

CALFED PUBLIC WORKSHOP
RED BREAKOUT GROUP

Facilitator: Dick Daniel
Recorder: Ron Ott
Note taker: Don Wagenet

11:00 am Introductions; Daniel introduced the breakout group process and the objectives of filling in the matrix.

These notes include the following formatting conventions

- Questions and comments from public/participants are paraphrased
- All caps indicates Recorder comments
- Italics indicate Facilitator response (to help explain flow of discussion at that time)
- Bold indicates participant commentor

Questions (Carol):

- 1) Are these just examples?; and
- 2) How will the group address other conflicts that are subsidiary to fish and diversions? *Daniel responded that alternatives will be rounded out for all four conflicts.*

Process comment (Jud Monroe): "Lester's point re integrated solution should be taken so that we "achieve objectives" - not solve a conflict; there is a "logical disjunct" in that we should be trying to achieve objectives; not unequally addressing one of four conflicts."

Process comment (Peter Gleick): Two comments:

1. Question regarding "how to proceed" - or is it "how does alternative lack a solution; we need to address more than one conflict" PROCESS SEEMS TO STRESS A PARTICULAR CONFLICT - YET WE ARE TRYING TO USE ACTIONS TO SOLVE ALL CONFLICTS - SEEMS INCONSISTENT.
2. None of the actions relate to demand side management - "such" actions transcend all four conflicts
3. DON'T SEE ACTIONS THAT WILL HELP OTHER CONFLICTS - SUCH AS DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT

Process questions (Pete Chadwick):

1. Why not just recreate the action list (WHY WOULDN'T WE PICK ALL ACTIONS TO COMPLETELY SOLVE ALL CONFLICTS?)
2. Is there a theme here (IS THERE A PARTICULAR THEME THAT WE ARE USING TO GROUP PARTICULAR ACTIONS?)
3. IF OBJECTIVE IS TO BENEFIT FISH, WHY GET INTO GROUNDWATER BANKING?
4. Wouldn't it be better to just address a theme?

Process comments/question (Mary):

1. IT IS DIFFICULT TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN CONFLICT LEVELS AND LEVELS OF INTENSITY (HOW DO WE THINK ABOUT LEVELS OF INTENSITY IN APPROACHING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT?)

2. Pricing is missing from this alternative
3. How do we think about low-intensity vs. high-intensity conflict issues?

Daniel response: Each action will have a performance measure; so if demand management (for example) leads to a situation requiring a high volume of water, the level of intensity indicated in the performance measure will reflect the relatively high importance/intensity.

Mary's question:

1. Is that what you mean as minimal - bottom line?

Daniel: Yes

Process comment (Jud M.): "You ought to put an X next to groundwater banking/conjunctive use in the fisheries diversions column, and then determine how actions can be integrated to benefit all categories - so that each action contributes to as many conflict resolutions as possible." Gary also supported groundwater banking for enhancing fish productivity.

PUT AN 'X' NEXT TO GROUNDWATER BANKING AND CONJUNCTIVE USE - THEN DETERMINE HOW WE DO THAT TO HELP FISHERIES. WE SHOULD TRY TO HELP ALL FOUR CONFLICTS WITH EACH ACTION WE CHOOSE.

Process comments (Gary):

1. So what do we get with a chart full of X's?; How do I match action categories to solution principles for each of the conflicts? Do boxes with lots of X's reflect solution principles - how to account [for these]? or:
2. What actions constitute the Solution Principles? - maybe we should do this first.

SUGGESTION THAT WE LOOK AT ACTIONS THAT MEET THE MOST SOLUTION PRINCIPLES - AND KEEP TRACK ESPECIALLY THAT.

Action Suggestion: (Will Taylor): Add alternative conveyance; Add an isolated transfer facility - it isolates exports "to some degree," and has (to some degree) benefits in resolving some of the conflicts.

ADD ALTERNATIVE CONVEYANCE FACILITY FOR WATER QUALITY. SMALL ISOLATED FACILITY HAS BENEFITS FOR THE ECOSYSTEM;

ALSO:

LESS VULNERABILITY RELATED TO EXPORT WATER SUPPLY, AND DOES NOT ADDRESS IN-DELTA WATER QUALITY AND ECOSYSTEM ISSUES

Comment (?): The isolated transfer facility could lead to decreased levee vulnerability; since there would be less dependence on levees to accommodate export flow volumes.

Taylor: Each action cannot benefit all four categories

Process comment (Tom Zuckerman): I am confused with the process; do we get to a long list of actions, or are we going to analyze a sample alternative? I suggest some ground rules regarding the insertion of pet projects [by the participants].

