

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

SIGN-IN SHEET

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
1. Chris Mobley	National Marine Fisheries Service
2. Ken Lentz	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
3. Dante John Nomellini	Central Delta Water Agency
4. Steven Saxton	North Delta Water Agency & Sac. River interests
5. Steve Macaulay	State Water Contractors
6. Byron Buck	California Urban Water Agencies
7. Ben Barretta	Nevada Irrigation District
8. Peter L. Candy	Environmental Interests
9. Randy Bailey	Metropolitan Water District of So. Calif/Fisheries Consultant
10. Frank Wernette	California Department of Fish and Game
11. David Forkel	Delta Wetlands
12. Gilbert Cosio	Murray, Burns, & Kienlen (Delta Rec Districts and upstream diverters)
13. Dana Friehauf	San Diego County Water Authority
14. Kent Nelson	Department of Water Resources - Central District
15. Roberto Borgonova	League of Women Voters of California
16. Martin Roche	Consultant
17. Jim Arthur	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
18. James McLeod	Banta-Carbona Irrigation District
19. Marilyn Cundiff-Gee	WCB/CVHJB
20. Alan Highstreet	CH2M Hill
21. Tully Lehman	Avant Pr./MPA Student at USC
22. Shahram Ahi	Department of Water Resources - Division of Planning
23. Jim Dixon	Zone 7 Water Agency - Pleasanton California
24. Kirk Brewer	Southern California Water Company
25. Robert Clark	CCV Flood Control Association/North Delta Water Agency
26. David Okita	Solana County Water Agency
27. Annalena Bronson	DWR/Reclamation Board
28. John Kopchick	Contra Costa County Water Agency
29. Dennis J. Oliver	Oakland Tribune/Alameda News Group
30. B.J. Miller	SLDMWA/SCVWD
31. Joan Ryan	EDAW Inc.
32. Paky Brennan	Love Canal Citizens for Safe Drinking Water
33. Ben Martinez	Love Canal Citizens for Safe Drinking Water
34. Joe Horn	Love Canal Citizens for Safe Drinking Water
35. Kaylea White	Montgomery Watson
36. Michael Norris	CALFED
37. David Fullerton	Natural Heritage Institute
38. Mary Selkirk	BDAC
39. Marcia Brockbank	S.F. Estuary Project
40. Michael Heaton	Attorney
41. Tom Boardman	Westlands Water District
42. Stein Buer	DWR
43. John Burke	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation/Central Valley Operations
44. Jim Spence	DWR
45. Gary Bobker	Bay Institute
46. Tom Gregory	California S.P.A.
47. <i>Michael Jackson</i>	<i>(did not sign sheet)</i>

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

INTRODUCTION

Victor Pacheco:

Welcome to participants, check for 4 handouts, and introduction of facilitation team.

Scott McCreary:

- Review of Agenda:
- Welcome and Introductions
- Ground Rules
- General Question and Answer Period
- Alternatives Review
 - Category 1
 - Category 2
 - Category 3

Review of Ground Rules:

- Everyone Participates
- Nobody dominates
- Constructive participation
- Recognize time constraints

QUESTION AND ANSWER (begin 1:08 pm)

THROUGH Q&A, CLARIFY PROCESS, ALTERNATIVES
LIST STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ALTERNATIVES FOR EACH CATEGORY
LIST SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS FOR EACH CATEGORY
OFFER SUGGESTIONS FOR REFINING THE LIST

Question: Peter Candy - Regarding the 100,000 acre-feet (af) of water to be purchased from San Joaquin Basin users. Who will it be purchased from?; where will it be stored?; and I have concerns regarding south and central delta water quality?

CLARIFY 100,000 AF PURCHASE - WHERE PURCHASED, STORED, & CONDITIONS OF RELEASE

Question: Mike Heaton - Regarding the No-Action alternative; How will CALFED account for parallel processes. For example, is CALFED program considered the program for accounting for CVPIA implementation? for Category III implementation?, and the water rights process? In this situation you have multiple no-action situations (due to the unpredictability of the parallel processes). [so] How to account for all of these on the No-Action alternative? Do you take a narrow or broad focus for the No-Action? How broadly will you address them?, What are the no-action assumptions?, How will you integrate them into the alternatives? - Unless you fall back on a narrow process that deals only with an in-delta process.

DOES NAA TAKE INTO ACCOUNT CATEGORY III, WATER RIGHTS, CVPIA REFORM - HOW TO DEAL WITH ALTERNATIVES?, WHAT ASSUMPTIONS ARE MADE?, AND HOW ARE THEY INTEGRATED?

Question: Paky Brennan - How will San Joaquin Valley farm runoff into the San Joaquin river and pollution be addressed in this process?

