

**BDAC  
MEETING SUMMARY  
(3/12/97)**

**BDAC MEETING SUMMARY**  
**MARCH 12, 1997**  
**BEVERLY GARLAND HOTEL**  
**9:30 AM to 4:00 PM**

**MEETING OUTCOMES**

- Lester Snow will meet with the Environmental Water Caucus to address concerns raised in their recent letter to the CALFED Program.
- BDAC was asked if the Storage & Conveyance configurations adequately represent the range of options for impact analysis. One member indicated that the range for conveyance options should be expanded to include a 3,000 cfs facility. Other BDAC comments addressed the need for cost and impact information, as well as descriptions of operating plans.
- BDAC members were asked to express their concerns relative to the approach being used to develop the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan. Six members, total, commented and raised different issues. Concern was expressed for potential impacts of Storage & Conveyance configurations on the San Francisco Bay. Restoring meanders to the San Joaquin River system may not be appropriate, and the presence of exotic species may impede meeting the restoration goals. Impacts of the CALFED solution on low-to-moderate income households and the need to address assurance and administrative structure issues for effective implementation were also raised as issues.
- BDAC members were also asked what assurance issues were raised by the Storage & Conveyance and Ecosystem Restoration Program components. No direct response was offered.
- Lester Snow responded to BDAC questions regarding the Ecosystem Roundtable by committing to provide more detailed information for the April meeting.

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS; STATUS OF STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION ACTIVITIES (Mike Madigan, Lester Snow)**

Chair Mike Madigan convened the meeting and welcomed BDAC members and members of the public. Chair Madigan asked for BDAC discussion regarding correspondence he had received on the topic of coordination of stakeholder activities. CALFED Program Manager Lester Snow described stakeholder dialogue as being of benefit to the CALFED process because it can bring forth a clearer view of the principles, interests and pattern of issues in stakeholder communities. It is especially useful that the issues that come up in other dialogues are then brought into the BDAC public process.

Chair Madigan asked BDAC member Tom Graff to summarize his letter of February 26, 1997. Mr. Graff said the topic of his letter is about a formal mediation effort underway involving urban and certain agricultural water agencies. He expressed a couple of concerns: the potential of the mediation overly influencing the choice of CALFED alternatives, and the ability of the mediator, Mr. James Waldo, to remain objective.

Chair Madigan then asked Byron Buck, California Urban Water Agencies, to address BDAC. Mr. Buck described the mediation process from his perspective. It involves a number of agricultural and urban water agencies who are discussing the three CALFED alternatives as an attempt to come to a consensus on providing input to CALFED on these alternatives. Mr. Buck noted that environmental interests were invited to participate and are doing so at the technical, but not at the policy, level. He also noted that Delta agricultural interests were also invited, but declined, and asked to be kept informed of the discussion outcomes.

Mr. Buck noted two phases, the first to establish ground rules and the second to engage in policy discussions. The outcomes of these discussions would then be taken to boards of individual districts for review and decision. For those districts that come to agreement, the input would be forwarded to CALFED.

The Chair then asked for additional comment from other participants in this mediated dialogue. Jason Peltier, Central Valley Water Association, addressed BDAC and said that there is real value for the agencies engaged in this dialogue. He thought the environmental interests would eventually join in this dialogue.

Mr. Graff explained that the environmental interests were last contacted in early January. He noted that before that time the environmental interests were approached and decided that under no circumstances would they participate in a process mediated by Mr. Waldo. Subsequently, environmentalists were asked to participate in a dialogue on resolving outstanding issues of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and CVP operations. Discussions began and there was disagreement on the topics to be addressed.

#### **Public Comment**

- Dan Nelson, San Luis Delta-Mendota Water Authority, noted that in December there was a strong sense that environmental interests were not ready to participate in the mediation and that the process remains open. He also noted that the dialogue with urban and agricultural water agencies would continue.

Chair Madigan and BDAC member Ray Remy discussed the value of continuing this agenda item. Mr. Remy felt that the mediated dialogue would continue, notwithstanding reaction from BDAC, and that the agenda for the BDAC meeting should proceed. Chair Madigan acknowledged that the dialogue will likely proceed and it is important for BDAC to discuss its concerns about the dialogue and be kept informed of its progress. He then called for further discussion.

