

## Tauriainen, Andrew@Waterboards

---

**From:** Riddle, Diane@Waterboards </O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=RIDDLE, DIANE@WATER7DEC8BE1-7D09-4111-A50A-759550813A4973D>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 14, 2014 4:57 PM  
**To:** Evoy, Barbara@Waterboards; Trgovcich, Caren@Waterboards; Grober, Les@Waterboards; Howard, Tom  
**Cc:** Kassel, Jim@Waterboards; O'Hagan, John@Waterboards  
**Subject:** RE: Call with Valerie Kincaid and Tim O'Laughlin

Tim is correct that SJR flows are required to be 1140 for 29 days in March (the number of required Chipps days) under D-1641. However, this year since we have waived the Chipps requirement (and are proposing to allow higher exports while not meeting all of the required Chipps days), that doesn't make total sense. Regardless, USBR should have requested a change for March, but they aren't technically out of compliance until the end of the month since it is a 30 day average, so maybe we'll get a request before the end of the month (or should at least tell USBR they should submit one asap).

---

**From:** Evoy, Barbara@Waterboards  
**Sent:** Friday, March 14, 2014 4:24 PM  
**To:** Trgovcich, Caren@Waterboards; Grober, Les@Waterboards; Riddle, Diane@Waterboards; Howard, Tom  
**Cc:** Kassel, Jim@Waterboards; O'Hagan, John@Waterboards  
**Subject:** FW: Call with Valerie Kincaid and Tim O'Laughlin

an update on the SJ picture.

---

**From:** O'Hagan, John@Waterboards  
**Sent:** Friday, March 14, 2014 4:22 PM  
**To:** Evoy, Barbara@Waterboards; Kassel, Jim@Waterboards  
**Subject:** Call with Valerie Kincaid and Tim O'Laughlin

Barbara,

Jim and I spoke with Valerie and Tim. Of most interest, Tim stated that his clients held off irrigation so far in March. He expects conditions will change next week when his clients will begin irrigation deliveries. We discuss current flow conditions and that data confirms there is limited deliveries from the major reservoirs. Downstream flows from the tributaries to San Joaquin are mostly FERC flow requirements or other flow conditions. We discussed some tributaries where there are some losses (either natural or small irrigation) occurring.

Tim stated in his opinion that the flows at Vernalis should be 1140 cfs and wanted to know our opinion but I provided no opinion. I told him I would check and get back to him. Les?

We also discussed the need for curtailment and the potential injury to his clients' prior rights from upstream post-1914 right holders. Tim stated that the upstream diversions are so minor that he sees no potential injury or reason for curtailment. I asked if his clients would be willing to allow such diversions to continue and waive rights to injury claims. He agreed to ask his clients. However, Tim does not represent all prior right holders, especially the diverters along the downstream portion of the San Joaquin. Valerie stated that if she represented a downstream prior right holder she would not want those post-1914 to continue to divert. I asked Tim if we curtailed these diverters, but allowed continued diversion for health and safety needs would that be an issue. Tim stated his clients are already helping some communities upstream and would have no problem with such exemption. Tim agreed to get back to me on Monday on exactly when his clients would be starting irrigation, and if they would be willing to waive injury by

upstream post-1914 right holders. He also stated that he was meeting with Paul Fujitani of the Bureau on March 25<sup>th</sup> to discuss summer operations of New Melones.

John O'Hagan, Manager  
Enforcement Section  
Division of Water Rights  
(916) 341-5368