HOW IS FARM POLLUTION RUNOFF IN SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY ADDRESSED?

Question: Roberta Borgonova (League of Women Voters) - I am an advocate of demand side management. I would like to see demand management included as a core action for all alternatives/ and / can the core elements be strengthened so that they appear in all alternatives?

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

CAN DSM BE INCLUDED AS A CORE ACTION? IS THERE A WAY TO STRENGTHEN CORE ACTIONS FOR ALL ALTERNATIVES?

Question: Annalena Bronson (DWR) - Have we thought about integrating more Sacramento River habitat restoration as part of/or in cooperation with existing flood control efforts into this process?

CAN WE INTEGRATE MORE RESTORATION ON THE SACRAMENTO RIVER? HOW DOES UPSTREAM PROCESS RELATE TO FLOOD MANAGEMENT?

Question: Gary Bobker - What assumptions were used in varying the amount of physical habitat among different alternatives?

WHAT ASSUMPTIONS WERE USED IN VARYING OF AMOUNTS OF HABITAT ACROSS ALTERNATIVES?

Question: Jim McLeod - Regarding riparian habitat - we know that is good for fish - with all of the overhanging branches, shading, and so on. We also know that riprap provides some beneficial habitat...[so] Can we get good data on habitat benefits with riprap? How do we get data that gives us an idea of how much benefit we get from each of these types of banks to make a good decision?

HOW CAN WE GET BETTER DATA ON FISHERY VALUE IMPACTS OF RIPRAP?

Comment: Annalena Bronson - The linkage is important with respect to flood control

Retort: - McLeod - The data is unavailable, you can't conclusively tell me the value of riprap to fish.

Question: Marcia Brockbank (SF Estuary Project) - Who/or what entities will make the final decision on the core actions that will be either strengthened or eliminated?

WHO WILL MAKE FINAL DECISION ON WHAT CORE ACTIONS TO BE STRENGTHENED OR ELIMINATED?

Question: Michael Jackson - Why do none of these alternatives include ecological/agricultural storage that mimics the ecosystem? (cites rice lands example, volume available from such storage)

WHY NO ALTERNATIVE THAT INCLUDES ECO/AG AND MIMICS ECOSYSTEM

Closure of Q&A - Scott McCreary - We have had lots of process questions, especially regarding the core actions, so would any CALFED staff like to respond to these questions?

Response: Dick Daniel -Regarding the 100,000 acre-feet on the San Joaquin- it is intended to be acquired from willing sellers, but in reality it will probably be conserved water. We want it to represent real water that is not the same as flows into and through the Delta. It will be additive to existing San Joaquin River flows (and from tributaries), and additive to existing regulatory/FERC flows currently being decided on two tributaries. It will be new water. The purpose of the water is to augment instream flows for salmon, and it represents "payback" water for spring exports - 100,000 af was chosen because that represents roughly one week of spring exports when such flows are needed for fish.

Clarification question - Steve Macauley - I am concerned regarding the 100,000 af, the way it is conceived as conserved water, and the definition of real water? Will this water be releases that otherwise would go out as flood flows? as outflow?

Response: - Dick Daniel - It may be BJ's "excess" water; or leakage into canals; other system accretions, but is real water, released by someone immediately after its decision with no impacts to delta water rights or upstream users

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

Question: Peter Candy - What is the dilution capacity/what will be the water quality impacts [benefits] of the 100,000 af?

Response: Dick Daniel - The 100,000 af is not intended for water quality purposes - it wouldn't be a drop in the bucket for water quality/dilution of agricultural return flows to the San Joaquin River - with respect to agricultural drainage and water quality considerations. To address agricultural drainage - if we are now considering it as a primary source of ag pollution - we are looking at a relatively low level of land retirement program in conjunction with CVPIA.

Response to No-Action alternative question (Dick Daniel to Mike Heaton) - Category III is in virtually all alternatives in our program as habitat restoration actions; and Category III will be non-existent by the time that this program is implemented. CVPIA [non-controversial] actions are considered as core actions, and CALFED may be the state mechanism for the state to assume its cost-sharing responsibility. CALFED process is independent of, and parallel to the water rights process - we have no conflicts with that process.

Response to Habitat restoration assumptions question (Dick Daniel to Gary Bobker): We used alternative 4 as a baseline level of habitat restoration, alternative 5 represented a moderate level, and alternative 6 a high level. The basic level of assumptions used a isolated transfer/habitat trade-off approach. The fisheries/habitat relationships in the Sacramento River were driven by delta smelt and salmon and other affected species, with similar (e.g. splittail) considerations for San Joaquin River trade-offs, and were driven by levee system vulnerability considerations in the delta. Levee/habitat improvements were driven by improvements being made to the levees for other reasons (simultaneous achievement of vulnerability and habitat benefits).