**Public Comment**

- Gary Bobker, the Bay Institute, noted a need for the type of dialogue described, however there were mistakes made in approaching environmental interests. He said that it is necessary for environmental interests to continue to discuss possible participation in this mediated process.

BDAC member Alex Hildebrand agreed with Lester Snow's points and cautioned that sometimes proposals from caucuses are given more credit than they deserve. In effect, that the big players put out proposals and it is assumed that these represent all interests when that may not be the case.

**Public Comment**

- Randy Kanouse, East Bay Municipal Utility District, said that the mediator was directed to contact all potentially interested parties to request their involvement.

Discussion continued among the following BDAC members and Mr. Snow; Mike Stearns, Ann Notthoff, Chair Madigan, Steve Hall, Stu Pyle, Roberta Borgonovo, Mary Selkirk, Vice Chair Sunne McPeak, Jack Foley, and Roger Strelow. Concern was expressed about the possible political significance of entities engaged outside of the public forum in what could be inferred as creation of the preferred alternative. It was noted that the Environmental Water Caucus has submitted a letter detailing its perspective and that other stakeholders did not review the letter. Another point was that such discussions better prepare stakeholders for participation in the public forum. Also, that the process is working as it should and that because of the complexity of CALFED outside discussions could be of help. Mr. Snow reiterated that as issues arise outside of the CALFED process, they should then be brought into the process as appropriate. Members made note that the outside discussions may be happening because the issues are not being fully addressed in the BDAC work groups. It was also noted that with more meetings both in and outside of CALFED, it becomes harder for some parties to participate. Chair Madigan concluded by noting that at the time of decision for CALFED, something approaching consensus will be necessary for the program to move ahead.

Chair Madigan then asked Ms. Borgonovo to summarize the letter to BDAC from the Environmental Water Caucus (EWC). Ms. Borgonovo opened by noting the strong commitment of the EWC to the CALFED process. The concerns expressed in the letter include a desire by the EWC for a mid-course correction. In particular, that equal weight be given to all parts of the program and tools be included such that Alternative 1 could be considered as the preferred alternative. These tools would include a strong water conservation program and water acquisition program. The letter notes that although CALFED is making an effort, the necessary assurances are not in place to ensure long-term freshwater flows to the estuary nor is there consideration of a cap on exports south of the Delta.

Mr. Hall noted that the EWC position is at odds with other stakeholder groups. Chair Madigan replied the Program and work groups are set up to deal with the issues raised in the letter. He also cautioned that CALFED is in a fact-finding stage, and that negotiations may be premature. BDAC members Mr. Hildebrand, Vice Chair McPeak, Ms. Selkirk, and Mr. Hall continued the discussion. It was suggested the letter be referred to the Ecosystem Restoration Work Group. It was also noted that doing so would not allow for full discussion of cross-cutting issues.

Lester Snow noted that throughout the process positions have been staked out and then have been worked through. He indicated that he will meet with the EWC and discuss their concerns within the context of the goals, objectives and mission of CALFED.

#### **Public Comment**

- Mr. Bobker repeated that the EWC is very involved with the CALFED process. He noted that the concern expressed in the letter regarding facilities is in part due to the apparent lack of attention to other "soft path" options for achieving the program objectives.

### **2. REVIEW OF PHASE II SCHEDULE (Rick Breitenbach)**

#### **Presentation**

Rick Breitenbach (CALFED Program staff) presented the information on opportunities for public involvement throughout Phase II. A list of scheduled activities as well as a memo describing upcoming opportunities not yet scheduled were included in the BDAC meeting packet.

#### **Discussion**

- Mr. Hildebrand inquired about when the Storage & Conveyance proposals would be available. He questioned the advisability of proceeding with environmental impact analysis when this information is not available. Mr. Breitenbach responded that a general analysis of some approaches to facilities and other components can occur early on because a general sense of their "footprint" is available. Lester Snow also noted that CALFED staff are integrating the program components and that shortly a more complete description of the integration as well as assurances will be available.

