gov