Comment/Question: Gary Bobker - This also could apply to the Suisun Bay - Was it a low-med-high cut for habitat accounting?

Response - Dick Daniel - We intend to rely on wetlands goals process regarding acreage below Suisun Bay (from Carquinez up) We looked at the goals and objectives of the North American Waterfowl Habitat Joint Venture, and picked those numbers. They are freshwater goals - I still need to adjust them for tidal wetlands - which have dual benefits to waterfowl and fisheries.

Response (to Mike Jackson - re eco/ag question)- Dick Daniel - Nobody really needs the water in March and late February when we need to drain the rice lands...[further explanation re timing of water needs with respect to October flooding; diversions; temperature effects, etc.]

Response (to Marcia Brockbank question regarding decision makers identities) - Dick Daniel - The decision regarding core actions will be made by CALFED - the Secretary of the Resources Agency, the Secretary of the Department of Interior, and the heads of the CALFED agencies.

Daniel: Staff will support the decisions with briefings; paper; submittals, etc.

Comment: Roberta Borognova - I hope that the decisionmakers account for the program objectives and solution principles - the purposes of CALFED when making those decisions.

Question: Marilyn Cudiff-Gee- Could you please re-explain the core actions?

Response - Dick Daniel - The CVPIA core actions - the non-controversial ones not dealing with flows or controversial uncertainties - like upper Sacramento River habitat restoration, will be based on the SB 1086 program, and we are looking at a Verona to Collinsville feasibility study regarding habitat restoration.

Clarification: Dick Daniel - Regarding agricultural drainage and San Joaquin Valley runoff - Subsurface tile drainage is addressed via land retirement by CALFED.

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

Support for Daniel (Victor Pacheco) - Agricultural drainage correction is an action in our toolbox.

Question: Joe Horn - If we continue to send water south, won't we have a problem with tile water?

Comment - Ken Lentz - Dick, you said that tile drainage is the sole source of polluted farm waters being addressed, but the [US] GS is talking about surface runoff, particularly in the San Joaquin system, and its effects on invertebrates (short-term toxicity)- if this in fact becomes a proven problem, what happens to your assumption? Daniel responded by saying that all alternatives contain some source control actions, etc.

Comment: Roberta Borognova - I would like to see core actions meeting the solution principles and objectives to some extent.

Response (to McLeod question re riprap benefits for fish): Dick Daniel - We have a body of literature regarding the benefits of habitat restoration and its relationship to riprap. Riprap does provide some benefits, - it provides minimal hiding places, minimal reduced velocities for resting, but it provides no shade, no change over time (no other benefits of SRAC) - and we are working the the Met (Randy Bailey) - with a report that should be done by "end of March" (per Bailey). Dick Daniel to provide a copy to anyone who wants one.

END OF QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD (closure by McCreary) - 1:44 pm
McCreary - transition to a review of the 20 alternatives....

CATEGORY 1 ALTERNATIVES - What are their strengths and weaknesses? - (General question to group)

Suggestion (Heaton): To follow up on the theme regarding their organization/or the manner of arraying the alternatives - the key is that it is difficult to relate alternatives to one another- to figure their logical relationships. It might be beneficial to turn the process "on end."

(McCreary draws four stair steps with "base, min, mod, and high" on four steps as graphic concept diagram of stepwise point made by Heaton). Heaton states that it is easier to comprehend a tiered or layered process of varying uniformity within each step, or layer. Heaton concludes by stating that the stepwise progression concept of alternative development is substantive as a way of layering sets of actions (and is perceived as stronger way or interrelating actions "progressively.")

GENERAL COMMENT - EASIER TO UNDERSTAND ALTERNATIVES IF STEPPED OR PHASED - RELATE OR BUILD ON EACH OTHER

Comment: Steve Macauley (with respect to Categories 1, 2, and 3). Anything with a low level of resource protection benefit and conflict resolution is pretty weak, would not get much stakeholder support, and should be eliminated (keying off one-line summary on first page of alternative description). The summary page was helpful, and triggered the response.

ALTERNATIVES WITH LOW RATING ON HABITAT RESTORATION AND ALL RESOURCE IMPROVEMENTS ARE WEAK AND DON'T MEET SOLUTION PRINCIPLES

Comment: Gary Bobker - (two-part comment) -

1..The manner in which alternatives are characterized [with respect to resource protection and conflict resolution as per the first page one-line summation] should not be criteria for winnowing, since some alternatives are still incomplete.

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

2. The minimum-moderate-high rating is beneficial; but lots more work is needed to identify core element details and then to revisit "low, or moderate, or high" goals, and their achievement with respect to resource protection and conflict resolution.

