from G. Young - 3/1/96

STEVE,

The following items have been pulled from the notes taken during the five breakout sessions. What is listed mainly includes comments/questions that are related to refinement of the alternatives. The list is a summary based on judgment of reading through all of the notes and pulling what seemed most relevant. Many other comments/questions are captured in the complete breakout session notes.

The comment/question seen most through all breakout groups include:

- include upper river habitat restoration
- include upper watershed management
- include more demand management
- include a list of "essential elements"
- guarantees for stakeholders
- provide more details/examples/explanations

Several additional, more specific comments/questions that are very important are still listed below.

(Note: Names of people or agencies in parentheses are those who made comments)

Summary from Orange Group

- Need more demand management activities in all alternatives - don't go far enough - create better incentives (mainly comment from League of Women Voters, but also echoed from environmental interests (Peter Candy), Central Delta Water Agency, and BDAC member (Mary Selkirk)

- Need more upstream habitat restoration in the upper Sacramento and San Joaquin River areas (DWR-Reclamation Board, others)
- Need layered approach to alternatives, phased
- Core actions need to meet solution principles (League of Women Voters)
- CALFED - 100,000 af from San Joaquin will be from conservation, realistically
- Need institutional Drought Water Bank (Dave Mikita)
- Should replace "acoustic" term for Georgiana with "effective"
- Clarify description of south Delta barriers
- Clarify intent of "real-time monitoring"
- Expand geographic scope/scale of habitat restoration (Randy Bailey)
- Guarantees for environmental water - look at ways to find max assurances other than traditional guarantees
- Distinguish "common" activities (other than core) and discuss these separately

Summary from Blue Group

- Ecosystem is much larger than that considered by CALFED. Consider the Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project (Regional Council of Rural Counties)
- Need more coordinated planning and demand management in Category 3 alternatives (Community Alliance w/ Family Farmers). What is meant by demand management? Need more definition of practices included. (San Diego County Water Authority)
- Need to include watershed management in more of the alternatives (Regional Council of Rural Counties)
- Category 1 alternatives need more levee improvements
- Category 1 alternatives are not aggressive enough in terms of habitat restoration - esp. in upper river areas (California Lands Commission) Need more extensive distribution of habitat type improvements - none currently in San Joaquin River (MWDSC) Would like to see "super soft solution" with lots of demand management/habitat restoration (California Research Bureau)
- Need more emphasis on how water transfers will be implemented.

- 100TAF from SJR conflicts with area of origin (Steffani)
- Incorporated phasing of alternatives. Phase 1 is alt 1 and phase 2 is alternative 6 - Assure long range program for demand management and habitat programs. Need to consider phasing and adaptive management (Stuart Pyle, others)
- taf of in-Delta storage should not be a given (USGS)

Summary of Red Group

- Better define that core actions are used in all alternatives and identify when core actions are implemented at higher than core in an alternative.
- CALFED promised SCVWD to address issue of drinking water quality better in the next few weeks.
- CALFED promised that Old River bypass/barrier will be referred to as Old River fix in the future
- CALFED promised Delta Protection Commission that land side buffer widths will not be included in the future and that previous inclusion was a clerical mistake.
- CALFED promised there will be an expanded definition of where water comes from in response to question "Why is the purchase of water (from SJR users) assumed to be from tributaries and not from project exporters who could put it in the DMC?"
- Confusion seems to be present regarding difference between *system reliability* and *system vulnerability* with the former used in core actions and the latter used in alternative descriptions (Lyle Hoag). CALFED's response was that these are generally the same but that CALFED promises to revisit the use of these terms.
- CALFED promised to revisit use of south Delta tidal barriers when Old River barrier is used to possible mitigate for effects of barrier. (Hildebrand)
- There is a need to keep habitat fixes away from the south Delta for alternatives that still keep the pumps operating.
- The issue of toxics and pollutants are not dealt with adequately in the alternatives
- It is important to retain an in-Delta storage element (Jim Easton)
- Storing water in the Delta is problematic (Richard Moss, PG&E)
- Need a range of upstream restoration in Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers in all alternatives (DWR - wetlands coordinator)
- Need to consider area of origin issues - Shasta County supervisor
- CALFED promised City of Stockton to better describe in alternatives the use of eastside storage to help south Sacramento County and Stockton East problems.
- Alternatives that bypass the Delta will hurt the quality of water in the Delta, and efficient use of water on farms on the westside of SJ Valley concentrates salts and degrades Delta water quality.(Hildebrand)
- Is it intended that recreational fishing and poaching be included in core actions regarding commercial fishing? (Lyle Hoag)
- CALFED promised to Plumas County to investigate the role of watershed management in alternatives. Is this part of restoration?
- CALFED stated to Harza Engineering that pen rearing of striped bass will probably be included in fewer alternatives in the next round.
- CALFED promised Hildebrand that the purpose of a Old River fix will be stated in our write-up
- CALFED promised Lyle Hoag that water quality implications from ships in the ship channel dumping bilge water, etc. will be investigated.
- CALFED stated that there will be subalternatives and nuances included in the next round (going to press on March 15) A new alignment of the eastside canal from Verona to the Delta was proposed as a subalternative of #13.
- There is not enough restoration, especially in the core actions.
- Not enough attention has been given to urban water quality.

Summary from Yellow Group

- Need to include upper watershed management
- Need to define our purpose for use of "real-time monitoring" or adaptive management. Seem to misuse these terms
- Need a set of "essential actions" that include more demand management, conjunctive use, fish screens, etc. and are common amongst the alternatives but above core.
- Need to have more demand management through all alternatives and need better description of what such activities include. (NRDC, Central Delta Water Agency, Sierra Club, EBMUD)
- Describe what is meant by an "emergency levee management plan". This is currently not well portrayed in text. (Reclamation Board)
- Need a better description in text of "fish tagging program"
- Conjunctive use needs to be expanded in alternatives
- Include relaxation of flood control requirements in some year types, especially when downstream storage is added in alternative (Plumas County)
- Need to include guarantees for stakeholders interests, there is a lack of institutional protections
- Alternatives in Category 3 focus too much on trying to continue/expand export supplies (NRDC, Sierra Club).
- Need an alternative to address San Joaquin watershed water quality problems (Central Delta Water Agency)
- Each alternative should include all four south Delta operational barriers (Delta Wetlands)

Summary of Green Group (no names were provided with notetaker's notes)

- Why were diversions from the Delta assumed to be maximum?
- Why include programs to benefit striped bass, a non-native species?
- Demand management actions should recognize the extensive amounts that are already "in the pipeline" (i.e., BMPs) and should acknowledge limited further benefits. Plus, there should be demand management requirements for refuges, fish actions (water released for fish), and other environmental uses.
- Drinking water quality is missing from Category 1 options. As proposed, reoperation would be detrimental to drinking water quality.
- More detail is needed on water right considerations
- A Drought Water Bank should be a core action
- A pollutant source control program should be a core action
- Pricing schemes should be dropped
- Alt. 13 needs a connection to south Delta and South Bay water users to provide them some quality benefits
- Should consider upstream flood control storage. Levees are not best bang for buck for Delta flood control problems
- Need more emphasis on "non-flow" problem solutions
- The inclusion of 800,000 acres of land in alt 1 is way too much