

**Yellow breakout group session notes -
by Greg Young/CH2M HILL**

FEB 27 1996

Eugenia Laycheck - facilitator
Zach McReynolds - CALFED - Co-leader
Ron Sissen - PAM - recorder
Rick Soehren - CALFED - Leader
Greg Young - CH2M HILL - notetaker
Bruce Herbold - EPA - fisheries tech. expert
Curt Schmutte - DWR - levees tech expert
Jean Elder - USFWS - "other" resource expert
Bob Baiocchi - Plumas County
Ronnie Wiener - NRDC
Pete Rabbon - Reclamation Board - DWR
Cliff Koster - Del Puerto W.D.
John Winther - Delta Wetlands

Dan Fults - Friant Water Users Authority
Daniel Sullivan - Sierra Club
Andy Leahy - Sierra Club
Tom Zuckerman - Central Delta Water Agency
Emery Roz - U.C. Berkley
Peter Mangarella - Woodward Clyde
Sue Garcia - Senate Agricultural & Water
Resources Committee
Marc Luesebrink - California Resource Agency
Eric Clyde - Montgomery Watson
John Williams -
Ron Knierim - SMUD
Randy Kanouse - EBMUD

Question and Answer period (Questions were written on poster sheets and then answered/discussed. Order of questions does not necessarily reflect the order in which they were asked or answered)

Question:

B. Baiocchi - In draft alternatives under "water quality and quantity" and under core actions, I thought we had may the point of including upper watershed management. Why hasn't it been put in and emphasized?

Answer:

never specifically answered

Question:

R. Wiener - To what extent do alternatives assume existence of CVPIA?

J. Winther - Do all alternatives assume 1995 Water Quality Control Plan?

A. Leahy - To what extent do alternatives consider future growth and demand?

B. Baiocchi - added to above comment - this should be divided to separate demands north and south of Delta?

Answer/discussion:

L. Snow - yes to CVPIA. The CALFED program assumes existing law, CVPIA is existing law. For Water Quality Plan the answer is also yes. We assume this is existing law. For future demand/growth, we have not spent much time looking at growth. We are focusing more on the alternatives themselves rather than getting into a Bulletin 160-93 thing.

B. Baiocchi - this needs to be discussed in PEIS. Growth in the southern areas is going to impact northern area water supplies.

D. Fults - whether a particular action (facility) is growth inducing or not, future demand needs to be included in this program's analysis.

B. Herbold - is this issue more relevant to the next workshop?

E. Laycheck - yes, I believe so.

Question:

C. Koster - What is the firm legal definition of area of origin as used in these alternatives?

Answer:

B. Baiocchi - As written in the California Water Code (concurrence from T. Zuckerman)

Question:

P. Rabbon - this process of giving you questions now does not limit us to these questions as this discussion expands?

Answer:

R. Soehren - no.

Question:

D. Fults - what does intensive real time monitoring mean? Is this supposed to be at an implementable level or only experimental and R&D?

J. Williams - What is meant by "adaptive management" as used in alternatives? Different people use the term in different ways.

Answer/discussion:

B. Herbold - Doesn't the level of monitoring depend on the particular alternative? Some alternatives require us to do much more monitoring than others, depending on the objective of the alternative. This amount of monitoring should become clear when looking at performance measures and if an alternative is dependant on monitoring or not.

D. Fults - Real time monitoring is not doable right now. It is still in the experimental stages. Many years of work and testing are still required.

L. Snow - in long run aren't we assuming we would implement monitoring and then continue to refine and adjust monitoring skills as more becomes known?

B. Herbold - For an alternative that relies on monitoring, this should be a detriment and adversely effect the performance of that particular alternative.

J. Williams - Real time monitoring is linked to adaptive management. Adaptive management will require intensive monitoring. I share the concern about whether or not this works well enough to let you operate in "real time". The need for adaptive management vs. real time monitoring should be specific in each alternative.

B. Herbold - the difference with adaptive management vs. real time monitoring is that actions are looked at after a period of time to their effect on other aspects (ecosystem) and adjusted based on the outcome. This does not have to be "real time". Real time assumes a moment to moment basis which does not work well for operating.

J. Williams - People originally defined adaptive management based on the assumption that there is uncertainty in system and you will use/manage the system to gain knowledge. This even includes deliberately doing things to harm the resource to learn how it reacts. It is considered a scientific testing/experimenting tool. Is this how it is meant in these alternatives? In past this adaptive management would be used to overharvest or underharvest fish to see what effect is - this could be tried for instream flows- trial and error approach to learn more about how the resource reacts.