DON'T HAVE COMPLETE ALTERNATIVES YET - SO CAN'T RESPOND TO L, M, H RATINGS. IF FIRM UP DETAILS OF CORE ELEMENTS AND THEN DETERMINE WHAT NEED TO SOLVE

Comment: Peter Candy - The key is to maximize the level of implementation of some of the core actions - like demand management or fish restoration.

IF FOCUS IS ON REOP, NEED TO ACHIEVE MAX LEVELS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Comment: Nat Bingham - (regarding the first page one-line summation of res. prot/conflict resolution rating): rhetorical question: Do all of us agree/disagree with the staff low-moderate-high ratings (accuracy) - McCreary takes "raised hand" vote. Most participants disagree with staff ratings - seen as inaccurate; so Nat suggests that participants identify revisions to make ratings more accurate, or more work for the alternative explanations.

DO STAFF RATINGS OF LOW, MODERATE, AND HIGH SEEM ACCURATE?

Response: Victor - The one-line summation was an approach for signaling the intent of each alternative, and is not a rating.

McCreary (getting back on course) - What (to the group) are the strengths of the Category 1 alternatives?

Comment: Stein Buer - We should maintain the ranges of actions and their levels of implementation, and related options until cost estimates are more refined.

KEEP BROAD RANGE OF OPTIONS AT LEAST UNTIL WE HAVE COST DATA

Comment: Roberta Borognova - The rankings are not quantified, there is not enough information and/or data to judge the alternatives, and I am afraid that demand management could fall out of the analysis - only alternative #1 has demand management.

Follow-up: Peter Candy - We should have demand management at a maximum level of implementation as a core action.

AGGRESSIVE DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT A PLUS; SHOULD BE MAX IMPLEMENTATION DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT ACROSS THE BOARD

Comment: Dana Frieauf - Regarding demand management - I feel that it should be administered at the local level, and that if mandatory conservation regulations are imposed, they could be onerous; so allow the local jurisdictions to administer demand side management.

PRESERVE AUTHORITY OF LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES - DELEGATE IMPLEMENTATION TO LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES

Comment: Dante Nomellini - The demand reduction alternatives don't go far enough. Conservation is one element of demand reduction, reclamation also is mentioned, but there is lots of potential for alternative supplies in the service area - we need a wider range of alternatives.

NEED WIDER RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES - WIDEN THE RANGE OF DEMAND REDUCTION/ALTERNATIVE SUPPLY OPTIONS

Comment: Mary Selkirk - Regarding demand management - Overall, the level of implementation of best management practices (BMPs), and the way they are implemented vary widely. Districts have varying

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

needs, so, we need to sieze this opportunity [that the CALFED process presents] to get specific standards and assumptions regarding demand management across the range of [water] districts.

DEVELOP STANDARD ASSUMPTION FOR DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT ACROSS DISTRICTS

Comment: Dave Mikita - All of the alternatives are not responsive to supply reliability questions - they do not allow one to get more water out of the delta. Need to add a drought water bank to strengthen system reliability for category 1 alternatives.

ADD INSTITUTIONAL DROUGHT WATER BANK TO STRENGTHEN SYSTEM RELIABILITY

Comment: Chris Mobley -

- Strength (+) - I am pleased to see the core actions presented as inevitable - I thought some of them would have been too controversial, and I look forward to rapid agreement regarding the core actions - I am pleased at their breadth.
- Weakness (-) - There are not enough objective numeric goals; for example; the CVPIA sets a goal of doubling [anadromous fish populations] as such a goal; we need ranges and associated modeling - some quantitative goals in order to compare alternatives -otherwise it is too difficult.

PLUS - BREADTH OF CORE ACTIONS

MINUS - NOT ENOUGH OBJECTIVE, NUMERICAL GOALS - NEED RANGE OF #'S TO EVALUATE QUANTITATIVELY

Comment: Jim Dixon - Is there a definition of when this starts? For example, many districts have been conserving actively for several years. You need to clarify what year is the base year for conservation.

SET A BASE YEAR OR CLARIFY DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT

Comment: Roberta Borognova - Regarding demand management - There is a philosophical approach, and a real range of alternatives leading to demand reduction, but the process needs to get to a set of regulatory incentives for conservation, reclamation, land retirement, and bring it to the fore. I would like to see some creative thinking regarding local control, verification of demand management implementation, etc.

CREATE BETTER INCENTIVES FOR DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT, COULD BE REGULATORY

Comment: Nat Bingham - Category 1 alternatives use too strong of a reliance on an acoustic barrier at Georgiana Slough. I agree with the barrier concept, but we should replace "acoustic" with "effective" because studies on the acoustic barrier have not been released, and we are still not sure such a barrier will be effective.

