Meeting Summary
September 10-11

Draft

BDAC MEETING SUMMARY
SEPTEMBER 10 & 11, 1998
STOCKTON INN, STOCKTON

MEETING OUTCOMES

- The level of support expressed by BDAC members for the approach taken in "Draft -- Selecting a Draft Preferred Alternative" ranged from endorsement to qualified support to uncertainty. Major issues of discussion included disagreement over the approach taken for making decisions on surface storage and the isolated conveyance, program linkages and financing of the program elements.

- Delta interests object to the contingent strategy for the isolated conveyance. Urban water users want assurance that drinking water quality will be adequately addressed in Stage 1. Environmental interests want all water supply reliability tools to be given the same level of attention as surface storage. They also want aggressive pursuit of the Common Program objectives.

- Linkages between the programs need further clarification and refinement.

- BDAC funding sources for the Common Programs and storage facilities, including storage of water for environmental purposes will need to be identified either prior to or in Stage 1. Also, the costs of each program and especially water quality, will need refinement.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10

1. Chair's Report (Vice Chair Sunne McPeak)

Vice Chair Sunne McPeak opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. and introduced CALFED Policy Group members Walter Yep (Army Corps of Engineers), A.J. Yates (California Department of Food and Agriculture), and Patrick Wright (Environmental Protection Agency). She informed BDAC that members Alex Hildebrand, Byrun Buck, and Rosemary Kamei represented the Council at the Legislative Oversight hearings held in August. Vice Chair McPeak also complimented BDAC member Jack Foley for his effective negotiating of the Imperial Irrigation District/San Diego Water Authority agreement.

2. Discussion of the Draft framework for Selecting a Draft Preferred Alternative (Lester Snow and Loren Bottorff)

Lester Snow, CALFED Executive Director, reviewed the documents in the packet pertaining to the Draft Preferred Alternative Framework. He focussed on staged implementation and decision-making, the Stage 1 principles, and the contents of the Phase II Report that will be published along with the revised draft programmatic EIS/EIR.

Loren Bottorff, CALFED consultant, reviewed comments from BDAC members and other members of the public on the July 1998 draft framework document and described major revisions that appeared in the August 5, 1998 draft.

Discussion

- BDAC members Byrun Buck, David Guy, Roberta Borgonovo and Vice Chair McPeak discussed with Lester Snow and Loren Bottorff the findings for decisions on surface storage reservoirs and the isolated Delta conveyance facility. One piece of advice was that the decision on the isolated conveyance should be based on findings that the solution is cost effective and technically feasible. Concern was expressed that the proposed commitment to new surface storage was not strong enough and that the Ecosystem Restoration Program would adversely affect agriculture. Storage may be needed to limit reallocation of water from agriculture to other uses. On the other hand, the draft preferred alternative should include strong incentives for solving water supply reliability problems without the use of new storage and conveyance facilities. The approach proposed for the isolated conveyance should be used for decisions on new surface storage.

- BDAC members Stu Pyle, Alex Hildebrand, Mike Stearns, Byrun Buck, Vice Chair McPeak and Lester Snow continued discussion. Inconsistencies between the policy framework and the longer draft framework were mentioned; however, support was expressed for the approach taken in the draft framework document. The purpose of the two documents was clarified and the concepts of linking actions and establishing conditions for decisions was explained. It was suggested definitions for terms such as "water supply reliability" should be developed and accepted by all stakeholders and the approach in the framework document leads to too much uncertainty. One member thought the Program is moving in the right direction, however clear goals should be stated for water use efficiency, and the draft preferred alternative should allow agriculture to regain some past losses in water supply during Stage 1. It was pointed out that ecosystem restoration will ensure greater water supply reliability. The Program should reconsider linking decisions on the isolated conveyance to decisions on dealing with seismic instability in the Delta.

- Mr. Buck, Vice Chair McPeak and Lester Snow discussed the timing for decisions on storage facilities. Some decisions will be made during the Clean Water Act section 404 analysis and the Program will likely make programmatic level findings by the time of the Record of Decision on the draft EIS/EIR (scheduled for December 1999). A site specific analysis will follow the programmatic findings.

- BDAC member Richard Izmirian, Mr. Foley, Vice Chair McPeak and Lester Snow discussed the proposed linkages between water supply reliability, water use efficiency and surface storage. A need was expressed for using a market based solution (water transfers and marketing) for balancing differences between supply and demand. It was stated that the

linkage between water supply reliability and market based approaches was currently inadequate. It was explained that simply looking at California's supply and demand projections would not solve water supply reliability issues. Demands are different in drought and wet water years and these differences call for more than just increasing supply. Many tools are needed to meet demands in drought years and different tools serve different purposes.

Concern was expressed that the current framework document may put off tough decisions that should be made in the near future. It was explained that adaptive management does not avoid decision-making, rather, it allows for gathering of necessary information to make informed decisions. It was suggested that decisions on water use efficiency targets can and should be made sooner rather than later and that the concepts proposed in the framework document were supportable, but additional details may affect that support.

