BDAC Meeting Summary
April 25, 1996
Sacramento Convention Center
10:00 AM to 5:00 PM

1. Welcome and Introductions (Mike Madigan)

The Chair convened the meeting and welcomed BDAC members. Attachment 1 lists the BDAC members attending and Attachment 2 lists the members of the public attending the meeting

2. Summary of Issues and Concerns from Scoping Meetings and Workshop 6 (Lester Snow and Mary Kelley)

Presentation
Staff provided a comprehensive overview of comments received to date from scoping meeting and CALFED Bay-Delta Program Public Workshop 6 participants. Overall, comments were supportive and people expressed support to move the Program forward and ensure its success.

So far, nine public outreach events, including eight scoping meetings, garnered comments from over 600 participants. The number of participants at scoping meetings ranged from 23 to 84 and the Workshop brought in over 200 attendees. Key scoping topics include: area of origin, cost, demand management, ecosystem restoration, equity, levee stability, storage, water quality, water supply, watershed management, and land retirement.

Discussion Points
- There may be a need to review the Program purpose and need statement. If, as a result of scoping, the Program mission or objectives are changed, those changes will need broad scrutiny by BDAC and others.
- The comments may result in revision of the level of analysis on some topics. The comments will be used to help formulate the alternatives and components which will appear in the short list.

Key Outcomes
- CALFED will prepare a Program schedule for next year outlining key workshops, BDAC meeting, and milestones.
- The Scoping period has been extended to May 20, 1996.

3. Process for Moving to Short List of Alternatives (Lester Snow)

Presentation
Staff explained that outreach with many groups will continue as the list of alternatives is refined. Stakeholders are establishing firmer positions on specific issues, as a result, BDAC needs to focus on the components as a whole.

The Program is currently at step six in the process. The refining process has, up to this point,

developed different combinations of components to narrow the number of alternatives. Each alternative will be evaluated against the solution principles and then revised to improve its performance. The focus of the refinement process is on the components which make up the alternatives. Refining alternatives will hopefully narrow the number of components to be addressed in the EIR/S.

Discussion Points

- Each component has positive and negative aspects, as a result, linkage between components is necessary to fulfill the objectives. BDAC should evaluate the components to identify linkages necessary.
- Narrowing the components to soon may exclude valuable components and include those that will be unacceptable when examined in more detail in Phase II.

3a. Discussion of Alternatives - Operating Criteria (Steve Yaeger & Dick Daniel)

Presentation

Staff presented detailed descriptions of operational scenarios for alternatives F, B, and C as examples. The presentation paralleled written descriptions provided at the meeting and Workshop 6.

Discussion Points

- Alternative F. The benefits of this alternative are a) the strong demand management component, b) limiting toxic, salt and metal contamination through the CVPIA concept of land retirement, c) a strong levee maintenance program which has the additional benefit of improving waterside habitat, and d) reduction of unexpected curtailments of water exports as fish populations rebound.

  Water will be acquired through management of upper watersheds and small scale storage on the San Joaquin River tributaries.

  The effectiveness of the components ranges from quite predictable to unpredictable. Existing models are fairly reliable for predicting levee performance, and water quality predictions are based on the quality of information available at the time. Ecosystem restoration effectiveness is very unpredictable because of unexpected changes in the natural environment. Adaptive management procedures helps deal with the uncertainties because changes can be made in mid-course to correct for unexpected short comings in restoration programs.

- Alternative B. Coordination of groundwater and surface water storage programs will increase the effectiveness of the groundwater component.

- Alternative C. South Delta water quality issues include high salinity levels in the San Joaquin River, recirculation of contaminated water to San Joaquin Valley water contractors and users, and eliminating the source of the contaminants.

  South Delta water quality will be protected by through-Delta conveyance and treatment of water.

Limited size of the conveyance will constrain unintended uses of isolated facilities (proposed size is 5,000 to 7,000 CFS).

Diverting water to storage facilities during winter flood periods in the Sacramento River will reduce overall flow by only 3% to 5%.

Assurance issues will need to be addressed..

LUNCH

4. ROLE OF BDAC WORKGROUPS (MIKE MADIGAN)

Presentation
The Chair described the purpose of the work groups and their function. Work groups are to examine and discuss policy surrounding key, cross cutting issues. Work groups will provide options to BDAC for addressing or resolving issues. BDAC may then provide recommendations to CALFED and Program staff.