### **3. COMPONENT INTEGRATION (Lester Snow)**

#### **Presentation**

Lester Snow opened this agenda item by providing BDAC two concepts necessary for component integration; 1) that the solution has to address all CALFED goals; and, 2) that the components must address more than one objective.

### **3a. EXAMPLE ALTERNATIVES (Steve Yaeger)**

#### **Presentation**

Steve Yaeger (CALFED Deputy Director) reminded BDAC members of work to date. He then described general characteristics of configurations in Alternative 1. Facilities as part of Alternative 1 could increase the diversion capability of existing pumping facilities. He noted that the foundation for the alternative is the Water Use Efficiency program component which, in turn, may rely on water transfers. Other configurations may include increased storage north, in, and south of the Delta. Common to all configurations are ecosystem restoration and improvements in water quality throughout the system. He concluded this description by saying that the operational concepts for the facilities would have the storage facilities filled at the least environmentally damaging times and that water supplies would be used for all beneficial uses, including environmental uses.

For Alternative 3, Mr. Yaeger noted that all of the characteristics for Alternative 1 would be included in this alternative. Additional characteristics include improvement of Delta channels for conveyance of water supplies and an isolated conveyance facility around the Delta. For purposes of the BDAC discussion, the illustration used showed a conveyance facility of 7,000 cfs. Storage in addition to that for Alternative 1 would be off-stream storage south of the Delta.

### **3b. STORAGE & CONVEYANCE COMPONENT (Stein Buer) Presentation**

CALFED Program staff member, Stein Buer, presented material on work to date on computer modeling and facility configurations. His presentation closely followed material included in the BDAC meeting packet. Mr Buer concluded his presentation by repeating the questions to BDAC contained in the meeting packet - do the configurations of storage and conveyance facilities, as presented, adequately represent the range of options for impact analysis?

### **Discussion Points**

- Vice Chair McPeak asked whether or not the Delta simulation model was now calibrated. She also noted that it is necessary to account for temperature variability in the Delta. Mr. Buer responded that because temperature is difficult to model, it will not be included as a variable but will be accounted for in other analyses. Vice Chair McPeak suggested that the range for conveyance capacity be broadened to include a 3,000 cfs facility.
- Mr. Graff asked whether an institutional screening of the configurations to determine the feasibility for water transfers would occur. Lester Snow replied that staff is researching criteria and safeguards for water transfers.
- Mr. Pyle asked what cost and impacts information would be available and what the expectations were of the upcoming Storage & Conveyance Workshop. In reply, Lester Snow said that the workshop would provide feedback to the Program and that more pointed public review would occur during environmental impact analysis. Mr. Yaeger

added that at the workshop information on sensitivity analysis and possibly cost information would be provided. He added that at the workshop participants will be asked to weigh in on the approaches to the analysis.

- Mr. Hildebrand and Vice Chair McPeak spoke to the need to look at the range of operating plans to be able to discuss the alternatives fully, particularly in the context of ecosystem restoration. Mr. Hildebrand requested that such information be available in the meeting packet prior to scheduled discussion. Lester Snow indicated that this material is currently being developed and revised. He also noted that there is a lack of knowledge and that the Program will have to use adaptive management to change where necessary. Mr. Buer further added that CALFED is reaching out to stakeholders to receive comment on a variety of factors for the storage and conveyance program component. Mr. Yaeger concluded the discussion by noting that at the workshop information on operating criteria will be presented.

### **3c. ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION COMPONENT (Dick Daniel)**

#### **Presentation**

After BDAC returned from lunch, Dick Daniel (CALFED Program staff) presented an overview of the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan. In addition to material in the BDAC meeting packet, Mr. Daniel described the foundation of the restoration program as being that of restoration of the ecosystem processes of streamflow, sediment supply, geomorphology and hydrology. He noted that restoring ecosystem processes will re-establish ecosystem functions. These functions include gravel recruitment, temperature and floodplains and flooding. Illustrative examples of locations for restoration of ecosystem processes were presented.