WOULD LIKE TO CLARIFY DESCRIPTION OF BARRIER AT GEORGIANA SLOUGH - "EFFECTIVE"

Comment: Richard Denton - (follow-up) - Please also clarify what you mean by south delta barriers.

CLARIFY DESCRIPTION OF S. DELTA BARRIERS AS WELL

Comment: Paky Brennan - For the past 50 years we haven't been able to clean up the delta; what makes you think this program can do it? - How do we expect to do it now?

Follow-on (McCreary) - Do you have any advice regarding a solution?

Brennan - (advice) - Provide more funding for limited land retirement of marginal lands

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

CONSIDER REMOVING MARGINAL LAND FROM PRODUCTION

Comment - Mike Jackson - There are no mechanisms to put fish back into their original spawning and rearing areas (i.e. above existing dams/diversions).

DEVELOP ALTERNATIVES THAT INCLUDE SPAWNING AND REARING HABITAT ABOVE DAMS

Comment (Gary Bobker) - The distribution of habitat and habitat benefits beyond basic levels needs extension; so, I saw a plus in that the Category 1 alternatives retain a common delta pool, thus potentially avoiding a [politically] "lethal" resolution [path]. However, I saw a minus in that water quality controls in several alternatives are not as strong as needed - especially with respect to source control. Also a minus - we need to elevate subsidence control (which has associated ecological and supply benefits) and reduced vulnerability beyond their present levels of implementation.

EXPAND DISTRIBUTION OF HABITAT AND HABITAT BENEFITS BEYOND BASIC
STRENGTHEN WATER QUALITY FOR SOURCE CONTROL - APPLIES TO CATEGORY 1, 2, AND 3 ALTERNATIVES
CONTROL SUBSIDENCE TO REDUCE LEVEE VULNERABILITY

Comment: BJ Miller - Regarding demand management - If it is a core action, why are we arguing about it? The only real question is how much of it you do (level of implementation). The same [logic applies] for water transfers - as a core action, we all know some are going to happen, so, if it is a core action, it is not an alternative to be discussed right now.

Further (Miller) - None of the components of system vulnerability adequately address it - there is an implicit mistake in that levee enhancements do not address the question of system vulnerability (referring to panel comment about underlying liquefaction potential of soils beneath levees).

LEVEE IMPROVEMENTS DON'T FULLY ADDRESS SYSTEM VULNERABILITY

Comment: Dana Frieauf - I would advise that CALFED staff look at water quality via the State Water Project, with respect to demand management.

EXAMINE WATER QUALITY THROUGH SWP

Comment: Chris Mobley - Link environmental water to habitat restoration; the quantities of water are not yet determined [to meet habitat needs].

LINK AMOUNT OF ENVIRONMENTAL WATER TO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OBJECTIVES

Comment: Randy Bailey - None of the alternatives address ecosystem restoration - CALFED staff need to expand the geographic scope and scale of ecosystem restoration. Several actions and objectives are logically inconsistent. CALFED staff need to closely examine whether or not actions solve [corresponding] problems.

EXPAND GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE/SCALE OF HABITAT RESTORATION
ACHIEVE GREATER INTERNAL CONSISTENCY BETWEEN ACTION AND PROBLEM

Comment: Ken Lentz - I have trouble with "real time monitoring" as presented in the alternatives. The text reads to "improve" real time monitoring, and I disagree with the glossary definition of real time monitoring. Different person's perceptions are different as to what "real time monitoring" means, especially regarding the "goods to be delivered." Real time monitoring can be very intensive (people, vessels, etc.). CALFED staff need to clarify the intent/definition of real time monitoring, and lessen their expectations of it.

CLARIFY INTENT AND MEANING/WHAT WILL BE PRODUCED FROM REAL TIME MONITORING

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

Comment: Marilyn Cudiff-Gee - CALFED staff need to pursue more habitat restoration/enhancement in the north of delta areas - this needs to be explored. We also need to integrate flood control, habitat, riparian habitat improvements.

EXPLORE RESTORATION ENHANCEMENT NORTH OF DELTA AND TRIBUTARIES TO SACRAMENTO RIVER

Comment: Byron Buck - None of the Category 1 alternatives address drinking water quality; source quality must be addressed prior to groundwater banking/conjunctive use. Those users must have higher source water quality before they will be willing to bank/conjunctively use.

EMPHASIZE DRINKING WATER QUALITY

Closure of Category 1 comments- McCreary 2:25 pm

CATEGORY II

Comment: BJ Miller -(2-part comment)

The name of these alternatives (as a group) is wrong. The use of the word "facilities" ("Reoperation and Facilities") is perjorative - because lots of people don't want to see more supply facilities constructed, so the naming has negative connotations. BUT... Lots of spending is going to be done for habitat restoration "facilities," and "facilities" having land-based purposes. So the artificial distinction [that most people will make regarding the implications of the word "facilities"] is a big process problem.

