Notes from 2/26/96 CALFED Workshop #5 - Red Breakout Group - 1:00

Facilitator Tim Hicks; Leader Judy Kelly, Steve Yaeger, Janet Derck

Molly Wilson - Supervisor, Shasta County
Jim Easton - HYA Consulting Engineers
Patrick Minturn- Shasta County Water Agency
Larry Puckett - CVPIA USFWS/CDFG
Joe Patten, individual
Clair Hill, California Water Commission
Cathy Patton - Woodward-Clyde
Kathy Kelly - DWR
Kate Hansel - DWR - Wetlands Coordinator
Alex Hildebrand - South Delta Water Agency
Lyle Hoag - Consultant
Richard Moss - PG&E
Amy Fowler - SCVWD
Margit Aramburu - Delta Protection Commission
David Miller - Harza Engineering
William R. Johnston - Modesto Irrigation District
Tom Hunter - Plumas County
Mike Hardesty - Reclamation District 2068
Virginia Cahill - City of Stockton
Cleve Latini? - Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District
Ed Littrell - California Department of Fish and Game
David Briggs - Contra Costa Water District
Doug Wallace - ??

Questions:

Lyle Hoag - HOW DO YOU BUILD UP AN ARRAY OF ALTERNATIVES? IT IS A DIFFICULT JOB. THE CORE ACTIONS ARE GOOD, BUT DON'T REPEAT THE CORE ACTIONS IN EACH ALT DESCRIPTION, BUT REFER TO THEM IN THESE DESCRIPTIONS. WHY ARE THE CORE ISSUES INCLUDED IN THE ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTIONS. **CALFED response: Some core actions are listed in the alternatives, because core actions can be implemented at higher levels than core. When an action is implemented above its core level in an alternative, the description says so.** Lyle's response - IDENTIFY IN DESCRIPTIONS WHEN A CORE ACTION IS IMPLEMENTED AT A HIGHER THAN CORE LEVEL.

Joe Patten - HOW AND WHEN WILL ECONOMIES THAT ARE GONE (RECREATION, FISHERIES) BE ASSESSED? [Rephrased: Some industries such as recreation, agriculture and fisheries have been hurt by water development and regulation. Will these effects be described and analyzed by CALFED?] **CALFED response: A more detailed analysis of economics will be in included in the Phase II environmental documentation.** JOE'S RESPONSE - THESE

INDUSTRIES ARE HURT NOW; HOW WILL CURRENT PROBLEMS BE ADDRESSED? **CALFED response: The No-Action alternative will be developed in Phase II and these issues will be addressed then.**

Amy Fowler - DRINKING WATER QUALITY - SPECIFICALLY TOXICS AND POLLUTANTS - NOT ADDRESSED IN THE ALTERNATIVES. **CALFED response: We will be improving the alternative in the next few weeks to address this issue better.**

Richard Moss - WHY WEREN'T COSTS AND FINANCING MECHANISMS INCLUDED? **CALFED response: We are still working on preliminary cost information. Cost information will be provided later.**

Kathy Kelly - IS THE 100K ACRE-FEET SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WATER ABOVE WHAT IS NEEDED TO MEET VERNALIS REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE 1995 WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN? **CALFED response: The baseline is the 1995 standards but we don't know yet if the 100K will be in addition to what is needed to meet the standards or whether the two can be combined.**

Unknown: IS THE OLD RIVER BARRIER SAME AS OLD RIVER BYPASS. IF NOT, WHAT IS THE BYPASS? **CALFED response: They will be the same in the next round of alternatives. It will be described as an Old River fix, either a barrier or a bypass, but not defining which.**

William Johnston - BASED ON WHAT IS THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE 100K ACRE-FEET OF SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WATER WOULD IMPROVE FISH POPULATIONS BASED ON? **CALFED response: The 100K would be used to transport fish past pumps, thus avoiding entrainment.**

