Ad Hoc Mtg on Alternatives
6/12

Frank Wernette:

Screens -

Response by Ron

New alternative

Agreed: will add their new alternative feature to modeling plan.

Carolyn Yale

- Needs to analyze ag impacts from Common Programs, from "resource basis" as well as "economic" ie: loss of prime ag land. Rayatt. There is discussion in EIR of the loss of ag Land.

Common programs are not excluded from impact analysis.

There are no alternatives to the common programs

Response: Common progs are embedded in alternatives & are being analyzed appropriately.

Carolyn -

Water Use Efficiency not brought out sufficiently ie: aggressive demand mgmt.

Need to bring out more clearly what tools would be used to implement ERPP. Needs stronger discussion.

Terry: Sites Reservoir WQ. isn't good for fish

Penny: Each alternative must be workable, ~~means if~~ & should be down on paper.

Mac: System modeling should accomplish this at least in part

Bob Pine: ERPP is order of may more detailed than other sections.

Carolyn:

- of 17 alternatives, some are different only in a small way
- More discussion of transfers to obtain water.

Clearer statement of objectives, clearer statement of what would be needed in terms of policy

Other Person:

Explain So Delta wing problems - ISDP language

- Carolyn: In WUE, (Section was much improved) needs more discussion of how the actions will play out

w/ respect to SIE, need to establish time limit,

Penny

No Action is extremely critical. Readily of doc. dont seem clear. This will be brought to Mgmt Team. They want a presentation projects, policies, procedures, modeling assumptions. Need a clear no action, clear, concise, and all in the same place.

2)

Carolyn: strikes her that in addition to no action, needs clear statement of agency roles / how they fit in - Needs to be documented in tech appendix or somewhere.

Penny

CMARP - strong role for

- Actions / targets don't change - meeting Board standards. Haven't seen adequate discussion of what might change w/ Board process. Some reflection of this issue needs to be made. Can't do it in this draft. As of now, put it a decision of process, maybe different scenarios.

- Levees: item 10: PL 99 requirements pertain which is about 100 yr std. Penny: Needs further explanation.

Penny - Re: ERPP

- what kinds of tools will assess ERPP actions
- Adaptive mgmt they support, if using their definition. Need to specifically define.
- Need for independent, outside scientific eval.

Penny: Adaptive mgmt - real time monitoring & rapid response. Also try this for habitat; if it doesn't work, do something else.

3) Larry Puckett
USF&W
- Improving areas without knowing what sensitive species are there
- level of detail frustration
  - New S&C
  - Setback levees
  - Flooding areas to provide new habitat
- P.6 storing & using water to dilute pollutants.

Frank Lee: — Next to last ¶, same page
re: water needs analysis
Discussion among Penning
Needs to have issue articulated in document.
Bring it up w/ Steve
Other: Question on Trinity No Action
CVPIA used
if discrepancy between CVPIA / CALFED
occurs, If water left in Trinity & doesn't
come into Sac, will be different
340,000 is No Action for CALFED
Then Flow Study is different
If such discrepancy exists, will the modeling
be useable?