- BDAC members Steve Hall, Roger Strelow, Ms. Borgonovo, Vice Chair McPeak, Mr. Yates, Mr. Wright and Lester Snow discussed the assurances needed for fisheries recovery and water supply reliability for urban and agricultural water users. Water users believe that scheduling decisions on storage and conveyance in the next seven to ten years limits the ability of the Program to assure ecosystem restoration and water supply reliability in Stage 1 and possibly Stage 2. Linking Program actions and re-operation of the current storage and conveyance system provides some assurance that the ecosystem, stakeholders and agencies will benefit from the draft preferred alternative. Other assurances are a long-term monitoring plan and a "reserve account" to minimize the uncertainty in meeting water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration goals. In addition, water conservation, reclamation, groundwater conjunctive use, habitat restoration and flexible real-time monitoring will help assure that stakeholders benefit in both the short and long term.

  The framework must explain that operation of the system will be flexible, water supply will not be further reduced and benefits in all resource areas are "bundled" in short (two to three year) term increments. Also, specific decision points on the isolated conveyance, reasonable conditions on which the decision is based, thresholds for water use efficiency, a definition of water supply reliability, and a long term water supply for the ecosystem must be clearly articulated in the document. It was proposed that water supply reliability for the urban, agricultural and environmental communities meant meeting conditions for Delta smelt, while keeping water user risks acceptable. It was also pointed out that re-operation of the system and surface storage are tools that can help manage the system and reduce conflicts. It was suggested that the draft preferred alternative include a commitment to surface storage, but specify the cost and the price to water users, and include an requirement that those who use the reservoir will pay for it.

- Mr. Hildebrand, Mr. Buck, Mr. Hall, Mr. Pyle and Vice Chair McPeak provided additional comments on storage and conveyance. It was stated that the Delta common pool cannot be

protected with an isolated conveyance. Key health issues surrounding future decisions on the isolated conveyance will not be resolved in the short term. Surface storage should be included as a tool, along with water transfers, more flexible operations, conservation, and an isolated facility. Stakeholders need to identify possible solutions for the problems they raise.

Presentation (continued)
Lester Snow discussed the concept of linkages and conditions. He began with describing the primary and contingent strategies for the isolated facility and expressed the need for findings on aggressive implementation of the Common Programs, public health issues surrounding Delta water quality and fish recovery of Delta fisheries. Lester Snow also proposed that certain terms used in the framework document, such as "demonstrated progress", "aggressive implementation", and "high level of water use efficiency" be defined in future negotiations.

Discussion

- BDAC members Howard Frick, Rosemary Kamei, Mr. Hildebrand, Mr. Hall, Mr. Pyle and Mr. Buck suggested that water use efficiency goals not be linked with decisions on surface storage. It was suggested that it is not CALFED's responsibility to mandate a certain level of conservation. The proposal to do so may "sabotage" progress on surface storage through non-participation of certain water districts in the water use efficiency program. It was pointed out that the Program may not benefit from actions in those districts which have closed water systems, and that conservation may provide less water than people think. Perhaps, water use efficiency requirements promoted by CALFED should be articulated in state policy or legislation.

- Mr. Buck, Ms. Borgonovo and BDAC member Martha Davis disagreed. All water users are connected by the water system, so all should achieve a high level of efficiency. The links should remain because CALFED models include demand projections which assume a certain level of water use efficiency. Also, the public expects efficient water use and that efficiency will provide additional flexibility in ensuring water supply reliability.

- BDAC member Robert Meacher, Ms. Borgonovo, Vice Chair McPeak and Lester Snow concluded this part of the discussion. It was suggested that water use efficiency standards be included in county general plans, rather than in legislation or the CALFED program. BDAC was reminded that a water use efficiency standard will be a likely condition for constructing and using new surface storage. There continued to be disagreement over whether new surface storage will be needed to ensure water supply reliability.

3. Update on Revised Draft EIR/EIS Schedule (Steve Ritchie)
Steve Ritchie, CALFED Chief Deputy Director, explained that a draft of the Phase II report will be released for pubic review on October 9, 1998, the administrative draft EIS/EIR will be completed by October 23, and the revised draft EIS/EIR will be sent to the printer on December

E-018916

7, 1998. He explained the environmental documents for Stage 1 actions will not be part of the programmatic document, but that Stage 1 actions may be "bundled" so that a single document will cover multiple actions.

Vice Chair McPeak observed that additional discussion on controversial issues may be needed to ensure the 2,300 page revised draft adequately addresses the issues and is up-to-date.

Public Comment
Gary Bobker (The Bay Institute) commented on how CALFED should integrate adaptive management into implementation. He advised that to achieve success with an adaptive management approach clear objectives, adequate assessment of actions, and acknowledgment that outcomes of implementation measures are uncertain, are needed. He stated there are strong arguments for and against an isolated facility and that there are multiple tools for dealing with water supply issues. The Environmental Water Caucus (EWC) is not against having a storage reservoir as a tool to ensure water supply reliability, but the need for it should be assessed and it should be considered in the same light that other water supply reliability tools are considered. He questioned how effective new surface storage would be, and noted that the effectiveness of other water supply reliability tools, such as conjunctive use, operations, and floodplain creation, are also unknown. He also questioned the ability of users to pay for a new storage reservoir, especially considering their future obligations for paying for Common Program actions.

