

CALFED PCT MEETING - SEPTEMBER 11, 1996

Topics of Discussion

Introduction/Agenda

- Update of workgroup and technical team activities.
- Clarification of Phase II process.
- Functions of PCT in Phase II.

Completion of Phase I

- Notice of Phase I Final Report
- Responses to Comments Document
- Documentation Report of Phase I details is available.
- Other Phase I distributions.
- Revisions to policy language after Workshop #7.
- Highlighted - strikeout versions available for comparison.

Phase II

- Judy Kelley will now facilitate PCT meetings.
- Steve Yaeger will focus on technical issues.
- Objectives statements will stand from Phase I.
- Subobjectives will be developed in work teams.
- Interaction of PCT and EIR/EIS process in Phase II.

Role of PCT in Phase II

- Accreditation
- Consultation
- Support services
- Review of policy issues
- Facilitate communication between CALFED and its agencies.
- Critique work of CALFED
- Identify issues
- Input and direct EIR/EIS analyses

Phase II Schedule

- Draft impact analysis - 3/97
- Draft preferred alternative - 4/97
- Preliminary Draft EIR/EIS - 5/97
- Formal Public DEIS - 9/97

EIR/EIS Process

- Comments needed by September 20th.

- No-Action Alternative reviewed in July workshop.
- Process comes down to comparing alternatives.
- Existing conditions reports on Delta are coming soon.
- Purpose and Need Statement has been revised.
- Assessment methods being developed - 9/12 workshop of fish and wildlife methods; another on October 17.

Water Quality Component

- Parameters of concern listed - 15 primary parameters.
- Water quality goals being developed.
- 41 actions including two new actions have been identified.
- Cost effectiveness of actions being studied.
- Determining how water quality component is linked to storage and conveyance components.
- Issues: identified those resolved and unresolved.
- Agricultural drainage and management of toxic wastes from mines and storm water are key issues.
- Developing tools for EIR/EIS assessment.

Storage and Conveyance Components

- Modeling technical teams - modeling assumptions.
- Need for agency participation.
- Need to reach out to stockholders for input after we first work out issues with agencies.
- Need for agency liaisons.
- Developing vision for team.
- Developing combinations of storage and conveyance that meet goals.
- Combinations based on environmental constraints.
- Models are engines to translate into facilities development.
- Importance on conveying modeling study results clearly and in laymen's terms.
- Need for coordination of benchmark assumptions.
- Fair and open process of reviewing combinations.
- Determining how CALFED facilities would fit into system operation rules in modeling runs.
- Initial model refinement process: bundle rules, refine DWRSIM, develop spreadsheet post-processor, inventory potential facilities, evaluate engineering and modeling data.
- Produce report in October.

System Integrity Component

- Levee improvement workplan being developed.
- More emphasis being given to subsidence reduction on Delta islands.
- Effects on recreation are being considered.

- Subteams working on seismic issues, fish and wildlife habitat considerations, subsidence, dredge material uses, emergency response plan, channel islands, and recreation.
- Outstanding issues: subsidence maps, seismic risks, priorities, flood control priorities, boat wakes, waterside habitat restoration, water quality, permitting, and levee-maintenance-associated dredging effects.
- Considering demonstration projects.

Ecosystem Restoration Component

- Early vision in fall of 96.
- Subobjectives, goals, and targets.
- Actions and implementation levels.
- Three technical workshops on indicators - two complete and another in the fall.
- Literature review completed on restoration programs.
- Restoration strategy developed.
- Process of setting targets developed three approaches.
- Subteams working on developing targets.
- Reviewing existing documents for targets.
- Focused technical workshop planned for October 31.
- Time-Value of Water will represent flow targets.
- AERT to discuss Time-Value of Water on October 3.
- Technical memo distributed on Time-Value of Water.
- "Straw" targets will be distributed on October 8th.
- Adaptive Management and Phasing elements being developed.
- Mid-November Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Strategy Report distribution date.
- Formal meeting on October 2nd.

Status of Finance Workgroup

- Looking at ways to finance program: cost and who pays.
- Flushing out policy issues first, then will try to resolve.
- Need to get through some tricky issues to get to preferred alternative.
- Developing a Revenues Alternatives Paper.
- Problem: difficult to think of issues in an abstract (lack of specific alternatives and facilities configurations).
- Examples with numbers may help process be more realistic.
- Will get deeper into issues with more component refinement.
- Summary report on issues will be ready by end of year.