Margit Aramburu: HOW WERE THE THREE SIZES OF LAND SIDE BUFFER STRIPS DETERMINED? **CALFED response: These figures were caused by clerical problems. In the next round, the alternatives will only indicate that a buffer strip will be preserved but not what the width is. An analysis will need to be done as to what the appropriate width should be at each individual location based on local conditions.**

?? - WHY IS THE PURCHASE OF WATER ASSUMED TO BE FROM TRIBUTARIES AND NOT FROM PROJECT EXPORTERS WHO COULD PUT IT IN THE DELTA MENDOTA CANAL? **CALFED response: In the next round, there will be an expanded definition of where the water comes from.**

Jim Easton - WHEN IN THE PROCESS WILL HYDROLOGIC MODELING BE DONE, AND WILL IT INCLUDE THE 1995 WATER QUALITY STANDARDS AS A BASIS? **CALFED response: The issues surrounding the baseline will be addressed in the April scoping process for the EIS/EIR, so we can't say what will be part of baseline now. We have a need for modeling in Phase I, but the time constraints may not allow it. We will do as much as we can within the time frame of this process. We also may use existing model runs.** Jim E -

WILL WE BASE MODEL RUNS ON MEETING STANDARDS? - **We don't know yet.**

Lyle Hoag - THE TERM SYSTEM RELIABILITY IS USED IN CORE ACTIONS, BUT THE ALTERNATIVES DESCRIPTIONS USE THE TERM SYSTEM VULNERABILITY. IS THERE A REAL DIFFERENCE? WOULD PREFER THE TERM VULNERABILITY BECAUSE RELIABILITY IS USUALLY ASSOCIATED WITH WATER SUPPLY. **CALFED response: Generally these are the same. The term vulnerability is more inclusive of the entire system and is therefore preferable, bu we are not completely happy with this term and will reexamine it.**

Alex Hildebrand - WHY IS THERE NO CONSIDERATION OF SEGREGATING DRINKING WATER FROM THE REST OF URBAN USES, WHERE QUALITY AND TREATMENT AREN'T AS IMPORTANT? **CALFED response: We are looking at that but mainly from an operational perspective, with small isolated transfer facilities, to segregate water in the Delta Mendota Canal. We haven't looked at the bifurcation of physical facilities. There doesn't seem to be a lot of support for physically separating flows.**

Alex Hildebrand - WILL CALFED COMPARE THE COST OF SHIPPING WATER TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COMPARED WITH DESALINATION? **CALFED response: We are still working on preliminary cost information. Cost information will be provided later.**

?? - WHY WASN'T THERE AN ALTERNATIVE WHERE ALL LEVEES WERE BROUGHT UP TO PL99 STANDARDS? **CALFED response: We are trying to provide distinctions and a range between alternatives.**

Lyle Hoag - THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS SHOULD ASSESS THE COSTS OF MINERALS IN EXPORT WATER? **CALFED response: Comment noted.**

Alex Hildebrand - WHY AREN'T OTHER SOUTH DELTA TIDAL BARRIERS MENTIONED IN CONNECTION WITH THE OLD RIVER BARRIER. OTHER BARRIERS ARE NEEDED TO MITIGATE THE EFFECTS OF THE OLD RIVER BARRIER. **CALFED response: We need to revisit this issue. We looked at them separately, but maybe we need to mesh them together because they are related.**

?? - WHAT DRIVES THE RECOMMENDED RESTORATION SITES BEING IN THE NORTHWEST DELTA? HOW WERE THEY SELECTED? **CALFED response: There are already willing sellers there (Prospect, Liberty, Little Holland, Yolo Bypass). Also, restoration needs to be in locations above sea level. Finally, there is a need to keep habitat away from the south Delta pumps while they still operating.**

Clare Hill - The amount of water used by urban areas use is higher than we think. This will have a major impact on treatment costs. Shouldn't we address that? **CALFED response: ??**

Joe Patten - WHERE DOES GRAVEL REPLENISHMENT IN THE SACRAMENTO RIVER FIT IN? **It is included in some alternatives but we haven't reached a level of detail specific**

enough to know exactly where or how much is being proposed.