5. REPORTS FROM FINANCE AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION WORK GROUPS (ERIC HASSELTINE AND MARY SELKIRK)

Finance Work Group Presentation and Discussion (Eric Hasseltine)
- Parallel programs include the California Round Table, California Farm Bureau, California Urban Water Association, and CALFED stakeholders group. These groups are preparing papers as part of their participation in the CALFED process.
- Costs and values will undergo both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Analyses can follow either a bottom-up or top-down approach. The bottom-up option determines a) which groups or resources benefit from components, b) allocation of costs, c) indirect costs, and d) beneficiaries' ability to pay prior to developing the total cost of an alternative. The top-down option determines a reasonable cost, first, then identifies how costs should be allocated. The work group will approach issues using both options.

Key Outcomes
- The next Finance Work Group meeting is scheduled for May 15 in Sacramento at a location TBA.
- The meeting will continue the focus on finance principles (3-4 were agreed upon at the last meeting) and pros and cons of policy issues.

Ecosystem Restoration Work Group Presentation and Discussion (Mary Selkirk)
- The work group, at its last meeting, narrowed its initial focus to five policy issues:
  - The CALFED ecosystem restoration vision;
  - References for identifying and restoring the system;
  - Use of historic data and historic functions of the system;
  - How to address adaptive management issues
- The group will also discuss different approaches for and integrate limiting factors into options for restoring the system.
- Problems in specific geographic areas are potential issues which will arise in work group

E-012778

discussions. Some BDAC members preferred adopting a programmatic approach that will provide structure for addressing specific problems within an overall framework.
- The group was encouraged to address areas in the upper watersheds, above the dams.
- The group was cautioned to match the level of detail to the level appropriate for the programmatic EIR/S.

Key Outcomes
- The next meeting is on May 20, 1996 in Sacramento at the Resources Agency Building.

6. KEY ISSUE OVERVIEW

This section of the agenda was a continuation (from the March BDAC meeting) of discussions on key issues of concern to stakeholders.

6A. Water Use Efficiency (Demand Management) (Rick Soehren)

Presentation
Staff presented four key questions (provided to BDAC and the public) focusing on appropriate approaches for implementing water use efficiency measures and identification of measures in the alternatives.

Discussion Points
- Much BDAC discussion centered on the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Decision 1630 (D-1630) and the sixteen Best Management Practices (BMP's) negotiated by 300 major water suppliers in California. The BMP's appear in a negotiated agreement in the form of a memorandum of understanding (MOU). Implementation of the BMP's is voluntary. The catalyst for the agreement was the recent drought which was a significant outside force that encouraged collaboration and consensus on water conservation measures. Now, with more abundant water supplies, there are fewer incentives for implementing the MOU. Currently, only 125 suppliers, representing 40% of California's population, are complying with the BMP's.

- Although voluntary compliance may be included as a general approach to implementation of water use efficiency measures, strong incentives such as pricing, comprehensive performance monitoring and penalties for non-compliance, are needed to encourage suppliers to adhere to voluntary, negotiated measures.

- The representative from the California Urban Water Agencies reported that the California Water Council is developing a consistent reporting process to better track BMP compliance and report on the reasons why some suppliers are complying and others are not.

- Staff recommended focusing on conservation targets rather then on specific methods, such as agricultural land retirement. Staff also raised issues regarding the definition of "efficiency". Does it concern the amount of water that is applied to crops or does it refer to the amount of water that is available in the system? This question of definition is important because some water users are dependent on return flows.

- BDAC members suggested several issues for the new work group to address.
  - ▸ Identify the lessons learned from the BMP MOU process and ways for getting better participation.
  - ▸ Identify the important issues urban suppliers can agree on during the forecasting process.
  - ▸ Identify a range of water use efficiency activities.
  - ▸ Identify options for performance standards.

Key Outcomes
- BDAC member Judith Redmond is the chair of the Water Use Efficiency Work Group.
- The first meeting will be May 23, 1996 at a location TBA.

6b. Assurances (Zach McReynolds)

Presentation
Staff provided an overview of the Key Assurances Issues and provided an outline to BDAC and the public. Interest groups are beginning to take positions as issues surrounding refinement of alternatives become more apparent. Discussion of the types and needs of assurances, based on the Solution Principles, will help correct tendencies to negotiate based on those positions, rather than on interests and concerns.

6c. Water Quality (Steve Yaeger & JohnGaston)

Presentation
An overview of key water quality issues was presented (based on water quality issues lists provided at the meeting), focussing on ecosystem water quality (in-Delta, upstream and downstream), agriculture water quality and urban drinking water quality.