L. Snow - this applies to habitat strategies - we do not know everything that effects fisheries so we want to be able to implement something and see how it works then adjust as needed. This is not purely experimental but rather use scientific judgement to determine where to start and what the outcome is thought to be, then monitor to see how it turned out and adjust accordingly.

B. Herbold - For example, rather than doing a little bit of screening and levee improvement for habitat all over - you would do a small amount of each in particular isolated areas and see how each reacts independantly. Whatever works best will be used to guide future improvements. Adaptive management assumes a phased approach to operations, such that adjustments are made as more information is obtained. This is more flexible.

E. Laycheck - In summary, adaptive management could be done over time and be experimental at the same time.

Questions: (all relating to core action)

E. Boz - Do all alternatives have core actions? Do we add or subtract from core actions for each alternative?

J. Winther - why aren't many actions considered core and grouped together since they are more insignificant compared to big facility cost? Current alternatives do not differ that much in many of the more minor actions. Why aren't these core also? Such actions should be dealt with as a group and set aside so we can focus on main points of alternatives.

T. Zuckerman - if I was organizing the actions I would put many of these items into core actions to focus the debate on more bigger issues - there are lots of common issues through all alternatives. For example, levee stuff in each alternative is similar and so is habitat restoration so why not include as cores?

P. Rabbon - why not expand core actions to include things that are common in each alternative - to a greater level?

Answers to "core action" questions:

R. Soehren - core actions generally - how they came about and how they are seen to fit into process. in last workshop there seemed to be many actions that seemed to be a good idea no matter what else was done. this was seen by Calfed as a good idea. an attempt was made to define core actions - see back of workshop handbook. - core actions are draft at this point - are subject to change like everything else in alt

Z. McReynolds - all alt. include core actions - yes probably things will be added and subtracted to every alt. we tried to put actions into core if it seemed like people did not want to be bother with certain actions. things that should not be core are things that are controversial - expensive, or at differing levels in diff. alternatives. if a core action is a necessary piece of getting equity or linkage between stakeholders then it should not be a core - it should only be

R. Wiener - if that is case then there needs to be another set of essential actions - like levees and demand managements., fish screens - seen as a base level - if screened out of core because of criteria set then still need separate list - this would still set the "floor" or minimum

Z. McReynolds - is this to reduce the bulk of workbook?

R. Wiener - yes but would also define min,

R. Soehren - core includes some screening and then increases
- is that because there is not broad support

Z. McReynolds - basic does not always mean that is the same little things 0 core actions would imply that there is always the same things done in each alt.

J. Williams - is there some feeling of what kind of outcome or benefit that would be gotten from each alternative as they were put together? Was there a defined objective level that forced particular actions to be included at particular levels?

Z. McReynolds - as seen in Lester's puzzle overhead - professional judgement was used to put actions in that seemed to make sense for an alternative to produce a result but that result is simply a opinion and not proven.

L. Snow- like essential element ideas. levee stability basic - does not always have same things in all alternatives - and habitat - basic does not always mean that improvements are i.e. in south Delta when a particular alternative would justify it to be in another location. There needs to be some way to analyze when some alternatives do not have particulars of a essential actions.

L. Snow - To clarify, actions on this list would be at some basic level -not necessarily maximum level and would be in all alternatives?
Group Answer - yes

J. Williams - how do we avoid transfers that may include groundwater substitution in areas that are or could experience groundwater overdraft?

R. Wiener - then include groundwater management as an essential element to control groundwater resources.

B. Baiocchi - as elements they will be considered differently - what if it an element has most benefit at optimum? It should not be at a minimal level in alternatives but should be at the optimum in all alternatives (i.e. upper watershed management).

J. Elder - essential elements would probably include many qualifications from DF&G. The question would be what details describe the essential element? Like anything else, DF&G would need to know what is being defined.

E. Laycheck - does this list give a good start to indicate what should be included in a list of essential elements?

A. Leahy - Again, the reason to take these out is to focus on other issues, bigger issues. We all want to see these essential elements, it is only a question of level. We should list the big issues that remain to make sure that we all agree on what should be included in essentials.