General Comments:

Amy Fowler - The alternatives don't address drinking water quality enough. Specifically, the issues of toxics and pollutants are dealt with adequately in the alternatives?

Lyle Hoag - Certain things such as an evaluation of water quality need to be addressed.

Alex Hildebrand - Where is the concept of reliability applied, in the Delta or throughout the system?

Lyle Hoag - What is the impact of economics on separating drinking water flows?

Alex Hildebrand - [Related to previous comment] The economics may be beneficial to the separation of flows.

Elements That Need to Stay In the Alternatives

Jim Easton - It is real important to retain an in-Delta storage element. There will be a huge competition for water to meet water quality standards and anadromous fish and endangered species act needs in the future.

Clare Hill - A Delta fix requires storage of water upstream in the Sacramento Basin. Water is wasted by dumping of reservoirs (1,000,000 out of Shasta in last 30 days). Locations and water are available. No fix can be successful without it. Doesn't like in-Delta storage. A closed facility to transport water is also needed.

Richard Moss - The ecosystem quality side of the alternatives is strong. Upstream storage is lacking. Storing water in-Delta is problematic; infrastructure would need to be relocated or would be put at risk.

Cathy Patton - How do you measure the success of any solution?

Joe Patten - Water stored in south Delta offstream storage can't be used for improvements in upper Sacramento System. Storage in the upper Sacramento can be used for a variety of purposes in and out of the basin.

Alex Hildebrand - Storage is more important in the San Joaquin Valley since it is an over committed system. Raising Friant Dam would go a long way to helping that situation. Yield could be used for water quality, fish flows and flood flow benefits. Regarding storage in the Delta there has been too much generalization of benefits and impacts. We need to define it better to know if it is good or bad. If we do the Chain of Lakes, we need to consider the water losses due

to evapotranspiration which are higher than in farming. The alternatives don't have enough detail about where water is to be stored or how it would be used.

Lyle Hoag - To make best use of additional yield from upstream storage, we need downstream storage. A third form of surface storage more valuable yet: we need the ability to grab the peak flows when they go by. Even during drought period, we could add 1 million acre-feet to system yield by adding an afterbay to the pumps and increase capacity of pumps to keep aqueducts flowing at peaks for a longer period of time.

Joe Patton - If we extend the Tehama Colusa canal to the Delta, we could use Lake Berryessa for the same purpose [storage of peak flows].

Jim Easton - What Lyle described is the Delta Wetlands program.

Lyle - It isn't the Delta Wetlands project because the storage needs to be downstream of the export pumps.

Clare Hill - Nothing can be done simply or quickly.

Margit Aramburu - Levees are what keeps Delta as it is today. All alternatives need to have some level of long term levee maintenance and stability.

Kate Hansel - It is good that a range of habit in the Bay-Delta and upstream are included. But, the alternatives need to also have a range of upstream restoration as well, including basic, moderate and high habitat actions in the upper Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins. Right now, under high restoration alternatives, these measures are included, and under low restoration alternatives, they are out.

Doug Wallace - We need to make sure that we keep the burden from being entirely on upstream users.

Alex Hildebrand - I endorse the last comment. To maintain the current configuration of the Delta, we need to improve flood flow capacity in the Mokelumne system. This would include both levee improvements and channel capacity improvements. We could offset the loss of shallow water habitat due to these actions, by removing exotic species in the south Delta.

Molly Wilson - Additional upstream water storage would increase ecosystem benefits. We would be better off in the long run if we develop more water. Area of origin is important to her. How and when will it be addressed?

Downstream users need to find the water they intend to flush the Delta with.

Richard Moss - [Asking Patrick] Does that include water never put to use.

Patrick Minturn - Yes.

Richard Moss - Alternative 20 is a good alternative; it could be improved by adding channel capacity improvements. During the panel discussion, there was the making of an interesting consensus, MWD is in agreement with through-Delta conveyance rather than an isolated facility.