Process comment (Peter Gleick): Demand side management is not here; but Gary's comment is more interesting - all actions must withstand solution principle scrutiny.

Process comment (Kent Smith): There will be a tendency to "get off the edge" early; we should keep our focus on the CALFED goals - to raise issues, give sense of complexity to the process, and to keep the process in perspective.

Process comment (Pete Chadwick): I suggest, to keep our focus, that we use the four bullets on page C-12 of the workshop handout; and propose the approach of seeing how the alternative can be modified just by using the [bullet] objectives on page C-12.

Process comments (Cliff Shulz):

1. It looks like this alternative was intentionally selected for "one-sided" approach without [consideration of] diversions. For example; a barrier at the head of Old River would reduce the risk of Fall-run listing. So...

LOOKS LIKE THIS EXAMPLE IS ON ALL ONE SIDE OF THE EQUATION: HOW DO WE ADD THINGS LIKE "BARRIER AT OLD RIVER."

BARRIER AT OLD RIVER WOULD HELP REDUCE IMPACTS ON OTHER SPECIES THAT ARE CLOSE TO LISTING - COULD ALSO GENERATE LOCAL WATER QUALITY BENEFITS

2. We must add other actions to have a basis for discussion - to be able to make the trade-offs needed and consider the [balancing of] actions and options [together].

Agency comment (Jean Elder [FWS]): Please note that Fish and Wildlife is not convinced that a barrier at the head of Old River will help Delta smelt. We would prefer that you look at a broader spectrum of species rather than just Delta smelt and Winter-run chinook salmon [as mentioned on page C-12].

FISH AND WILDLIFE NOT SURE OLD RIVER WILL HELP DELTA SMELT - NEED TO LOOK AT OTHER SPECIES

PROCESS - NONE OF THINGS LISTED ARE ACTIONS. NEED WHERE, WHEN, HOW MUCH BEFORE - (THESE ACTIONS AND CATEGORIES) - NEED ACTIONS.

Process comment (Jud Monroe): None of the things on the chart (matrix) is an action. We need to know the what, when, where, how much, and other characteristics of an action before we can make these decisions - the chart has categories, not actions. We need to evaluate alternatives per solution principles; not just the actions, but the integration of actions comprising an alternative - but we definitely need some "level" of an action.

Process comment (Lance Johnson): This process does not account for the "phased expectation of results" - or in other words, the time that is required for benefits to be accrued from respective actions.

NEED TO LOOK AT WHEN ACTIONS TRULY DERIVE BENEFIT. PHASED IMPLEMENTATION OF RESULTS.
NEED TO TEST ENTIRE ALTERNATIVE AGAINST SOLUTION PRINCIPLES - NOT JUST ACTIONS.

Process comment (Ed Winkler): The alternative fails with respect to ecosystem quality and durability principles. It misses the terrestrial/riparian habitat restoration goals, both of which need to be part of any solution.

ALTERNATIVE DOES NOT MEET ECOSYSTEM QUALITY AND DURABILITY FOR TERRESTRIAL AND RIPARIAN HABITAT.

Core Action Comment (Lynn O'Leary): My main concern is with levees and levee management. The actions listed only mention the modification or construction of levees. We need some base assumptions that answer such questions as:

- Will levees be there?
- Will levees be allowed to fail? - will failures be consciously planned?
- What can be done about some islands that are below sea level, and cannot possibly be "returned to tidal action."

NEED TO KNOW BASIC ASSUMPTIONS IF WE ARE GOING TO HAVE LEVEES OR NOT.

ALSO, THE HABITAT/LAND USE-FLOOD PROTECTION CONFLICT DOES NOT ADDRESS SYSTEM VULNERABILITY.

Flood protection is not part of the habitat/land use conflict, since there needs to be some base level of flood protection.

CORE ISSUE - LEVEE MANAGEMENT AND LEVEL OF PROTECTION

Regarding Levees (Cary Wright): "You cannot make basal assumptions regarding levee stability; otherwise several [interactive] actions will be "killed" because of cost. None of us know how big the next seismic event will be?"

LEVEE MANAGEMENT MAY BE TOO EXPENSIVE

- HOW DO WE DETERMINE LEVEL OF PROTECTION IN \$ OR HABITAT?
- MIGHT NOT GET THERE FROM HERE

Regarding the Goals of CALFED (Cary Wright): "If your goal is some type of bill or ballot measure that you can get support for, and get passed through the legislature, then why not set goals and objectives per each alternative, which allows the assignment of price tags for each alternative." Because...