In response to a question about impacts to San Francisco Bay from the storage and conveyance configurations, Mr. Daniel replied that one of the operating concepts being considered by CALFED is letting the first peak flow of each year pass through the system and not be retained in storage. This would activate movement of sediment and flush water contaminants. Mr. Buer added that the Program is looking at a range of flow management options including ignoring fluvial processes. He added that all this information will be available for public review.

#### **Discussion Points**

- Mr. Hildebrand brought up two points. He stated that the lower San Joaquin River system may not be an appropriate site for re-establishment of a meander system. He then asked how CALFED can guarantee restoration goals when the impacts from exotic species on the ecosystem is unknown. Mr. Daniel responded that the Program will attempt to restore ecological functions and processes, but cannot guarantee populations of specific species.

- BDAC member Bob Raab questioned the idea that there is "unneeded" water in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River systems given the current condition of San Francisco Bay. Mr. Buer replied that CALFED will provide information on flow volumes and timing and can display the consequences of differing management operations.
- Mr. Remy inquired about the financial impact of CALFED actions to mid-to-lower income households. Mr. Buer replied that the Program is conducting economic modeling. Lester Snow added that it will be up to the individual water districts, through their own integrated resource planning processes, to determine the cost of water to households.
- Mr. Pyle remarked that the ERPP as it stands does not address issues of administrative structure and assurances. Lester Snow responded that these issues are coming up in both the Assurances Work Group and the Ecosystem Restoration Work Group.
- Ms. Borgonovo noted that San Francisco Estuary Project researched the economic values of not maintaining the ecosystem with the necessary flows. Mr. Yaeger replied that the outcomes of the Estuary Project have been folded into the CALFED analytical process.

Chair Madigan repeated the questions posed in the BDAC meeting packet. What are BDAC's concerns relative to the approach being used to develop the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan? What assurance issues are raised by the Program components?

#### **Public Comment**

- Earl Nelson, Western Area Power Administration, commented that he had not heard any discussion of the impacts of the CALFED Program on electrical energy generation. He said that there are definitely implications for generation as well as economic considerations.

Mr. Remy inquired about the relationship of the Ecosystem Roundtable to BDAC. Lester Snow responded that the Roundtable is a subcommittee of BDAC and allows CALFED to take advantage of early project options.

#### **5. RESTORATION COORDINATION ACTIVITIES UPDATE (Cindy Darling)**

To accommodate response to Mr. Remy's question, agenda items 4 and 5 were switched.

#### **Presentation**

Cindy Darling (CALFED Program staff) made a presentation to BDAC on CALFED Restoration Coordination based on the materials in the March meeting packet. In addition, Ms. Darling noted that the Roundtable has identified priority habitats and species. Also, she added that the Roundtable is using input from technical teams throughout the solution scope area to gain technical input on priorities for projects. Lastly, she noted that another responsibility of the Roundtable is to coordinate funding with other entities to reduce project duplication.

### Discussion Points

- Mr. Hildebrand asked how the Roundtable and the Ecosystem Restoration Work Group relate to each other. He also asked if the projects recommended by the Roundtable are subjected to the CALFED solution principles. Ms. Selkirk replied that the Work Group is providing advice on the long-term vision through comments on the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan and that the Roundtable is prioritizing implementation actions for the next three to five years. Lester Snow noted that early implementation is a pre-existing obligation from the December Accord. He noted that the CALFED alternatives are subject to the solution principles, but that the solution principle test is less rigorous for the restoration coordination activities because the long-term solution has not been developed and restoration is only one part of the solution. He also noted that restoration coordination activities will be consistent with the long-term program.
- Ms. Borgonovo inquired as to who were the representatives to the Roundtable. Ms. Darling replied that there are four environmental representatives, one waterfowl representative, four urban representatives, four agricultural representatives, one commercial fisheries representative, one recreational fisheries representative, one power generation representative, one rural counties representative, and one Delta representative.
- Vice Chair McPeak and Mr. Hildebrand called for the solution principles to be applied to project decisions. Lester Snow and Ms. Darling noted that the Roundtable is using criteria for project selection that meets with the Solution Principles as much as possible.
- Mr. Raab requested that the western boundary for the north San Francisco Bay region be moved to include the entire Petaluma River watershed. Ms. Darling noted that projects located on both sides of the river will be considered for funding.
- Mr. Remy brought up two points. He asked for clarification of the relationship between the Roundtable and BDAC. If the Roundtable is a subcommittee, it should report directly to BDAC with its recommendations and if not, it should be chartered as a separate entity. The other point was to ask how the Roundtable recommendations relate to the funding trigger mechanisms. Lester Snow responded that there are two trigger mechanisms in Prop. 204 for the release of funds. First is selling of up to \$60M of bonds for immediate funding of Category III projects authorized by the California Secretary of Resources. The second requires the certification and Record of Decision for the Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report prior to the expenditure of \$390M for implementation of the preferred solution.
- Ms. Selkirk noted that BDAC needs a better explanation of the role of the technical teams and the workshop format being used. She explained that would better clarify how the Roundtable is functioning and its relationship to CALFED. In reply, Lester Snow said the information is forthcoming.