All of this will involve reoperation (regardless of category or alternative), so why specify in category II alternatives? The title gives a false premise.

NEED ANOTHER TITLE FOR FACILITY REOPERATION - OTHERWISE PROMOTES ARTIFICIAL DISTINCTION
RECOGNIZE THAT ALL ALTERNATIVES INVOLVE SOME REOPERATION

Comment: Randy Bailey - Category I, II, and III classification is irrelevant - is it artificial or to help in organizing the alternatives - is it meaningful?

CATEGORIES I, II, AND III NOT MEANINGFUL CLASSIFICATION

Comment: David Folker - It is tough to understand new facility/reoperation alternatives in terms of yield. Will there be planning studies and modeling?

CLARIFY YIELD EXPECTED FORM CATEGORY II FACILITIES

Comment: Peter Candy - Clarify controls on the isolated transfer facility. There is a huge potential for abuse - what will be the controls/constraints to achieve environmental goals?

CLARIFY CONTROLS/CONSTRAINTS FOR ISOLATED FACILITIES

Comment: Byron Buck - All users want to see [equity] guarantees with respect to environmental water.

CLARIFY GUARANTEES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL WATER

Comment: Steve Macauley - Once standards/guarantees are met, the constraints should then be limited so that they do not prevent exporting of more water during "excess" flows (however excess eventually gets defined) - upstream or downstream of the delta.

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

ONCE THESE GUARANTEES ARE MET, SHOULDN'T BE ADDITIONAL CONSTRAINTS ON SUPPLY [EXPORT]

Comment: Jim Dixon - Guarantees must go both ways (same comment as Buck, above).

Comment: Roberta Borognova - The philosophical approach of restoring to "near original" - needs to incorporate the strengthening of the core actions - with greater demand management. Are the actions, objectives, and solution principles matching [logically consistent]?

INCORPORATE MORE DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT IN CATEGORY II AND STRENGTHEN CORE ACTIONS ACROSS BOARD - ENSURE ACTIONS PRINCIPLES MATCH

Comment: Jim McLeod - How do you determine high priority diversions for screening?

Response (Mobley) - CDFG, NMFS, and USFWS are cooperating on the development of screening criteria, and also take into account the size of the diversion, the timing of species with respect to the diversion, sensitivity of some species, presence, location of the diversion with respect to some life histories, and the risk to species during pumping periods.

Return (McLeod): The only criteria is that they're on the river and pumping (trying to hint at other mortality causes (i.e. ocean harvest, etc.). Does not address actual scientific data re fish kills. Advises CALFED staff to revisit criteria for high priority diversions.

CLARIFY PRIORITIES FOR DIVERSION SCREENING
IMPROVE CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING HIGH PRIORITY DIVERSIONS

Comment: Randy Bailey - [CALFED staff need to] clearly document the assumptions behind the actions as now written. Better definitions are needed.

PROVIDE ASSUMPTIONS BEHIND ALTERNATIVES AND ACTIONS.

Comment: Mike Jackson - What is the source of water for conveyance facilities - source and timing can vary widely.

PROVIDE DESCRIPTION OF SOURCE AND TIMING OF WATER AT CONVEYANCE FACILITY

Comment: BJ Miller - We need to put an asterisk by all storage - because it is unsure whether you can make them work. If delta requirements are uncertain [needs for success of other programs] and storage requirements are uncertain, it is difficult to evaluate the costs and benefits of [hypothetical] storage. The key is to match environmental requirements with potential storage and operational requirements. Do the storage volumes make sense?

CONFIRM/COMPLETE OPERATION STUDIES TO DETERMINE STORAGE VOLUMES MAKE SENSE

Comment: Ken Lentz - [CALFED staff need to] explain why some decisions were made [with respect to actions retained or discarded]. Decisions to remove actions have a "backroom" flavor. Justify why actions have been eliminated, and present how substantive is the underlying data [supporting these decisions]. What are the theories/notions guiding the alternatives as developed.

NEED TO JUSTIFY WHY ACTIONS INCLUDED AND WHY TAKEN OUT. SUBSTANTIATE DATA FOR ALTERNATIVES (Macauley - "this is really phase 2")

Comment: Chris Mobley - Explicit goals and objectives are needed to support monitoring, adaptive management, phasing, tiers of actions. The quantitative goals and objectives will better enable us to address the conflicts in a climate of uncertainty. We need a yardstick/with consensus regarding the worthiness of the goals and objectives.

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

NEED EXPLICIT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR DESIGN ALTERNATIVES TO BE IMPLEMENTED WITH ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Comment: Peter Candy - One thing that has not been looked at is the use of recycled water that is then stored in an in-delta storage facility, and used for fish releases.