WHAT WE NEED TO DO IS TO START WITH GOALS (E.G. RESTORE 25% OF HABITAT). CANNOT GET OBJECTIVES WITH THIS PROCESS - "NEED GOALS"

- 16,000,000 south-of-delta California residents will get their water - the votes and the money are there. - Any efforts to fix the delta through export reductions will not be successful....This process does not get to these goals.

Regarding levees (Tom Zuckerman): Better financed levee system has mutual benefits; good schemes are out there for waterside and landside berms which go far to resolving some of the habitat protection conflicts. The levee situation is key - despite the size of any peripheral canal proposed; all solutions assume that levees will be maintained to preserve delta habitat. The question is not "whether" levees will be protected, but the degree of work to be done."

Process Comment (Ed Winkler): Fish screening and reduced entrainment are not addressed in this alternative. - Also needs to look closely at the consolidation of diversions.

Follow-ups -(Pete Chadwick): This is a big affordability issue - the cost of consolidating diversions, screening lots of diversions, etc. is a fairly expensive proposition. --- (Ed Winkler) - the cost of cleaning screens is high where no power is available in the delta.----(Pete Chadwick) - you also must consider the physical nature of the system for screening - it's constantly shifting-tough to install screens on some levees.

NEED TO LOOK AT COST EFFECTIVENESS - HOW MUCH \$ TO CONSOLIDATE DELTA DIVERSIONS?

MAY NOT NEED TO SCREEN ALL DELTA DIVERSIONS - BARRIERS/BLOCKAGE COULD HELP

Regarding Levee Actions (Tom Zuckerman): So the key is to decide, as levees are rebuilt, where the best strategic locations for screens may be, and to design the levees in those locations accordingly.

Regarding Levee Construction (Jean Elder): There are some good ideas from the coastal breakwaters that have been used. They create waterside slopes (grading) to accommodate salmonid [nearshore habitat; cover; resting] use, and may be beneficial in the delta as new levee work gets done.

NEED TO CONSIDER OTHER FACTORS - SITING, DEBRIS, ADDITIONAL COSTS.

THERE ARE MULTIPLE BENEFITS ASSOCIATED WITH A WELL-FINANCED LEVEE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM - QUESTION IS HOW YOU DO IT OR HOW MUCH YOU SPEND.

Process comment (Peter Gleick): There are four goals here, some goals will help, others will not. We need more specifics to get substantive discussions going.

- WINTER-RUN CHINOOK SALMON AND DELTA SMELT
- TAKE LIMITS
- NO NEW LISTINGS
- EQUITY

Regarding Levee construction (in general) (Tom Zuckerman): If we assume that varied levee construction methods are accepted for delta smelt or winter-run protection; then how do you answer "how well" it benefits these species? Given that historically no problems with the ESA were experienced when levees were built, how can we attribute some of the problems of endangered species to levees; how do we even know whether there is a relationship between levees and ESA fish protection?

IF WE SAY THAT BUILDING LEVEES HELPS (WINTER-RUN), THEN HOW MUCH DOES IT HELP?; WHAT LEADS US TO BELIEVE IT WILL HELP?; -- DEPENDS ON CONFIGURATION (E.G. MORE SHALLOW WATER HABITAT)

Process comment (Cliff Schulze): We need to carefully separate the intent of each action. What baseline assumptions are you using? These make a difference (e.g. do diversions remain at the same level?)

YOU NEED TO SEPARATE WHAT GOAL YOU ARE GOING AFTER. NEED TO KNOW THE BENEFIT YOU ARE PROTECTING.

Process comment (Tom Zuckerman): How many purposes does each action have? How will we reconcile across actions, intents?

LEVEES, FISH SCREENS, GROUNDWATER STORAGE, SOUTH-OF-DELTA STORAGE, WATER QUALITY, THROUGH-DELTA TRANSFERS, SOUTH -OF - DELTA STORAGE FOR MULTIPLE PURPOSES

TIMING OF PUMPING (GOAL IS TO REDUCE DEMANDS AT CRITICAL TIMES)

Process comments (Gleick, Winkler, Zuckerman): How do we move this process along?; What are the goals of this discussion?; the group needs to be on a learning curve; the process needs a fast-forward, and some waivers and disclosures regarding the actions. The key is to scrutinize the goals -actions should be tied to goals, and the validity of the goals is the key question. The timing and characteristics of specific actions are needed - some specifications for actions.

Suggested Action (Cary Wright): "Restrictions on Commercial Fishing"

HARVEST MANAGEMENT FOR WINTER-RUN

Suggested Action (Lance Johnson): Selective levee stability [actions]; reconstruction to achieve improvements in spawning and rearing habitat, and to reduce [incidental] take problems by reducing flow velocities through the delta.