List of possible essential elements as discussed by breakout group:

levee stability actions
habitat improvements
demand management
upper watershed management -above lowest dams
conjunctive use/groundwater banking
groundwater management
water transfers - (assuming certain safeguards)
in Delta environmental water - (from J. Winther)
all water quality issues - pollutant source control - (only a question of degree)
everything under ecosystem quality (except relocation of export diversion location)

Question:

R. Wiener - can Delta water quality be protected in absence of a common Delta pool?

Answer/discussion:

R. Soehren. - yes to an extent but is tied to guarantees - cannot sufficiently answer that question.

Question:

R. Wiener - why isn't demand management carried through all alternatives (beyond core levels)?

Answer/discussion:

never specifically answered, but R. Wiener felt it was sufficiently discussed under essential element discussion.

Question:

P. Rabbon - what is an emergency levee management plan as referenced in the alternatives, and are PL99 and HMP levels set as performance standards or for federal funding eligibility?

Answer/discussion:

C. Schmutte - Currently, there is not a very well defined system to respond to emergencies. An emergency management program would set aside equipment/materials/funding and be well defined ahead of time. Unlike today where you call a contractor and wonder who will pay.

P. Rabbon - I disagree with how this is portrayed in text but agree with how C. Schmutte has expressed it (above) - more focused on implementation and materials/tools. There needs to be a better explanation in text.

C. Schmutte - As for the PL99 and HMP standards, they are both for performance and funding - level of performance is up for discussion on how it would apply across Delta.

B. Herbold - this is a CALFED operation. Am I not clear that federal funding would not be part of any alternative that comes out anyway?

C. Schmutte - PL99 is much more expensive than HMP so levels of funding are not yet known.

P. Rabbon - We cannot let levee standards get to the point where it allows development of islands. The focus needs to be for funding of levee maintenance and stabilization.

B. Baiocchi - How does auburn dam play in with levee stability needs?

P. Rabbon - The Auburn dam proposal has no effect on Delta levee needs.

C. Schmutte - levees in Delta are impacted by tides rather than upstream water factors.

Question:

B. Herbold - what is role of hatcheries in salmon restoration?

Answer/discussion:

B. Baiocchi - I represent Plumas County. There are lots of people who want increases in wild stocks rather than hatchery fish. We need to look upstream of Delta to make improvements in spawning grounds and other upstream fisher resources to improve native stocks.

D. Daniels - we do have an alternative that proposes a hatchery on the San Joaquin River. Currently, stocks on the San Joaquin fluctuate greatly - probably do to changes in outflow. We need a hatchery to create a baseline level of stocks. We are also looking at how hatcheries conflict with natural stocks and seeing if we can change hatchery operations to minimize impact on natural stocks.

Question:

T. Zuckerman- What is meant by a fish tagging program?

Answer/discussion:

D. Daniels- management of harvest by marking only hatchery fish. This way any non-marked natives caught would be released both commercially and in recreation.

T. Zuckerman- I thought that the way they catch them they're already dead.

D. Daniels- mortality during hook and release is not 100% but there is some mortality but also room for survival.

B. Herbold - tagging in some tests shows that it may not work due to several hooking of same fish tends to wear fish out to point where they die or are eaten by predators. Catch and release all the time gets hard on fish.

J. Williams. - CVPIA people who are doubling natural populations need to be able to tell natural from hatchery. This would tend to encourage use of tagging system.

Question:

C. Koster - Are there fish screens designed to do the job of what's asked in the alternatives?

Answer/discussion:

D. Daniels- no 100% effective screens but yes screens are effective. However, we need guarantees that if we build screen and operations change that there is no change in screening or if fish populations increase, there is no change in screening.

B. Herbold - is there a fish screen for hood intake that would be very effective?

D. Daniels- yes this would be possible but is not seen as just one diversion but multiple 2500 cfs diversions.

Alternatives review portion of breakout group:

E. Laycheck - pass out cards to participants - they must right down likes and dislikes of three categories - with statewide emphasis. Participants can turn dislikes into recommendations to the Program.

(people are busy writing down thoughts)

category 1 - emphasis on reoperation

(what do you like/dislike about this category and the alternatives within)

J. Winther - like Delta pool solution - sticking with same pool we use today.

T. Zuckerman- lack of an isolated facility is a good thing.

B. Baiocchi - need the inclusion of reoperation of flow requirements below dams that would improve fishery habitats.

E. Roz - adaptive management real time monitoring - I do not see adaptive management or anything that looks at basic biological impacts of alternatives. Should this not be an essential element or in core actions?

J. Williams - monitoring in CVPIA implementation is not going to work so alternatives need to ensure a level of monitoring that is adaptive.