Response: Richard Denton - The in-delta storage theory for these purposes has problems. It does not trace the transport mechanisms that it needs to. For example, what if fish are above the release point when the water is released. Any such solution must be cognizant of the entire range of life cycle/presence considerations, and must be more consistent with the intent of moving X2 outward.

EXPLORE USING RECYCLED WATER IN IN-DELTA FACILITIES

Comment: Mike Heaton - the process has expanded to lots of uncertainty (from original alternatives development process). As we get further away from the delta, it gets more difficult, so, stay focused on the delta with respect to habitat restoration, water quality (both in-delta considerations only).

STAY FOCUSED ON DELTA HABITAT RESTORATION AND WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS
SEVERAL OBSTACLES TO THIS ALTERNATIVES APPROACH

There may not be a "guarantees" solution - maybe "ironclad" guarantees are not a reality [realistic goal].
LOOK AT WAYS TO FIND MAX INSURANCE/ASSURANCES OTHER THAN TRADITIONAL GUARANTEES.

Comment: Mike Jackson - Where do you draw the line (back-and-forth between Jackson and Heaton re geog scope).

Closure Category II (McCreary)

CATEGORY III REVIEW

ELIMINATE EVERYTHING THAT IS ISOLATED

Comment: Dante Nomellini - What are the objectives of each of the alternatives? across all - in quantitative terms? We cannot have narrow alternatives?

Comment: - Roberta Borognova - address the institutional

BJ Miller to Nomellini - What are your interests (we know your position already);

Nomellini - Solution for the entire State of California:

- exports are limited to supplies
- exports are limited to delta needs
- exports are limited until full northern California development however it happens.
- no isolated transfer facility - because no guarantees
- recognize areas of origin

Beware of categorization of everything that is surplus

ADDRESS INSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE FOR LARGE ISOLATED FACILITY
LIMIT EXPORTS

Comment: McLeod - You should not be interested in going back to the delta as it was [pre-settlement or 50 years ago] - dredging and levee improvements were more frequent and damaging, lots of habitat via farming followed by government confiscation....What are the restoration endpoints?

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

CLARIFY ASSUPTIONS FOR DELTA RESTORATION - WHAT IS BASELINE? - CAN'T RETURN TO DELTA AS IT WAS

Comment: Richard Denton - I recommend elimination of alternative # 15. It is bizarre. Does not meet the objectives, is rarely usable, and very expensive. Rarely accessible due to required Sac River flows.

RECOMMEND ELIMINATION OF ALTERNATIVE 15 - DOESN'T MEET OBJECTIVES AND IS COSTLY

Comment: Roberta Borognova - Category III alternatives do not have demand side management.
Comment: Nat Bingham: Category III alternatives tend to be too expensive.

CATEGORY III ALTERNATIVES TEND TO BE TOO EXPENSIVE

McCreary - (to group) - Do the alternatives represent the full range of alternatives? and What recommendations would you make to staff to narrow the range of alternatives?

Victor: What issues need more full expression?

Comment: Ken Lentz - The first thing to do is to put out CALFED's decisions as soon as possible. This will solicit responses from potentially affected parties. Be sure to base decisions on the best data available. Show expediency, and offer as much supporting information/reasoning as possible.

PUT OUT DECISIONS ASAP - RELEASE DOCUMENT TO GET FEEDBACK
OFFER AS MUCH INFO TO REVIEWER AS POSSIBLE

Comment: McLeod - To what extent are you interested in restoring fish? CALFED is not telling me their level of interest in restoring fish and habitat - Are the CVPIA doubling goals also yours? So, what are your habitat [restoration] goals? [How much of one goal gets satisfied before it is met, and before another gets satisfied - and how will their satisfaction be integrated?] How will decisions [regarding endpoints] be arrived at?

TO WHAT EXTENT INTERESTED IN RESTORING FISH? SAME RANGE AS CVPIA?; TO WHAT EXTENT WILL HABITAT RESTORATION GO?

Comment: Marilyn Cudiff-Gee - There is not enough north-of-delta issues consideration; too much in-delta focus; many delta impacts can be addressed with north-of-delta actions. Existing documentation is informative, but the underlying assumptions are needed, and the underlying data. So, as the winnowing from 20 to 8-12 alternatives occurs, provide data and assumptions used at the greatest level of detail possible.

NEED MORE INFORMATION AND DETAIL ON ISSUES AND PROBLEMS NORTH OF THE DELTA THAT IMPACT THE DELTA.