### **Public Comment**

- Ed Petry called for completion of the San Luis Drain. His other points included concern over the lack of flows in the San Joaquin River and a desire for increased storage at Millerton Lake, as well as habitat restoration along the mainstem of the San Joaquin River.

### **4. PHASE II TECHNICAL EVALUATIONS (Steve Yaeger)**

#### **Presentation**

Mr. Yaeger reported that pre-feasibility studies contrast with environmental impact analysis by continuing to refine Program components and calculating detailed costs for actions. Impact analysis compares and contrasts the CALFED alternatives and presents information for decisions on a preferred alternative from a broad range of possibilities. He noted that pre-feasibility studies will provide greater support to the upcoming decisions and will shorten implementation time.

#### **Discussion**

- Mr. Hildebrand asked how CALFED is determining that proposed actions are realistic, for example water transfers. Mr. Yaeger replied that with water transfers conditions would be applied using the following criteria; physical, economic, resource planning, potential customers and third party impacts.

### **6. FLOOD REPORT UPDATE (Lester Snow)**

#### **Presentation**

Lester Snow stated that the Governor's Flood Report was mailed to BDAC members. Wayne White, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, reported that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has a mandate to bring levees back to pre-flood conditions. The Corps will be considering options for non-structural protection once the previous level of protection is in place. Additionally, consideration is being given to possible actions for non-Corps project levees such as those along the Cosumnes River.

#### **Discussion Points**

- Mr. Pyle asked about present ecosystem conditions. Mr. White replied that as field reports are compiled a picture will emerge. BDAC member Tib Belza noted that one recently installed restoration project was washed out. Mr. White followed that the overall habitat conditions at that site were in place.
- Vice Chair McPeak requested progress reports be made to the Ecosystem Restoration Work Group. Ms. Selkirk said that a Corps presentation is on the next agenda for the work group.

## **7. WATER USE EFFICIENCY (Rick Soehren)**

### **Presentation**

Rick Soehren (CALFED Program staff) presented a brief update on this program. He noted that there is ongoing work on the effective use of environmental water diversion, water recycling, and water transfers.

### **Discussion**

- BDAC member Richard Izmirian stated he is anxious to begin discussions on water transfers and inquired whether the only linkage between Storage and Conveyance and Water Use Efficiency is water transfers. Mr. Soehren replied that both transfers and storage and conveyance costs will affect the marginal price of water supplies. Lester Snow noted there is increased interest in the water transfers part of the CALFED Program and that due to this interest, it may need greater attention from the Program.

## **8. PUBLIC COMMENT (Mike Madigan)**

Chair Madigan asked for general public comment.

- Nancy Schaeffer, San Francisco Bay Joint Venture, commented that it is still important to look for the nexus between protecting Delta resources and resources of the entire San Francisco Bay.

Mr. Graff asked how CALFED relates to the San Francisco Estuary Project. BDAC member Marcia Brockbank said that there is no formal link, however the National Estuary Program is CALFED's forerunner. Mr. Stearns asked for information on levee stability. Lester Snow replied that the Program is looking at a wide variety of data including seismic stability and effects from changes in sea level.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 PM.