Follow-up (Jud Monroe): Reducing velocities will cause a lot of spreading out [of juveniles and fry]; so that they won't be "taken south."

General Question (Will Taylor): What if the minimum goals are unsatisfactory for one or more of the stakeholder groups?

Clarification Question (Cary Wright): The San Diego IID is working on a Colorado River transfer - does that affect demand management? It results in more water left in the delta, moves water through the delta better [no export of equivalent volume] and provides better economic returns for instream flow maintenance.

Daniel: It may allow prior rights holders to sell surplus waters to assist with instream flows. Lots of people looking at potentially inadequate legal protections for short-term transfer "sellers."

Gary: (?) - Transfers also take too long - often not useful once the time is taken to get them approved.

Regarding Transfer Equitability (Peter Gleick): There are 3d party, area of origin, and other 3d party impacts that must be accounted for with transfers - a free market does not do it alone!

Regarding "Safe-Yield" for the Delta (Tom Zuckerman): We need to identify a "safe-yield" for the Delta; so transfers will only be allowed on a safe-yield basis - once other water management goals have been fulfilled.

Follow-up comment (???): How will it be defined?

Daniel: Can you define a "durable" safe-yield for the Delta?

Zuckerman: There are lots of demand management measures that could be used [coordination of land use planning with water planning] - limiting approvals of southern California subdivisions without guaranteed water supplies.

Gleick: Keys to safe-yield in Delta are identification of the values to preserve.

Shamrih (?): Any safe-yield concept must account for the maximum safe-yield. It really varies with the configuration of the delta solution(s). The key product would be a statement of maximum benefits across the board that could be gained with different configurations.

Transfer Comment (????): Regardless of the listed species, any transfer related solutions must have language that "levels the field" for instream water use [affording it some legal clout] - perhaps an institutional agency to allow other [resource] agencies access to it.

Regarding Safe-Yield concept (Cary Wright): What happens if a drought persists, and demand greatly exceeds the "safe yield?" First, you are not going to stop growth with controlling water. Second, southern California has money, and can help in this solution. Start metering water!!! There is no way you will solve the problem by limiting exports. The key is in developing an equitable solution. The San Diego Water Authority has money, and can help; exports can be slowed, but not reduced. You must consider all people that are part of the mix. There are just too many people affected. If all people in the state want to contribute to the cost of building a string of desalination plants, then build them, but not at the expense exclusively of so. Cal residents.

Water Quality Consideration follow-up (Jud Monroe): Remember that lots of the demand management programs are dependent upon low-TDS water from the Delta. The key is in the mixing ratios, and transport of low-TDS and low-salinity water.

Daniel - How to handle December 15 agreement/flows?

General discussion followed, wherein it was agreed that Dec. 15 flows would be part of some alternatives, but are not required for all alternatives, which may use other flow regimes.

Fish Habitat Comment (????): There is a need to address impediments to upstream migration to minimize new listings. The potential for Spring-run listing is real; there is limited access to habitat that could be addressed/improved with appropriate management. The Corps has done some work related to blocking the Sacramento Harbor. Other migration problems include:

- Flood control work
- Getting held up in the Yolo bypass

NEED TO REDUCE ENTRAINMENT LOSSES BOTH IN-DELTA AND OUT OF DELTA

New Action Suggestion - Meander Corridor: (General)

By providing setback levees for the Sacramento River from Shasta to Sacramento, multiple benefits would accrue:

- Water Quality and supply benefits
- Increased habitat variety
- Increased sediment recruitment

SPAWNING AND REARING HABITAT FOR WINTER-RUN & DELTA SMELT

Chadwick: There would be 3d party impacts to people living along the river.

Fish Protection Comment (Bob Clark): Would that lead to increased predation potential?

San Joaquin River Ponds Comment (Steve ???): Lots of San Joaquin River work to cut off ponds and isolate fish away from predators. Lots of former gravel extraction pits are now ponds....

Actions Decided Upon:

[X] indicates proposed core action for all alternatives

1. Barriers to Keep Fish Out of Harm
2. Demand Side Management
3. [X] Conservation (universal with respect to geography and beneficial use)
4. [X] Levee Management
5. South-of-Delta Storage for Multiple Purposes
6. Shallow Aquatic Habitat
7. Harvest Management
8. [X] Source Control of Pollutants
9. Water Transfers
10. Fish Screens
11. Delta Water Plan Outflows
12. Meander Corridor

Water Quality Comment (Rick Woodard): Conservation can be a negative with respect to water quality when it leads to concentrated waste streams.