

## **CALFED PCT MEETING - OCTOBER 9, 1996**

### **Topics of Discussion**

#### ***Introduction/Agenda - Judy Kelly/Steve Yaeger***

- Update of workgroup and technical team activities.
- Minutes from last meeting.
- Functions of PCT in Phase II.

#### ***State Policy Development and CALFED Process - Jerry Johns***

- The State Board process could be used to help CALFED.
- State Board process could be built into CALFED program.
- Process could be incorporated into Cal Water Plan.
- Process could be built into 13142 water policy planning.
- Board could write a plan with water quality objectives at key locations.
- Plan could include other principles and guidelines for water quality.
- Board would help CALFED achieve key products at key times.
- Process would be exempt from CEQA.
- Board would adopt products as state policy.
- Process would help Board and CALFED.
- Example: Board could hold a water quality control plan hearing and adopt key elements as state policy; followed by public review and a draft plan. There would be a draft environmental document supporting the new state policy. A letter of agreement with the two parties would be developed. The outcome of Phase II could be adopted as state policy including long-term standards and facilities operation. It would not be part of water quality control plan, but it would be state policy.
- The process would start up after CALFED distributes draft EIS.
- First task would be to determine what needs to be state policy and then support with a hearing by the Board.
- Limit policy to Board purview only. Remains to be seen how much Board will buy off on and what becomes policy.
- It will be helpful to work through some examples.

#### ***EIR/EIS Program - Rick Breitenbach***

- Programmatic EIR/EIS will review suite of storage and conveyance alternatives.
- Will include assessment of preferred alternative, but focusing on consequences of a broad programmatic perspective.
- Alternatives will be operational concepts of moving water through windows, conveyance of water through and around Delta, diversion windows, basic water quality standards, and storage components.
- EIR/EIS process may lead to further refinements.
- In Phase III we will move from programmatic to project specific process.

**Water Quality Work Team Update - Rick Woodard/Ron Ott**

- Water quality subgroup met to develop parameter list.
- Target criteria ranges have been developed.
- Actions were ranked.
- Tools developed to predict parameters.
- Cost-effectiveness of actions assessed.
- Planning a public workshop.
- Developing a draft water quality program.
- Team and stakeholders looking closely at actions.
- PCT will review parameter ranges and tools.

**Storage and Conveyance Component - Stein Buer**

- Continuing model development.
- Facilities - some studied and some not; focusing on a few key facilities.
- Spreadsheet post processor: draft package of analyses examples.
- Key issues: process of developing operational rules; analysis tools.

**System Integrity - Curt Schmutte**

- Team is developing workplans.
- Seismic map of Delta is being refined.
- Recreation has not been considered.
- Refining work on emergency response.
- In-channel islands: focusing on specific issues including value, natural history, restoration techniques, and priorities for restoration.
- Looked at NHI proposal: question sustainability.
- Subsidence essential halted with seasonal inundation - drowns oxidizing microbes.
- Will take 50-100 years to grow peat back to natural land height, but sacrifice wildlife and agricultural values during the period.
- Concerned about providing only wetlands and no upland habitat by flooding islands.
- Test program on Twitchell Island for growing peat back.
- Capping existing peat and filling islands with dredge spoils is also being considered.
- Toured Delta with team: looked for things that could be accomplished quite easily - lower Sherman, Franks Tract, Prospect Island, and channel islands.
- Large amount of fill will be needed: need to have a dredge material reuse plan, but concern for water quality, metals, and endangered species.
- Subsidence maps are being generated.

**Ecosystem Restoration - Dick Daniel**

- Time Value of Water: natural hydrograph examples; tool to allocate ecosystem water.
- Ecosystem Restoration Component: ecohealth; recovery plans, 18 objectives, goals and targets.
- Goals are fixed, but targets are not.
- Map of system with focus area; North Bay is included, but not South and Central Bays.

- Public workshop is planned for November 19th: focused on goals/targets.
- Agencies and stakeholders are involved.
- Mailout will include terms and definitions.
- AERT meeting brought out some concerns including concern that this process is at odds with CVPIA water management plan.
- Experts will be used to develop time value of water.