Several members of the public provided input to the discussion points: Byron Buck (California Urban Water Agencies), Vicki Willis (City of Benicia), Ed Petry (City of Mendota), Bruce Macler (EPA), Bill Dunn (Calaveros County Water District), and Jim McCleod.

Discussion Points
- San Francisco Bay stratification. Qualitatively, high flows during winter provide the most benefit to San Pablo Bay, but, modeling is needed to determine the optimal solution for the Bay. The Program is conferring with the USGS for evaluation of impacts of alternatives on Bay stratification.

- Agricultural water quality in the San Joaquin Valley. Currently, the pumps cause recirculation of polluted water through the water conveyances that supply the Valley, resulting in poor drinking and agricultural water quality. The quality of water fluctuates with high and low water flows, so that downstream treatment plants must be designed to handle the differences in quality. These special designs are costly.

- Urban water quality. Major pollutants of concern are total organic carbon (TOC) and bromide (sea water). The cost of treating TOC's (generated from water passing through Delta peat soils) is a $100 - $125 per AF increase over traditional water treatment. In addition, the literature questions whether TOC's can be treated. One suggested solution to the high cost of

treatment was installation of point-of-use (individual household) systems. However, the practicality of this option and the effectiveness of these systems in treating TOC's were questioned. So far, no device meets California's drinking water standards. Encouraging SWRCB to address water quality issues and increasing the price of water to cover costs for more storage and water treatment were also mentioned as options.

- Drinking water quality raises public health issues, some of which may be too broad for CALFED to address, however, the point was made that CALFED has a commitment to maintain the highest standards for California drinking water.

- Lawsuits surrounding the San Luis Drain. If the project proceeds it could significantly impact ecosystem restoration implementation.

Key Outcomes
- A team will be formed to address water quality technical issues to help the CALFED staff ensure this objective is met in the alternatives.

- The USBR and Resources Agency will report at the May 29 BDAC meeting on the status of the San Luis Drain issues.

6d. Other Issues

Presentation
BDAC member Alex Hildebrand presented an overview of problems with San Joaquin river system water quality. Since the 1900's, water flows into the River have decreased by 4 MAF. A result of the CVP has been a reduction of 550,000 AF/year in water flows and 345,000 AF of the decrease occurs during the irrigation season. A major contaminant is salt which totals about 1 million tons per year during years of full delivery.

Mr. Hildebrand recommended that three barriers be built to capture water at high tide to be released at low tide. This option would stop recirculation of the poor quality water (mentioned in Alternative C discussion, above) into the Delta-Mendota Canal.

Discussion
- The barrier option is part of the solution in the DWR Interim South Delta Water Quality Program and impacts some of the components proposed in the CALFED alternatives.
- One of the results of the option is that salts, if water is released into the central Delta, will be widely dispersed but will end up in San Francisco Bay.
- With this option State Water Project operators can vary flows on a seasonal basis and take advantage of facilities which are idle part of the year. This option may have third party impacts by restricting use of facilities which would otherwise be used for other purposes.
- To understand the impact of this option and CALFED alternatives, it is important to know the status and scope of current projects.

Key Outcomes
- CALFED staff agreed to provide BDAC with a summary of current, related projects at the next meeting.

7. Upcoming Program Activities

Attendees were directed to their BDAC packets for upcoming meeting dates.

7a. No-Action Alternative (Rick Breitenbach)

Presentation and Discussion

- Staff presented a list of proposed criteria for screening projects for inclusion in the no-action alternative. Public review of the criteria will begin around the end of June.
- No-action alternative projects are generally defined as existing water contracts with fully permitted projects. They will be evaluated for their environmental impacts in the cumulative impacts analysis.

8. Public Comment

Additional comments were received:

Ed Petry (City of Mendota) -- Mr. Petry discussed the community impacts of poor south Delta water quality. Wells in the San Joaquin valley have a life expectancy of two years because of salt contamination. The salts and pollutants cause corrosion of household plumbing, which results in a replacement cost of $3,500.00 per home.

9. Next Meeting (Lester Snow)

Staff provided an overview of the following topics to be covered at the next BDAC Meeting on May 29, 1996 in Sacramento at a location TBA.

- Strengths and weaknesses of components;
- Evaluation of components to meet the Solution Principles; and
- Indication of and rationale for alternative refinements.