Assurance Workgroup

- Process of making sure solutions are implementable.
- Next meeting October 2, 9-12 am.
- Need to prepare a list of needs and objectives.

- Need to develop a procedural framework.
- Identify tools: legislation, etc. November timeline.
- Assess how tools meet needs. December timeline.
- Package of alternatives. March timeline.
- Meetings to be held monthly (Oct 2; Nov 6; and Dec 13)
- Needs and Objectives by next week.
- See a big role for PCT.
- By Decembers all pieces will be in place.

Water Use Efficiency Workgroup

- Urban, agriculture, water recycling, wildlife refuges, etc.
- Defining objectives and satisfying them.
- Identifying tools and actions.
- California Urban Water Conservation Council MOU's is a key source.
- SWRBC has a strong active role in certifying compliance with MOU's.
- Agriculture Efficiency work: draft objectives; develop tools.
- CUWA is developing guidebook for cost efficiency.
- There is an environmental water use efficiency issue - agencies promised to look into this.
- Refuges are developing BMP's.
- Draft paper soon.

Media Coverage

- Recent press conference had good media attendance.
- Positive coverage to date.
- Questions about revival of PC.
- Six broadcasts taped and available for viewing.

Summary of Key Discussion Points

Phase II Process

1. The question was asked whether CALFED objectives could be revised during the Phase II process. In response, Steve Yaeger explained that objectives were not expected to change, but that detailed subobjectives would be formulated in the respective technical work teams and that these subobjectives would come under review by the PCT-AERT and BDAC-ERWG.
2. After the presentation on the role of the PCT in Phase II, comments focused on the enormity of the role of the PCT during Phase II. Judy Kelly stated that the PCT role would focus on communication with member agencies, review, idea generation, and accreditation. **Action:** Review list of PCT roles for Phase II; will review again at October meeting.
3. **Focus of Phase II Process** - Jerry Johns suggested that he would have an easier time explaining and justifying his role in the PCT if that role were integrally linked with the environmental documentation process and that the State Board were being asked to help in that process. He further suggested that all the Phase II activities be related directly to the environmental analysis and documentation process. Judy Kelly related that the EIR/EIS and the ERP were both important processes in Phase II. Kathy Kelly suggested that the EIR/EIS is the main and primary focus, while the ERP is only one component. **Action:** Look into means of better relating Phase II activities with EIR/EIS process.
4. **Role of Environmental Analysis** - Concern was expressed that the environmental analysis would be a post-decision process for alternatives, rather than an integral part of the evaluation process of deciding on alternatives. There was a suggestion that the analyses would help the PCT make decisions/recommendations.
5. **Component Refinement** - Concern was expressed about the short time frame for making decisions on storage and conveyance alternatives. If such decisions were to be made in the next 6 to 10 weeks, then that would be a formidable task. Would the PCT have specific proposals to review for each of the major components? Steve Yaeger responded that the common programs would have more specific proposals than the storage and conveyance components, which would have a range.

EIR/EIS Process

1. **Schedule** - Questions came up about the schedule of EIR/EIS elements. **Action:** PCT comments on Purpose and Need Statement are due by September 20th. PCT members will contact R. Breitenbach as to which "Existing Conditions" reports (see matrix) should be sent to which agency staff. Comments are due on these reports by October 15.

2. **Differences in the Baseline/Benchmark Runs** - Questions were asked about the differences in the various baseline runs of the hydrology/operations model. Stein Buer was to cover this topic later in agenda. **Action:** PCT comments on "Purpose and Need"
3. **Water Quality for Agriculture** - Concern was expressed that low salt goals for agriculture in the Delta would dictate a certain solution in the storage and conveyance components. Jerry Johns related that salinity standards protect Delta agriculture sufficiently to alleviate such a concern. Ron Ott related that there were no plans to offer new standards in the water quality component, and the process would simply evaluate whether one storage and conveyance alternative would turn out better than another.
4. **Recreational Water Quality** - The question was asked whether the water quality component team was considering effects on recreation (fishing and water contact activities). In response, Carol Howe stated that the issue of elevated toxins in fish tissues was being considered, but otherwise no other effects on recreation were being considered. **Action:** Look into including water contact recreation.

