DRAFT MINUTES
PUBLIC MEETING - SEPTEMBER 22, 1999
CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM SOUTH DELTA IMPROVEMENT TEAM

The CALFED Bay-Delta Program, South Delta Improvements Team (SDIT) held a informational public meeting at the Tracy Community Center on September 22, 1999. Attachment 1 is the meeting sign-in sheet. Attachment 2 is the meeting agenda. Attachments 3 and 4 are informational material that was provided at the meeting. Attachment 5 is an open letter to CALFED submitted during this meeting. Attachment 6 is a copy of a letter to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) regarding South Delta Weir Effects that was also submitted during the meeting.

UPDATE ON RECENT CALFED/SDIT ACTIVITIES - Mr. Stein Buer, CALFED, provided introductory remarks and a update on the current status of CALFED SDIT activities. Mr. Buer indicated that the meeting was an information meeting and not a public hearing regarding the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). He indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to disclose the status of SDIT activities and to receive public comments on those activities. Mr. Buer noted that such comments would be forwarded, as appropriate, to the CALFED Policy Group.

Mr. Buer reviewed the key components of the South Delta Improvements Project (SDIP), specifically, a) modifications to the State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP), b)Tracy Fish Test Facility (See Attachment 3), c) channel dredging, d) construction of permanent fish control and agricultural barriers (initially 2), and e) water quality projects, such as improvement of dissolved oxygen levels in the Stockton area. Mr. Buer indicated that CALFED has initiated and/or continued planning efforts on the above high priority south Delta actions to ensure their early implementation. The proposed schedule for those actions is:

Complete EIR/EIS, including Record of Decision (ROD) and Permit(s)	2001
Complete Design	2003
Complete Construction	2012

Mr. Buer also reviewed various meetings that had occurred since the previous SDIT public meeting on May 28, 1999. In particular he noted that on August 12, 1999, the CALFED Policy Group informally directed CALFED staff to proceed with the planning process to address the various south Delta issues of concern, but did not approve specific actions. A discussion ensued regarding the direction provided by the Policy Group, with input by Messrs. Alex Hildebrand; Tom Zuckerman, Central Delta Water Agency: and Frank Wernette, California Department of Fish and Game. It was agreed that Policy Group direction specifically included direction to resolve stakeholder concerns surrounding the analysis of south Delta alternatives. Mr. Buer indicated that EIR/EIS for the future south delta actions will be a supplement to the 1996 Draft Interim South Delta Program (ISDP) EIR/EIS.

ASSEMBLYMAN MIKE MACHADO - Assemblyman Mike Machado made a brief presentation at this meeting. Mr. Machado indicated that it is important to have a consensus on the necessary safeguards to protect the Delta. He indicated that he has put in for up-front funding in a proposed bond act for a Grant Line Canal Barrier. Assemblyman Machado stated that the SDIT needs to be responsive to the local constituency and to temper science with practical knowledge of Delta residents. Following Mr. Machado's brief initial remarks, an extensive public question and answer phase ensued and is summarized by issue below:

Better Monitoring - Mr. Jerry Robinson, South Delta Water Agency, indicated that better monitoring, more stations, on the San Joaquin River, Old River, and Grant Line Canal is needed. Mr. Machado indicated that the proposed bond measure has provisions for funding such local programs.

Adverse Impact of Temporary Barriers - Several persons indicated that since the temporary agricultural diversion barriers have been installed that their water quality has decreased. Mr. Herman Sibley, landowner, indicated that the tested salinity in his water doubled within two months. Additionally, several other individuals indicated that they have noted significant increases in algal growth since the installation of the barriers.

"Band-Aid" Approach - Mr. Alex Hildebrand, farmer, stated a concern that the CALFED program is providing stop-gap ("Band-Aid") measures without developing a comprehensive solution.

Addressing Local Concerns - Numerous members of the public indicated that they feel that their concerns are not being addressed and/or that their input should be solicited earlier in the process. Other members also identified concerns that the rural constituencies are not provided with equal representation and that the existing process has pitted poor counties against rich counties.

Reservoirs - A concern was identified that the current CALFED proposal does not include construction of additional reservoirs. Mr. Machado indicated the proposed bond measure includes funding for an Integrated Storage Investigation that will evaluate long-term solutions and need for additional surface storage.

Shipping Water South - A concern was expressed that the current CALFED proposal merely provides for additional transfer of water to Southern California.

Return Water from Stanislaus River and Friant Dam - One member of the public indicated his opposition to dams and proposed return of water diversions from the Stanislaus River and Friant Dam as a solution to south delta water problems.

Governance - Ms. Rogene Reynolds, San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District, and others, expressed a concern about development of a program to address Bay-Delta issues without the concurrent development of a governance plan. Ms. Reynolds was concerned about who would implement the CALFED program following adoption of the ROD. Mr. Machado agreed with this concern and indicated ongoing concerns regarding lack of program oversight, CALFED interaction with the legislature and constituents, and program funding concerns.

Permitting Issues - Mr. Bob Grove, Del's Boat Harbor, indicated that they have a sedimentation problem that needs to be addressed, and although they have the funding to do the necessary dredging they have not be able to secure the necessary permits. During subsequent discussions other public members expressed serious concerns regarding the dredge permitting process.