NEED ASSUMPTIONS AND DATA USED IN PRODUCING ALTERNATIVES; SUMMARIZE ALTERNATIVES AND PROVIDE DETAILED MSUPPORTING INFORMATION

Comment: BJ Miller - Can you construct the alternatives per the original stakeholder definition [process]?

There are four essential elements:

1. Comprehensive ecosystem management for north, in-, and south of delta areas = core element. The key is to outline the process to embark on rational restoration that can withstand a trial and error period.
2. Comprehensive demand management - BMPs, agricultural, conjunctive use, reclamation, transfers - all need area buy-ins from user groups.

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

3. Do in-delta (maybe out) actions addressing water user needs regarding supply, quality, levee vulnerability, which then opens up a range of physical actions possible (storage, etc.)
4. Develop a set of assurances - varying based upon trade-off impacts

Miller: Two important points - Ecosystem restoration and demand management are not trade-offs, - they will be done.

OUTLINE PROCESS FOR EMBARKING ON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROGRAM
DEFINE COMPREHENSIVE DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM WITH STAKEHOLDERS
ADDRESS NEEDS OF WATER USERS AND ADDRESS NEED FOR ADDITIONAL STORAGE
DEVELOP A SET OF ASSURANCES TO ASSURE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ABOVE POINTS

Comment: Gary Bobker - The diversity of habitats systemwide (Sacramento River, Suisun Bay) needs more development (geographically) - inadequately represented. Need an agreed-upon large-scale ecosystem restoration vision that can serve as a foundation - the adoption of a long-term program. Need a parallel vision of demand side management.

DIVERSITY OF HABITATS NEEDS TO BE MORE FULLY DEVELOPED
DEFINE VISION OF HABITAT RESTORATION/ECOSYSTEM AND PARALLEL VISION OF DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT

Comment: Nat Bingham - The full range of alternatives is not represented. The through delta alternative is not fully explored with respect to water quality benefits of the facility. So, after BJ's exercise (see comment above), you need to overlay the life histories of species, with particular attention to life history "bottlenecks." (outmigration...). Then fashion alternatives so they cannot affect bottlenecks.

DOCUMENT KNOWN BOTTLENECKS IN LIFE CYCLES OF FISH AND WINNOW IN ALTERNATIVES

Comment: Roberta Borognova - The full range of alternatives were not easy to see because it was difficult to see how the alternatives were put together. I like the idea of four elements, - the more information the better - but an explanation is needed of how concerns already expressed have, or will be addressed.

EXPLAIN HOW CONCERNS ALREADY RAISED WILL BE ADDRESSED

Comment: Randy Bailey - None of these are alternatives. There is not a full list of elements.

McCreary - "What is missing?"

Bailey - Actions do not meet objectives. CALFED staff should ask whether the scientific underpinnings are valid (they are not per Bailey); only assertions.

NO ONE IS AN ALTERNATIVE, MOST LISTS OF ACTIONS DO NOT MEET CALFED OBJECTIVES
SCIENTIFIC ASSUMPTIONS NOT VALID

Comment: Bailey - The ecosystem will not respond as it has in the past. The laundry list of actions needs to be expanded. Think broader, and bigger. The narrow focus will prevent the achievement of the program's objectives. A list of the interactivity among actions has not been addressed. The whole thing looks like a probability exercise now (equity trade-offs). Distinguish activities that common (not core actions) - and discuss them separately.

GET INNOVATIVE, EXPAND, BE MORE COMPREHENSIVE

ORANGE BREAKOUT GROUP
February 26, 1996

Comment: Mike Jackson - The full range of alternatives is not represented. The authors do not have enough knowledge regarding the tributaries. (cites example).some facilities could be dedicated to objective achievement - look at how to meet goals operationally.

STAFF NEED MORE INFORMATION ON TRIBUTARIES/OPERATIONAL OPTIONS

Recommendation (Jackson) - Look at existing facilities; see which ones could be used for supply/quality goals (to keep them in the process to pay for habitat restoration) - do it more specifically.

LOOK AT EXISTING FACILITIES TO DETERMINE WHICH COULD BE USED TO MEET WATER SUPPLY AND QUALITY - BE MORE SPECIFIC WITH RESPECT TO RIVERS.

Comment: Marilyn Cudiff-Gee - The presentation of the core elements, if important, should be in the front of the document. The assumptions also should be included, and a discussion of the synergies/benefit linkages.

DOCUMENT SHOULD EXPLAIN COMMON ELEMENTS/LINKAGES

Comment: Maurice Roos - There is no information on new storage. Yuba River and American River have potential, but there is no mention of it here - no specifics.

Recommendation (Roos) - Keep focus on delta with existing exports.

NEED TO LOOK AT YUBA AND AMERICAN FOR NEW STORAGE -EXPAND LOOK AT NEW STORAGE - KEEP FOCUS ON DELTA