### ***Water Use Efficiency - Rick Soehren***

- BDAC meeting considerations: water transfers, role and scope of Water Use Efficiency Work Group.
- Concerns from the agriculture side.
- Objective of increasing utility of each use of water.
- Getting stakeholder input on Urban Water Quality.
- Focusing on 1991 BMP's.
- Next steps: reporting, evaluating, certification for implementing BMP's; incentives and regulatory options by Board to enforce BMP's; or legislative solutions.
- Expect to have a workable solution to urban water conservation.
- Technical and planning assistance being provided by water agencies.
- Need tools for planning and analysis.
- DWR will play a greater role in future in developing financial incentives to urban water agencies for water conservation.
- With regard to water recycling, need to provide tools to agencies so they can determine how to recycle primarily through supply incentives/sanctions.
- CUWA volunteered to provide feasibility analyses to water agencies for recycling.
- With regard to ag water use efficiency, progress is not as far.
- AB3613 tool is being considered.
- MOU's with irrigation districts are being considered with DWR supporting process with districts and environmental organizations.
- Workshops are being planned.

### ***Assurances Work Group - Mike Heaton***

- Group is developing measuring tools to insure implementation.
- Not looking for guarantees, just assurances that program will be implemented as planned.
- Five step process: tools, MOU's, funding, etc.
- Guidelines and principles being developed.
- Will test tools against assurances needs.
- March 97 planned set of preliminary assurances for programmatic level.
- Issues: recirculate working paper that articulates the assurances needs to stakeholders; assurances that water rights will be protected.
- Focus: need for money, water, and standards
- Need rules and yield assurances for urbans.
- Need parity in assurances and level of detail.
- Stakeholders will not provide funding unless they know what they are going to get.
- Stakeholder shadow process: getting their own discussions going.

- Key points to an agreement are standards.
- Counterpart to December Accord process with some meetings together later in process.

***BDAC and CALFED Meetings - Sharon Gross, Judy Kelly***

- Refined components in November.
- Schedule has slipped; relooking at schedule; keeping back end, but reworking front end.
- Need for further agency support.

***Next Meeting***

- November 13.

10/12/96

4

## Summary of Key Discussion Points

### ***State Policy Development and CALFED Process - Jerry Johns***

1. Lester Snow related that this process would provide a parallel process that would provide more opportunity for public/stakeholder input (or two bites out of the apple).
2. Pete Chadwick related that it helps to provide a parallel rather than sequential process with feedback effects. Jerry Johns agreed and added that it will be difficult for Board to change after holding hearing and adopting a state policy. He added that the Board should be part of the CALFED process rather than simply react to the process. The earlier the Board gets involved the better: probably begin after the Draft EIS is distributed. Greg Zlotnik asked how easy would it be to change policy after being adopted. Jerry responded by stating it would be a regular formal process by the Board. Kathy Kelly asked if it would extend the CALFED process. Jerry stated that it could slightly extend process and Board staff.
3. George Barnes suggested using legislative process. Jerry Johns answered by stating that we do not want standards as law; operating criteria should be standards and come under policy rather than law.
4. Dick Daniel stated that we need policy to protect designated environmental water. Jerry Johns stated that such water could be protected by Board policy.
5. Judy Kelly stated that there would be more discussion on this topic with Board and CALFED, and that the topic should be extended to the EPA and Corps. Tom Hagler and Jim Monroe stated that this would be a Board specific topic.
6. **Action:** have more discussion with Board, EPA, and Corps on this issue.

### ***EIR/EIS Program - Rick Breitenbach***

1. Jerry Johns, Gene Elder, Tom Hagler, and Greg Zlotnik reiterated the need for more details on specifications and facilities. Rick Breitenbach and Steve Yaeger stated that a range of specifications would be presented and that details can not be provided at the programmatic level. Chris Mobley stated that if we have a good set of goals and targets, then alternatives can be vague. Pete Chadwick added that people will be looking at Phase II product knowing Phase III will be providing more detail. Jerry added that the heavy lifting should occur in Phase II, not Phase III; Phase III process should be administrative. Greg Barnes disagrees - it is hard to provide details even until things are built - adaptive management will provide process with details. Jerry Johns questioned our ability to perform operations studies without more specifics. Pete Chadwick stated that we can provide ranges and show range of results from operations studies. Dick Daniel stated that we can come up with preliminary operations criteria and develop tools to evaluate them. George Barnes warned that it may be more complicated than we envision as small variations in operations can have large water supply impacts that would concern stakeholders. Tom Hagler added that the tough deals should be struck in Phase II, and to do so we need sufficient specificity on key components and not more generalizations. Chris Mobley added

that if ranges are too great, then no one will be happy. Jim Monroe stated that the Corps will have to determine which program option is the best environmental program and more specifications will make this easier. He added that the Corps needs more detail on sizes and types of facilities and that site specific characteristics can wait until Phase III. Liz Howard stated that given environmental variability wide ranges of options are needed, otherwise we may only get artificial buyoff.