MODELING STUDIES CONDUCTED BY DWR - Ms. Michele Ng, DWR, presented a summary of initial results of recent modeling by DWR. Ms. Ng indicated that the results are preliminary and will be refined in the near future. She also indicated that the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) is conducting a sediment transport study. Initial results for the USBR monitoring indicated that with either 2 or 3 agricultural diversion barriers a reduced amount of sediment is transported to the south delta. DWR is currently evaluating sedimentation and dredging issues in its model by adding more detailed channel cross-sections. However, these changes are currently crashing the model and need to be resolved.

Ms. Ng presented the modeled minimum water levels and average electrical conductivity for representative above normal and critical water years at six (6) locations and four (4) modeling scenario variations. Specifically, the locations were:

1) Old River at Tracy Road,
2) the Delta-Mendota Canal (DMC) Intake,
3) Old River at the DMC Intake,
4) Middle River at Tracy Road,
5) Grant Line Canal at West End, Clifton Court Forebay, and
6) Grant Line Canal at Tracy Road.

The modeled scenarios were:

1) No export pumping to the CVP or the SWP (a pre-project condition),
2) the ISDP (3 agricultural diversion barriers) and intake operations, known as "gulping" (current Priority II operations),
3) implementation of the SDI (2 agricultural diversion barriers) and intake operations, known as "sipping" (pumping continuously, but with a variation of

30% about the mean, in synch with tidal stage variations),

4) SDI and intake operations as flatline pumping (continuous pumping at the average export rate).

Ms. Ng indicated that the modeling effort generally showed that there is little difference in water levels between the sipping and flatline scenarios and that, generally, there is improved water quality with implementation of either barrier scenario versus the pre-project condition. Numerous technical questions, such as model assumptions, software, how Vernalis flow is handled, channel geometry, etc., were raised and answered regarding the details of the modeling effort. The main general issues of concern were:

a) what is the meaning of the results, and
b) is the model reflective of the real world.

Another public concern with the modeling effort was that the 1997 flood event be accurately modeled, to which Mr. Jeffery Twitchell, MBK Engineers on the behalf of Stewart Tract, indicated that they have a model calibrated to that event that could be made available.

STATUS OF DWR'S DREDGING PROPOSAL - Mr. Steve Bradley, DWR, reviewed the status of DWR's planning efforts to conduct dredging at critical areas that have been impacted by the installation of temporary agricultural barriers. Mr. Bradley indicated that DWR is currently handling dredging to address impacts on marinas (Marina Dredging) separately from dredging to address impacts on agricultural diversions (Ag Dredging) for reasons associated with obtaining environmental permits. A general concern identified for both Marina Dredging and Ag Dredging was that a routine maintenance dredging program should be implemented under the direction of a responsible agency. Mr. Bradley explained that the proposed dredging is to mitigate for the interim impacts caused by the installation of the temporary barriers. For a long-term maintenance dredging program to be implemented, it would have to be part of the overall CALFED Bay-Delta Program solution to Delta problems.

Marina Dredging - DWR is evaluating whether the proposed Marina Dredging will be covered by a "Nationwide 35" permit from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Bradley discussed the proposed Marina Dredging at the Tracy Oasis Marina. He indicated that DWR currently estimates that approximately 1,200 lineal feet will need to be dredged and that approximately 10,000 cubic yards of dredge spoils will be generated. Mr. Bradley also indicated that the dredging effort has not been approved by DWR and is not currently funded. However, DWR is proceeding with refining the Marina Dredging proposal and working with USBR staff regarding the possible use of USBR-owned land near Hammer Island for a disposal site.

Several questions were raised regarding the planned Marina Dredging. Generally, the attendees were concerned that: this was a "Band-Aid" solution to what could be a continuing

problem, the timing of the dredging effort, and other impacted marinas also be addressed (specifically, the Lazy M Marina and Del's Boat Harbor). Specific concerns regarding the timing of the dredging efforts centered around whether the dredging would take place during the normal dredge window (August 1 to October 15) and, hence, impact necessary maintenance dredging for navigation or flood control.

Ag Dredging - Mr. Bradley indicated that the proposed Ag Dredging along Grant Line Canal would not be covered by the Nationwide 35 permit that may be applicable to the Marina Dredging, and as such would require a separate permitting effort. He also indicated that DWR is working with the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game regarding whether any associated modifications to agricultural diversions would require installation of fish screens. DWR hopes to expedite the permitting process and resolve the fish screen issue. Mr. Alex Hildebrand stated that he is concerned that requirements for installation of fish screens on pumps modified for mitigation reasons would be inequitable to the impacted farmers who have already been adversely impacted by decreased water levels. Ms. Margit Aramburu, Delta Protection Commission, indicated that a range of mitigation measures should be evaluated and a determination made as to whether there are no new impacts from diversion modifications, since the diversions are a continuing practice.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION - The following issues of public concern were identified and not previously discussed in these minutes:

> *Proposed Old River Fish Control Barrier* - Various concerns were identified regarding the proposed permanent fish control barrier on Old River. Specific concerns were that barrier be designed to handle flood flows, the location of potential set-backs, and that public access be limited per the wishes of the current landowners.
>
> *Future Meetings* - There was a general consensus that future meetings such as this are necessary, but that CALFED should avoid scheduling such meetings in conflict with other related meetings.