R. Wiener - these are more affordable and more flexible to allow use of adaptive management, especially compared to those that involve big concrete things.

J. Winther - These alternatives are best suited to incremental approach

T. Zuckerman - Like the emphasis on restoring Delta and Sacramento River habitat (also in other two categories)

R. Wiener - dislike not wide enough scope of habitat improvements.

T. Zuckerman- would like to see more assurance of demand management implementation in these alternatives.

P. Rabbon - lack of flexibility of levee management

R. Kanouse - promotes water banking and reuse

R. Wiener - conjunctive use needs to be expanded beyond the level presented in these alternatives

D. Fults- to much reliance on the term "real time management" - not doable right now and may not work for 20 years.

D. Fults - Alternatives (all 20) do not provide details as to how they measure up to meeting demands, future or even current. They need to answer the question: - what level can we meet? The text doesn't tell how much or at what level

R. Kanouse- 20 alt spend time distinguishing between physical facilities but little discussion of demand management activities that should be included in all alternatives. Granted more detail will come in EIR process - but there shouldn't be a continued bias to facilities being solution to problem.

additional Category 1 comments from 3x5 cards: (in most cases, there is no author associated)

- like emphasis on repairing/restoring Delta with habitat and levee system
- dislike lack of connection to areas of San Pablo Bay and San Francisco
- dislike the reliance on real time monitoring
- dislike the increasing flows for water quality in lieu of other methods to improve quality
- dislike lack of foresight to meet increased growth and demand
- like alternative 9 - good
- like improved operation of system without risk of new conveyance or other facility
- seems more feasible politically than new facilities
- dislike most alternatives have limited potential for ecosystem quality improvements
- like that it assures demand management at basic levels
- general recommendation - alternatives should be structured so they provide solutions that build on each other cumulatively, both in a structural and timing perspective.
- need to include decision points to show where solutions diverge incrementally
- need to know how much additional water becomes available compared to now
- reoperation should differentiate between water quality needs of urban and ag uses
- would be productive to advocate use of dredging material to rebuild Delta levees
- like conjunctive use/groundwater, habitat restoration and extensive levee improvements
- dislike screening diversions
- dislike reduction in net water availability
- should include in-Delta storage for yield
- needs stronger emphasis on levee work
- need greater attention to specific conjunctive use opportunities

category 2 - mix of reoperation and new facilities

(what do you like/dislike about this category and the alternatives within)

C. Koster - Thru Delta facility is good as opposed to isolated facility - this is the old Duke's ditch idea

R. Wiener - do not like eastside canal (alt. 13) because of potential to export too much water - environmental problems with construction - water quality problems in Delta, etc.

C. Koster - should include raise (raze) Friant and dedicate yield to environment and water quality on down to Delta.

B. Baiocchi - relaxation of flood control requirements in reservoirs in some year types should be included to increase storage capacity. Also should include dredging of sedimentation to free up capacity in reservoirs

D. Fults- like ability of alternatives to meet future demands/growth with expanded capacity of facilities.

R. Wiener - need to incorporate "essential elements" - conj. use - demand managements

A. Leahy - We need an assesment of what the potential is for demand management so we can see what is possible and build from there.

D. Fults - things are more specific in this category - easier to understand because of more detail in text

T. Zuckerman - lots of split system and is therefore the worst of both worlds - problems of small split diversions and impact on fisheries and operational headaches.

B. Herbold - split systems have the greatest flexibility in the event of "zebra mussle"

??? - creates guarentee problems with dual systems

R. Kanouse - The "legal sized matrix" shows extensive pollutant source control for these alternatives, but text only provide a sentence. There needs to be, to the extent alternatives rely on source control, identification of practicies that will be included in any alternative. Stating that it is high is not enough. We need a list of specifics (to all categories)

B. Herbold - building on that - what is level for CALFED as increment above what is already going on in the field of pollutant source control (to all categories)?

P. Rabbon - There is a lack of long-term levee management plans in these alternatives.

J. Williams - I guess you can say that the devil is in the details

A. Leahy - lack of emphasis on conjunctive use and groundwater banking and transfers

additional Category 2 comments from 3x5 cards: (in most cases, there is no author associated)

- like that it offers greater flexibility
- like isolated conveyance
- need to include water transfers
- need upper watershed management plans
- like potential for greater environmental restoration
- there is a risk of misuse of new facilities - need guarentees
- any isolated facility must incorporate physical design constraints to help guarentee future consistency with intentions at time of design and implementation (Categories 2 and 3)
- need to define major plumbing so their potential is clear, prior to assessing
- like in-Delta storage
- dislike isolated conveyance
- need to incorporate "Anti-Degradation Water Quality Policy" of Calif inot all alternatives
- need greater emphasis on across-the-board demand reductions

category 3 - emphasis on new facilities

(what do you like/dislike about this category and the alternatives within)

R. Kanouse - glaring ommission is lack of institutional protection - talked about in past - cannot get further down the road talking about facitities without developing guarenttees taht stakeholders interests will be protected!