2. Pete Chadwick brought up the principles of adaptive management and that we would be experimenting with standards with a commitment to change as needed; but that all sides were uncomfortable with this because there are no assurances.
3. Dick Daniel asked if the program will have a Section 7 endangered species consultation. Chris Mobley answered yes. Dick followed up with the hope that the Ecosystem Restoration Component will provide sufficient detail to reach a conclusion so that a Biological Opinion could be prepared and conflicts resolved. Dick added that assurances are needed to minimize further listings in future.
4. **Action:** We need to tighten ranges and specifications for each component to bring along interest groups. We need smaller ranges for more difficult issues.

#### ***Water Quality Work Team Update - Rick Woodard/ Ron Ott***

1. Jerry Johns questioned our ability to predict water quality under the different alternative scenarios. Ron Ott stated that we will use professional judgment and models.
2. Tom Hagler and Jerry Johns stated that we should use existing water quality plans and should not back off existing levels of protection. They added that it may be OK to back off specific site criteria. **Action:** Look at basin plans with this in mind.
3. Jerry Johns stated that basin wide water quality improvement is a good goal, but our inability to regulate non-point sources is a problem. Chris Mobley stated we should not be saddled with solving all the basin water quality problems. Steve Yaeger stated that we have mostly non-point source issues and actions in our program.
4. Jerry Johns brought up Board's approach to developing watershed partnerships to address non-point source problems. He added that we should show that cooperative efforts are in partners best interest and we should provide funding for their programs.
5. **Action:** Provide more guarantees to stakeholders that incentive programs will be regulated.

#### ***Storage and Conveyance Component - Stein Buer***

1. Chris Mobley related the need to lay out concepts in simple terms because broader buyin needs a small group of operating rules. **Actions:** develop some rules in a smaller group, then open discussion on these in general group. Wrap in stakeholder in process. Dick's "windows" group should also have input. Sensitivity runs should be made to show water supply impacts. A small group of packages should be evaluated. Get advise early on from the Corps.

10/12/96

6

2. Jim Monroe stated that we need an evaluation of each potential site involved in these new facilities. **Action:** Sites for storage and conveyance facilities should be evaluated.

### ***System Integrity - Curt Schmutte***

1. Jerry Johns asked about coordination with Bay LTMS program and suggested linking two efforts. Jim Monroe stated that no one has asked to move the LTMS program into Delta region. **Action:** Need to link two programs, add the Delta, and involve the Board in review of management plan.
2. Dick Daniel stated the need to use dredge materials in ecosystem restoration program. Chris Mobley stated it would be better to trap new sediments rather than use old sediments that are potentially laden with salt. Curt Schmutte stated that we need to trap bedload on-site or at nearby locations for moving to sites, and need to determine how to keep sediment in place.
3. Frank Wernette expressed concern that a serious disconnect could result from lack of coordination with eco groups and that conflicts need to be addressed. **Action:** Curt Schmutte stated that they were preparing proposals to be sent to ecosystem groups.

### ***Ecosystem Restoration - Dick Daniel***

1. Greg Zlotnik asked if Bay is being considered. Dick Daniel responded by stating the North Bay is in our focus area.
2. In reference to Time Value of Water, Tom Hagler suggested considering the marginal value of water for ecosystem needs and providing a common currency for evaluating water at different locations in the system by providing weighting system. Dick Daniel responded that this is being done.
3. Concerns were expressed here and at AERT meeting about conflicts with CVPIA process. **Action:** coordinate with CVPIA Water Management Plan.
4. Steve Ford was concerned about stakeholder buyin on Time Value concept. **Action:** involve stakeholders at least in results of process.

### ***Water Use Efficiency - Rick Soehren***

1. Jerry Johns suggested broadening our scope to more than just exported water. Rick Soehren stated there is standard water law for bigger providers for UWMP's.