

SUMMARY OF MEETING

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE,

OCTOBER 11, 1996

ATTENDEES: Doug Kleinsmith, Kathy Kunysz, Alan Thompson, Dan Steiner, Terry Erlewine, Rick Breitenbach, Monique Magolske, Harlan Glines, Jim Martin, Tom Zuckerman, Jim White, Jean Elder, Andrew Hamilton, Loren Bottorff, Jeff Jaraczski, Terri Anderson, Tom Hagler, Ray McDowell, Victor Pacheco, Wendy Halverson Martin, Stein Buer and Gwen Bucholz.

SUMMARY

The meeting was held on Friday, October 11, 1996 to continue discussions that started September 27, 1996 concerning the determination of appropriate assumptions and criteria for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (CALFED) existing conditions and No-Action Alternative scenarios. Notebooks were distributed that contained portions of the No-Action Alternative and Cumulative Impact Analysis Screening Report dated September 18, 1996, meeting materials for the September 27, 1996 meeting, and the meeting materials for the current meeting. Attendees were asked to keep the notebooks up to date as new information was provided and to bring the notebooks to each future meeting.

This paper summarizes the questions and comments about existing conditions and the No-Action Alternative and discussion points that were raised regarding the comparison table at the meeting. Apparent agreements that were reached at the meeting are presented in italics below the discussion point. Except where noted below, it was agreed that the criteria/assumptions and conveyance and storage refinements assumptions for each item are accurate.

The next meeting will focus on points that require further definition or have not yet been resolved. CALFED will provide information on the points in question and may make recommendations regarding potential approaches. Items to be discussed include Delta water quality standards, Mokelumne River flows, CVP/SWP demands, Sacramento River contract amounts, CVPIA's 800,000 acre-feet, DWRDSM assumptions relative to barriers, drinking water regulations and agricultural subsidies.

GENERAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- Pages of the meeting materials should be numbered.

Future versions of the meeting materials will be page numbered.

- References to "CVPIA efforts" throughout the comparison table should be changed to "CVPIA PEIS efforts" because CVPIA includes many tasks beside the PEIS.

The change will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

- What is the meaning of the column titled "Conveyance and Storage Refinement"?

The column entitled "Conveyance and Storage Refinement" refers to a CALFED process designed to combine storage and conveyance alternatives. The information it provides is used to sort through different options. It is not an estimate of existing conditions or conditions under the No-Action Alternative, but is an attempt to quantify the three CALFED alternatives. Using this information, one might estimate what the impacts of various alternative scenarios might be so that the alternatives can be developed based on some information, not just speculation. This information is to be used as a benchmark because it is an early estimate of what the future No-Action Alternative might be.

- Why are standards used as existing conditions when there is a information about actual conditions? Would not real existing conditions provide a better basis for impact assessment?

This issue was addressed at the September 27, 1996 meeting. Participants agreed that existing conditions should describe the conditions as they have occurred in the field and not minimum flow standards and other parameters that are contained in the Bay-Delta standards. The standards provide the rules for operating the simulation models, which rely on historic data for input. The simulation models are used to represent what would have occurred under a variety of hydrologic conditions if today's water supply demands and facilities had been present during the hydrologic period of record. The purpose of the existing conditions and No-Action Alternative modeling efforts is to provide a method of evaluating the action alternatives developed by CALFED. The action alternatives will be compared to both existing conditions and the No-Action Alternative.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

TUOLUMNE RIVER FLOWS

CRITERIA/ASSUMPTIONS

- Not all of the Tuolumne River flow requirements are dictated by FERC.

The change will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The new Tuolumne River flow requirements should be used because they will be in place as of April 1997 and the new flow requirements are in competition for water with some CALFED actions.

Because these flow requirements are not yet in place, previous flow requirements will continue to be used with an acknowledgment that they may change in the future. This approach is consistent with other aspects of the CALFED modeling effort.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

MOKELUMNE RIVER FLOWS

ASSUMPTIONS/CRITERIA

- East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) does not operate Camanche Reservoir pursuant to a FERC license, but to the 1961 California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) agreement.

The change will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

- The flow under existing conditions should reflect the 1961 DFG agreement with acknowledgment that EBMUD has recently been operating to flows outlined in the Lower Mokelumne River Management Plan.

The change will be made in future versions of the comparison table. DFG offered that it was not certain this was the correct assumption to use from it's point of view. See attachment from Jim White to Rick Breitenbach.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT CONTRACT RENEWALS

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT CONTRACT AMOUNTS

CRITERIA/ASSUMPTIONS

- For the CVPIA PEIS, water deliveries for municipal and industrial contracts were limited not only by recent historic and existing environmental documentation, but also by “facilities for East Bay Municipal Utilities District and Placer County Water Agency and a biological opinion for Contra Costa Water District”.

The change will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

- For the CVPIA PEIS effort, Sacramento River agricultural water contractor use was based on 1980-1993 data, which was less than the contract amounts in many cases, because that information was readily available. However, this period does not reflect how much water was used historically by the Sacramento River water users. In all other regions, the CVPIA PEIS used the entire agricultural contract amounts.

Jeff Jaraczski will report back on this issue at the November 15, 1996 meeting.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Same as above.

WATER RIGHTS

CRITERIA/ASSUMPTIONS

- The State Water Project (SWP), as well as the Central Valley Project (CVP), have water rights obligations.

The change will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

WATER CONSERVATION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

CVP AND SWP OPERATIONS

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

- Sensitivity analysis may be needed for the No-Action Alternative.
- The 800,000 acre-feet of water may need to be included but some assumptions will have to be made because there is no long-term plan for its use.

CALFED will need to make appropriate assumptions for use of the 800,000 acre-feet of water for fish and wildlife. This issue will be discussed at the November 15, 1996 meeting.

LAND RETIREMENT

CRITERIA/ASSUMPTIONS

- The statement should be changed to read "Bulletin 160-93 assumes the retirement of 45,000 acres by 2020".

The change will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

- Land retirement described under the Monterey agreement should not be assumed to have occurred under existing conditions.

This clarification will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

POWER

CRITERIA/ASSUMPTIONS

- The statement should be changed to read "The modeling for SWP and CVP currently assumes that power is produced incidental to other operations".

The change will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

RED BLUFF DIVERSION DAM OPERATIONS

CRITERIA/ASSUMPTIONS

- Is the seasonal gate closure from mid-April or mid-May?

Mid-May is correct: Red Bluff Diversion Dam is currently open 8 months. No change is necessary in future versions of the comparison table.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

WATER CONTRACT RATE SETTING

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

DELTA PROVISIONS

- DWRDSM assumptions need to be checked to determine whether interior barriers should be added to existing conditions and the No-Action Alternative.

If needed, the change will be made in future versions of the comparison table. This item will be discussed at our November 15, 1996 meeting.

CRITERIA/ASSUMPTIONS

- The nature of the barriers should be clarified.

The clarifications discussed at the meeting will be made in future versions of the comparison table.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

FLOOD CONTROL

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Metropolitan Water District is looking into this issue further. This item will be discussed at our November 15, 1996 meeting.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Same as above.

GROUNDWATER REGULATION

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDY PROGRAM

EXISTING CONDITIONS

This topic will be discussed further at our November 15, 1996 meeting but may be outside the purview of this group.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Same as above.

ENDANGERED SPECIES LISTINGS

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue.

NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The group agreed that the comparison table accurately portrayed this issue but changes may need to be made in the near future.