R. Wiener - incorporate all essential elements - conjuntive use, demand management, etc.

E. Roz - glaring lack of understanding of basic biological impacts of building a series of lakes - don't know the biology - don't know the impacts - irreversible - that may occur.

T. Zuckerman - these alternatives look so expensive - affordability is in questions

B. Baiocchi - water rights issues involved in facilities and administrative process to building anything can be delayed in courts and delay implementation. Would recommend new facilities south of Delta to divert and store flood water instead of upstream of Delta. Administrative process will take time especially if building upstream of Delta.

R. Kanouse - these alternatives recognize the need for high drinking water quality

R. Wiener - (category 2 also) - thought there was growing consensus that we are not trying to balance Calif. water needs on the back of the Delta. These alternatives focus too much on trying to continue to supply demand (south of Delta).

A. Leahy - I dislike the fact that these make huge increase in the amount of water that can go south - increasing the water availability through these alternatives needs to be recognized

D. Fults - I would like to know what these facilities would provide in the way of water supply. Do they meet what we have know or 50% or 150%?

B. Herbold - since these all have different goals we need performance measures to allow for comparison. Otherwise we cannot tell to what level these are satisfying objectives.

Z. McReynolds - what do you mean by different goals?

B. Herbold - For example the chain of lakes vs. only habitat improvements. We do not know what degree we are meeting objectives with either of these alternatives. We need to know how the alternatives add up - they are going to cost this much and help us get this far down the road. Core actions will take us to here - add additional actions to get further - can start comparing issues - it is impossible to compare as they are now.

P. Rabbon - long-term levee management needs to be included - also need incremental analysis of alternatives; how they build upon themselves.

R. Kanouse - by mid may PEIS begins? How do you, w/o having sufficient detail of demand management programs, know how far they go to meet objectives? How big would facilities need to be? How do you make this decision as to how much savings from an action or the level of demand management. When you think about what is in the 3-5 alternatives in PEIS you will need to know what level things are going to be.

Z. McReynolds - to paraphrase what R. Kanouse said above - if you don't know what level of demand management, how do you know if your alternatives cover the range of needs for the PEIR

R. Knierim - these alternatives are capital intensive. This will only increase rates - if I am a water users and you want to build a dam for big \$\$\$ I will want to know why we aren't doing conservation, especially if it seemingly can be done for less money. How much would it cost to put low-flow toilets in every house in Calif.?

R. Kanouse - w/o any details how do we know the relationship between those activities and the facilities we are discussing - how do we mix the comparison without much detail?

Z. McReynolds - prior point - You are saying is that we are asking you "Within this set of 20, is the array wide enough? Do we have all bases covered?" and what you may be saying is "I can't answer that question without knowing the levels of implementation". As we narrow the alternatives we will become more detailed.

R. Kanouse - will all of this discussion occur during PEIS? I want to know if odd/even watering is sufficient or is 30% rationing the base line for dry years? These have greatly different implications in an alternative.

E. Laycheck - your asking "at what time does the process get to an even level of detail as presented in the facilities?"

R. Soehren.- questions as to whether odd/even watering vs. rationing will not be answered for awhile. Rather, the focus will stay on conservation levels. Facilities have not been identified for site specific locations and there is not alot of precision on facilities either. We are trying to stay at a low level of detail across all actions.

R. Knierim - we are at the same point SMUD was 15 years ago. SMUD shut down Rancho Seco and started conservation and has still not increased rates. Same can be done here through demand management activities. Large facilities force conservation in themselves if rates are increased. As rates increase, people tend to conserve such that the conservation ends up making a facility unneeded.