Amy Fowler - I am representing CUWA-Ag. An alternative needs to be a package meeting all user requirements. The alternatives need institutional guarantees, which haven't yet been included. Large-scale comprehensive ecosystem restoration is needed. The 1st category of alternatives [Operational Changes Only] don't meet all user needs. On the other hand, just emphasizing new facilities may also miss important needs. Need some combination to have balanced alternatives. They have four favorite alternatives and will provide these in their written comments. The first group of alternatives emphasize demand management which by itself is not an alternative, because some major conflicts are not addressed and the solution principle that all needs be addressed is violated.

Alex Hildebrand - The alternatives aren't analyzed regarding how they would operate under different water year types.

Kathy Kelly - She likes the approach to facilities: a range from non-structural to Cadillac facilities. She likes the operational flexibility of some facilities to help ensure the reliability of supply. She doesn't like Alternative 1, especially the action to remove 800,000 acres of agricultural land. Land retirement is good, but this is 15-20% of San Joaquin Valley agricultural land. This will polarize communities participating in this program and will kill the alternative which otherwise is O.K. otherwise. Sooner or later this will come down to cost, so she likes smaller facilities like the Dual Transfer Facility which provide flexibility. She doesn't like in-Delta storage. Additional actions on eastside streams are not included in alternatives. Why not? We need flood control and water quality control in the Central Delta. Demand management and conjunctive use could be put together in one alternative at reasonable levels to solve our problems. **CALFED response: [Referring to eastside stream storage] offstream storage has been the emphasis of the program.**

Joe Patten - Storage in the westside of the Sacramento Valley is far cheaper than storage on the eastside. He likes seeing gravel replenishment in the program. This needs to be accelerated and permits streamlined because it would reinstate the fishery in Redding. Moving fish upstream would be better because the upstream temperatures are better for the fish. The Sites reservoir needs to be built to the full capability of the site (3 million acre-feet), not 1 or 2 as shown in the alternatives.

Virginia Cahill - With the possible exception of Alternative #13, these alternatives don't solve the problems of the Stockton East water district. The purchase of 100,000 acre-feet of water could make the situation worse. **CALFED response: Eastside storage could help solve South Sacramento and Stockton East problems. This needs to be described more clearly in the alternatives.**

Alex Hildebrand - All alternatives that bypass the Delta with good quality water would hurt the quality of water in the Delta.

Lyle Hoag - We need to solve the Stockton East problem. This problem could be solved at a cheaper cost: build the eastside facility from Verona to Nimbus then to Delta pumping stations. This would help San Joaquin County, EBMUD and San Francisco, and would be consistent with the Sacramento Forum Plan. It would also provide high quality water to the Delta pumping plants. This is a variation of #13 but much cheaper to do.

Doug ?? - EBMUD is concerned with interties that would degrade the quality of their water, such as the just-suggested alternative.

Amy Fowler - Regarding Alternative 13, how do south Bay water users get their water? Also, when alternatives are evaluated, will engineering feasibility be examined?

Bill Johnston - Anyone could dislike some alternatives, because they don't all address their needs.

Clare Hill - It is essential that CALFED consider additional storage. Regarding Alternative #14, water quality should be excellent not moderate. It will help the whole system, because it would be operated to avoid the problems in the Delta. Wouldn't take water out at times when quality is a problem. Alternative #15 is a good long-term solution.

Lyle Hoag - It's too early in the process to give a thoughtful or objective answer as to which alternatives are best.

Joe Patten - The matrix in the handouts has a blank for water transfers under Alternative #14. However, if the facility in #14 were built, transfers could occur more easily.

Alex Hildebrand - Water pricing and groundwater banking to encourage efficient water use won't work in places where supplies are limited or where water comes from various sources, because it could result in overdrafting. Efficient use of water on farms on the westside of the San Joaquin Valley concentrates salts and degrades Delta water quality.

