BDAC Assurances Work Group
Meeting Summary
December 13, 1996

The BDAC Assurances Work Group held its fourth meeting on Friday, December 13, 1996 at the Resources Building from 9 a.m. to noon.

BDAC Members of the Work Group present were:

Hap Dunning
Alex Hildebrand
Tib Belza

Invited Participants in the Work Group present were:

George Basye
B.J. Miller
Gerald Meral
Elizabeth Patterson
Dennis O'Connor

Other Participants included:

Ken Bogden, Jones & Stokes
Linda Cole, Valley Water Protection Association
Jeff Jaraczeski, NCWA
Tom Hagler, EPA
Penny Howard, USBR
William Dunn, Calaveras County Water District
Randall Neudeck, MWD
William Johnston, Modesto ID
Amy Fowler, SCVWD
Kathy Kelly, DWR
Larry Puckett, FWS
Glen Birdzell, Stockton
Martha Turner
Allan Highstreet, CH2M Hill
Dan Jones, MWD
Cliff Schulz, KCWA
Peter Candy, Surfrider
Doug Wallace, EBMUD
Anthony Bartsett, SEWD
David Sandino, DWR

E-013955

E-013955

Introduction

Work Group Chair Hap Dunning opened the meeting. Work Group members and participants introduced themselves.

Modifications of Stakeholder Concerns

Mike Heaton reviewed changes made to the Stakeholder Concerns portion of the 12/2/96 staff paper based on stakeholder comments.

Alex Hildebrand voiced a concern that not only those able to pay were entitled to assurances. Hap Dunning raised an environmental concern that exports of water be reduced if necessary to achieve ecosystem restoration. Gerald Meral noted that outflow was the environmentalists' primary concern. Attendees suggested some minor wording changes to this suggestion.

B.J. Miller suggested tabling the list of stakeholder concerns for now and moving on to the case study. The list could be revisited later if necessary. Tom Hagler voiced his concern that we not continue to tinker with this section by adding substantive or program issues to the list. He supported Miller's suggestion of moving on, but reserving the right to return to this section if necessary. Randall Neudeck and Tib Belza supported this concept.

Case Study

Lester Snow introduced the case study as a move away from the generic and to the specific. He strongly encouraged the group to focus on assurance issues, not program issues, and to look forward and set an objective for the January 14, 1997 meeting.

Mary Scoonover described the staff's desire to first determine whether the case study provided a an adequate vehicle for discussing assurances. If yes, then the group would move to identifying assurance issues raised by the case study, and plan to address several options for resolving those assurance issues at the next meeting.

Dave Fullerton walked the group through a summary of the case study contained in a 12/3/96 staff paper. He explained that the case study in no way represented a CALFED preference for one alternative over another; this case study was purely illustrative. It is similar to Alternative 3 and has specific as well as programmatic actions. Alex Hildebrand indicated a need to know the alignment of an isolated facility and operating procedures before being able to adequately address assurance issues.

The group discussed the merits of selecting a specific isolated facility capacity instead of the range presented. Staff agreed to modify the paper to reflect two alternative sizes of facility, 5,000 cfs and 15,000 cfs, in order to raise differing assurance issues.

E-013956

E-013956

On Gerald Meral's suggestion the group moved through the case study one component at a time. The group agreed that the water quality component of the case study ought to encompass more than just pollution control measures. At numerous locations the group suggested adding monitoring and oversight as programmatic functions.

Staff agreed to modify the case study prior to the next meeting.

Staff asked for comments on the preliminary list of assurance issues. Gerald Meral suggested discussing the issue of new or reformulated entities at one time and in one location.

Mary Scoonover described the staff's intent to develop differing methods of assurance for each of the three suggested portions of the case study: 5,000 and 15,000 cfs isolated facilities, an adaptive management program for ecosystem restoration, and a north of delta storage facility of approximately 1 million acre feet.

B.J. Miller presented a suggested method for developing assurances for the case study. Staff agreed to prepare a draft of methods of assurance prior to the next meeting using Miller's materials, as well as other methods of assurance.

Review of Workshop Planning

Staff described the planning efforts for the March 18, 1997 workshop scheduled from 9 to noon. Staff asked work group members to review the memorandum in the meeting package and comment about the content or suggested structure of the workshop. In addition, staff asked the work group participants to help identify work group constituents who should be invited to the workshop, but are not regularly attending the work group meetings. Staff asked participants to provide their constituents names and addresses.

Tentative Meeting Schedule

Staff asked for comments on the proposed 1997 meeting dates. Amy Fowler explained that Rosemary Kamei was unable to attend Tuesday work group meetings. Hap Dunning identified a conflict with the July date. Staff agreed to collect additional comments and prepare a revised list of meeting dates prior to the January meeting.

The next work group meeting is January 14, 1997 from 9 a.m. to noon at the Energy Commission Building, 1516 Ninth Street, Hearing Room A, First Floor, Sacramento.