R. Wiener - you can also effect demand by simply increasing rates.

J. Williams - back to the EIR - How are you going to determine levels for purposes of EIR?

additional Category 3 comments from 3x5 cards: (in most cases, there is no author associated)

- dislike expense
- isolated facilities are unacceptable
- like alt 16
- like offstream storage upstream and downstream
- need upper watershed management plan
- large expensive new facilities are not implementable, no political support
- risk of misuse of facilities
- dislike getting too far removed from natural conveyance
- like large isolated facility
- dislike irreversibility
- need guarentees
- like that these might produce more water
- dislike that ideas are "iffy" and violate Delta pool
- absolutely needs institutional protections/guarentees
- must be affordable to include in the next level of review
- understand that most every facility has been looked at by many agencies over that past 20 years yet few have proceeded.

Suggestions for refinement of Alternatives

?? - We don't know enough details to choose or compare alternatives.

P. Rabbon - quantifiable performance measures for the four objectives and incremental analysis are needed.

Z. McReynolds - participants must remember that there is no right answer and we are trying to quantify an opinion with any performance measure.

T. Zuckerman - didn't find a coherent project to resolve San Joaquin water quality issue - only saw small amounts of buying water and controlling ag drainage. I want one or more alternatives developed to address specifically San Joaquin watershed water quality problems.

T. Zuckerman - there is talk about the CALFED process implementing things - I suggest that we need some mechanism that resolves competing interests of agencies with regard to levee maintenance (flood protection vs. habitat restoration). Streamline the process that currently complicates any levee work.

J. Winther - did not see Old River barrier included in the alternatives

R. Soehren. - the idea of an Old River bypass takes place of this barrier in many alternatives

J. Winther - I think each alternative should include all four south Delta operational barriers

B. Herbold - We need to have someone determine if Old River bypass would actually work from an engineering perspective - we need to know more about it.

J. Williams - do we need all the dams we have - we don't seem to need Nimbus dam - if removed, we could double spawning habitat for salmon - there are others also - alternatives should consider removal of facilities where it could have habitat benefit

J. Winther - the alternatives are missing a Georgiana Slough hydraulic barrier and should consider it

D. Fults - seconded above comment - instead of acoustic barrier - would even need in event of isolated facilities.

J. Winther - Alternatives have to look at water yield. Need an incremental analysis

Z. McReynolds - you are stating that performance measure should include water yield

D. Fults - you need to know where you are with particular alternatives as to how much reliability they provide.

A. Leahy - what we need is more info from CALFED! what are you going to use to refine to 5 alts?

R. Soehren- we have not heard much from group about "no we dont want this alternative". We know that some alternatives are closely related and can be merged together to refine and create one better alternative. This process alone will get us close to the 8-12

Z. McReynolds - we may be able to get down to less without losing anything of significance in the alternatives

C. Koster - do we have until March 1 to respond to alternatives or is this our only chance?. Is CALFED starting tomorrow to refine.

Z. McReynolds - answer is yes to both - we start tomorrow but we don't shut the door on comments. There are also many other inputs to this process thru agency review, other hearings, BDAC, etc. These will come into play when we try to bring 8-12 down to 3-5. If you dont feel you have been able to provide all of your comments to us here - we will always be accepting written comments -

R. Soehren. -I want written comments by next Mon.

J. Winther - will this public process repeat at 8-12?

R. Soehren- we have scoping meetings around state in April on 8-12 scoping document but no planned workshop like this.

J. Winther - the decision to refine to 3-5 is up to who and how?

R. Soehren- we have not determined that and are open to suggestions and input from participants.

giggle test of 20 alternatives (requested by B. Herbold)

B. Herbold - alts 13 and 15 are "out there" - difficult to take seriously - alt 15 we have already done in San Joaquin - too costly and will take too long to develop - there are more reasonable ways to do similar objectives

R. Soehren- interjecting - someone stated to me earlier today that they really like alt 13. Maybe not how it is but some modification of it - maybe partway down San Joaquin valley - modified it could work with what the Sacramento Water Forum is doing

B. Herbold - seems more like an expansion of alt 10 than a modification of 13

J. Winther - the process is getting down to the point where most the zanny alternatives are already out so do we want to just throw out others that may seem crazy? Rather, we should continue forward with them to prove that they should be excluded once and for all.

B. Herbold - I just want to provide guidance to the Program that some alternatives should not make it all the way

T. Zuckerman - I want another workshop after 8-12 alternatives have been developed.

E. Roz -second that thought (above) especially with essential element list being included

C. Koster - ??? (I didn't catch what was said here)

R. Soehren- we are trying to track benefits and impacts of alternatives but if something has a critical impact then we need to take it seriously and look carefully at the alternative.

C. Koster - the least disruptive alternative to the status quo will get the most support from legislature.