Storage and Conveyance Component Refinement

1. **Baseline/Benchmark Model Runs** - A question was expressed about the differences between the baseline and benchmark modeling runs. Stein Buer stated that these runs were based on different packages of operating rules with existing facilities. There was repeated concern that baseline run was not the same as benchmark operating rules, and that benchmark constraints were not consistent with the present baseline. Stein Buer related that the benchmark run will get us going and would eventually be refined until it closely approximates the baseline run (once the present discussions about the baseline run are concluded). For now the two are slightly different because of their different purposes: the benchmark run is for component refinement and includes a component to account for increasing population, while the baseline and no-action runs are for EIR/EIS evaluation. (Later in sidebars it was related that the benchmark had future constraints rather than present constraints because the benchmark run represented conditions when the storage and conveyance components would come on line.) For further clarification, there was a suggestion to better illustrate the constraints and operating conditions in each of the present simulations. **Action:** Clarify various baseline/benchmark model run purposes, differences, assumptions and operating conditions.
2. A suggestion was made to define some of the nomenclature. **Action:** Better define "effective" and "constraints".

Levee System Integrity Component

1. **Coordination with ERP Component** - A suggestion was made to coordinate closely with the ERP efforts. **Action:** Ensure close coordination between the two groups.

2. **Emergency Response Plan** - Suggestion was made to make this a checklist to easily identify tasks involved. **Action:** Develop checklist.
3. **In-channel Island Team** - The need to bring this effort into the CALFED levee and ERP workgroups was expressed. **Action:** Integrate the Channel Island Team work and team into the Levee and ERP workgroups.
4. **Using Dredge Spoils for Filling Islands** - Concern for developing some comfort level for using channel sediments for filling islands. **Action:** Need to look into feasibility issues for using dredge spoils for filling islands.
5. **Emergency Response Plans** - **Action:** Need to have consulting engineers review emergency response plans.
6. **Policy Issues** - **Action:** Policy issues should filter back to PCT within several months.

Water Quality Component

1. A comment was expressed about pesticides and best management practices. **Action:** Involve Dept. of Pesticide Regulations - John Sanders or Paul Gosselin.

Ecosystem Restoration Program Component

1. **Inclusions of flow and export limits in targets** - Concern was expressed about including flow and export limits in ERP component, as they may burden process because they are so controversial. Dick Daniel acknowledged concern, but emphasized the need to consider flow targets soon. Consideration of putting off flow targets was discussed. Sense of urgency was acknowledged, but thought raised that flows belonged only in storage and conveyance components. Others expressed that flows "are the big enchilada" and need careful attention.
2. **Time-Value of Water**, - Lester Snow stated the importance of the Time-Value-Of-Water (flow at a location) in determining strategies to divert and release water. "No single issue is more important." He also stated that the concept of Time-Value is completely objective. Steve Ford added that when water is low in value then that is the time to divert, while high value water is the time and place to augment flow. Jerry Johns suggested Time-Value would lead to the concept of a "water check" or voucher - when would you want to spend it. He also warned that value would change with facilities, and that targets will keep moving. Goals absent cost may be OK, and we would work to achieve goals through facilities and operations. Others suggested developing agricultural, water quality, and water supply value of water in addition to the ecosystem value of water. **Action:** The PCT should pay some attention to this technical memo as it will be the subject of a future AERT meeting on October 3rd and a public workshop on October 31st. Time Value of Water is a key concept of the CALFED Program. PCT comments are welcomed before October 3rd or at the meeting.

3. **CUWA Alternative** - Concern was expressed about why the CUWA restoration alternative was being pushed outside of the BDAC process. Lester Snow stated that they are pushing ahead of the CALFED process because they believe their plan is superior, whereas the CALFED process is not at a point to provide such a specific restoration package, and that the CUWA alternative could fit within the boundaries of alternative two. He added that the CUWA alternative was based on a fundamentally different ecological view of the way the Bay-Delta functions in producing fish, and that we soon need to expose their theories to our experts. Dick Daniel added that DWR has received a recent briefing by CUWA on their alternative, and the AERT would receive a similar briefing on September 18th. **Action:** Agency fish experts in the AERT should evaluate the CUWA alternative and underlying assumptions, and provide technical advise and comment to the PCT.

AG/Urban Efficiency Workgroup

1. Have we adequately put land retirement and fallowing behind us? The NRDC continues to see the need for this.

Finances Workgroup

1. **Numbers** - Being developed. **Action:** To PCT around December. Get finance work materials to PCT as soon as possible.

Status of Assurances Workgroup

1. The need for involving Delta Ag in the process was expressed. Tom Zuckerman is involved. **Action:** Involve Delta Ag.

Media Coverage

1. Steve Ford has been getting calls from southern California about the process. Lester Snow believes these may be coming from the Prop 204 campaign.