David Miller - Regarding core actions, how will CALFED establish incentives for conjunctive use and ease institutional barriers? He needs more detail.

Lyle Hoag - Is it intended that recreational fishing and poaching be included in core actions regarding commercial fishing? **CALFED response: yes.**

Joe Patten - He has noted an marked increase in the amount of fish eaten by sea lions, and thinks that we need to deal with this problem.

Kate Hansel - There is a missing core action. There is no restoration in the core actions, only protection of existing habitat areas. **CALFED response: There isn't broad-based support for restoration, only protection.** Kate - it's hard to believe that you can't get agreement for some level of restoration.

Tom Hunter, Plumas County - How does watershed management fit into this? It isn't spelled out

very well in the alternatives. Is restoration part of watershed management. **CALFED response: We need to investigate this.**

David Miller - Regarding the action to pen rear striped bass, what happens if the striped bass increase? Will that harm salmon? **CALFED response: There isn't agreement among the resource agencies. This action will probably be included in fewer alternatives in the next round.**

Bill Johnston - The Old River Barrier should be in core actions. He thinks Old River Barrier is less controversial than Georgiana Slough which is a core. **CALFED response: There is disagreement as to whether the Old River Barrier is good or not. It may be detrimental to Smelt. The controversy regarding the Georgiana Slough barrier is how well it would work, not if it is good or not.**

Alex Hildebrand - The Old River Barrier should be shown as an operable barrier where it could be opened when smelt are around and closed when salmon are around. You need to state the purpose of the barrier, not just say a fix at Old River. **We will state the purpose in our write up.**

Jim Easton - The problems with salmon are real, and the Old River Barrier should be included now.

Alex - Some core actions refer to more water reclamation. That's good, but reclaimed water has more salt than fresh water which could cause salt buildup problems.

Kate Hansel - Regarding the matrix, if an action is shown in all alternatives, isn't that a core action. **A discussion of core actions ensued.**

Clare Hill - How much time is there to provide written comments. **CALFED response: March 1.**

Lyle Hoag - Alternative three uses the Sacramento Ship Channel as a conveyance facility. Don't ships dump bilge water and a lot of other stuff in the channel that you wouldn't want in your drinking water? **CALFED response: We need to investigate the water quality implications of this action.**

Kathy Kelly - Do we need to focus on this completely to get comments quickly? What happens next?

Joe Patten - Lester didn't say he needed comments by Friday. **CALFED response: We will take your comments any time, but we will be narrowing to 8-12 alternatives in the next week or so, so your comments after that will only help in future work.**

Bill Johnston - We weren't told about this schedule when we received the package. **CALFED response: It is indicated on the bottom of page 1.**

Lyle - We've raised some sub-alternatives in this session. Will you tend to carry those in your winnowing down to 8? **CALFED response: Yes, there will be subalternatives and nuances included in the next round. The next report with 8-12 should go to press on March 15.**

Alex Hildebrand - You have received comments from Delta water agencies, individuals, BDAC members and others. Do those get the same consideration as if they had been made at this meeting? **CALFED response: Yes.**

?? - Land retirement is shown with large-scale and small scale, but no moderate implementation. It should be shown with a moderate implementation level.

Cathy Patton - Concept of "parking the peaks" is an interesting concept, as distinguished from long term carryover.

Major Themes of Breakout Session

We haven't tested any alternatives by water year type to reality-test alternatives.

A new alignment for the eastside canal from Verona to the Delta was proposed. It is a sub-alternative of #13.

There was general agreement that additional storage was needed.

Several people raised water quality concerns. Not enough attention is given to urban water quality in any alternative. The bypassing of the Delta by a facility will affect Delta water quality.

Concern was expressed regarding the lack of modeling and cost information in Phase I. Questions were raised regarding how much quantification will be done in Phase I.

We don't have enough restoration, especially in the core actions.

We should continue to pay attention to the level of detail.

A new concept "parking the peaks" was introduced.