Ronnie Cohen (Natural Resources Defense Council) urged CALFED to continue with the economic analysis of water management options, supports the EWC's approach for addressing new storage, advocated for maximum conservation by urban and agriculture communities, and supported the purpose of the Diversion Effects on Fish Team.

2. Discussion of the Draft framework for Selecting a Draft Preferred Alternative (continued)
After lunch, Vice Chair McPeak laid out the following statistics to demonstrate that there is a projected gap of one to two maf between expected future water yield and future demand (over the next 20 to 30 years). She suggested the shortfall could be made up by a new surface storage reservoir.

Future Water Yield (2.5 - 3.75 maf, total):

1 maf	urban BMP's (does not include .25 to .5 maf of savings from landscaping changes and tiered pricing)
.25 - .75	water reclamation conservation
.25	water markets (transfers)
.25 - .5	watershed management
.25 - .5	changed agricultural practices and voluntary land retirement
.25 - .5	re-operation of water facilities

Future Demand (4.5+maf, total):

1 maf	re-operation of the Colorado River
2	groundwater overdraft
.8	CVPIA
.25 - .75	Delta outflow
.3	reductions in Trinity River diversions
.25 - .75	new demand (population growth)

Ms. Borgonovo stated the EWC will respond to these projected estimates and that a focus group is needed to further discuss the relationship between water supply reliability and surface storage.

Mr. Hildebrand, Mr. Buck, Mr. Frick, Ms. Davis and Mr. Pyle discussed the need to question assumptions. Will reductions in agriculture water supply adversely affect food productivity? Population forecasts are often wrong and ultimately the market will affect costs and supply. Assumptions regarding results of water use efficiency and water transfers should be quantified. Urban conservation efforts have produced more water supply than was imagined by water planners. The Program should make sure that conservation projections are not based on old data or water use patterns.

4. Report on the CALFED Conservation Strategy (Marti Kie)
Marti Kie, CALFED Bay-Delta Program staff, described the CALFED Conservation Strategy consistent with the information in the BDAC meeting packet.

Discussion

- Mr. Guy and Ms. Kie clarified that some CALFED related mitigation will be implemented prior to completion of possible Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP's).

- Mr. Buck and Ms. Kie discussed that HCP's and project specific permits may include assurances and that the development and processing of the permits should be streamlined by the information in the Conservation Strategy. The project specific permits and environmental documents will provide the project specific information not available during the programmatic phase of the CALFED program.

5. Update on the Ecosystem Restoration Program (Dick Daniel and Terry Mills)
Dick Daniel, CALFED Program staff, provided an overview of the strategic planning process for the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP). He informed BDAC that the plan sets out six goals, takes an ecosystem approach for restoration, calls for a need for conceptual models, discusses institutional issues pertinent to management of the program, discusses scientific dispute resolution, an approach to regulatory compliance, and criteria for assessing projects and actions.

Mr. Pyle, Mr. Daniel, Mr. Izmirian, and Vice Chair McPeak discussed that adaptive management will include quantification of objectives so that success of Stage One actions will be measured and that conceptual models should provide the information to determine outflow needs (currently estimated at .825 to .875 maf) necessary to achieve those goals.

Terry Mills, CALFED Program staff, described an approach for determining the rate of recovery of certain endangered species. Using winter run chinook salmon, as an example, he explained the recovery goal had two parts: a cohort replacement rate (the number of adults who return to the rivers to spawn over two to five years) of greater than 1 and a population of 20,000 salmon sustained for thirteen years. He provided examples which demonstrated that using either method by itself would not accurately determine whether the species is recovering. Benefits of the approach include that it uses existing recovery goals, it is metric based, the presentation is simple, it can be applied to other chinook species and the level of evaluation is the ecosystem level.

Discussion

- BDAC member Pietro Parravano, Mr. Hasseltine, Ms. Kamei and Mr. Pyle discussed the sampling methods used in counting fish with Mr. Mills and Mr. Daniel. Winter run have characteristics which easily distinguish them from other races of fish. In addition, DNA testing is used to confirm the species of the fish. Data gathering is becoming increasingly difficult due to changes in operation at Red Bluff Diversion Dam. When data gathering began, the gates were closed during the upstream migration, fish were forced into a narrow ladder and fish counts were accurate. Now, the gates are open to facilitate the migration and the accuracy of the counts has decreased. New strategies for counting fish are being tested. The prognosis for building populations is that many years are needed to meet the recovery target.

Public Comment

Rogene Reynolds (Delta resident) suggested that the public and decision makers have not achieved much progress in resolving water issues. She also remarked that there is little public support for an isolated conveyance north of the SWP/CVP pumps and that Ecosystem Roundtable review of the Restoration Coordination 1998 funding package was inadequate.

Wiley Horne (Metropolitan Water District) complimented staff on an exceptional job on the Conservation Strategy and warned that the staff will be short of resources in 1999.

Tim Quinn (Metropolitan Water District) informed BDAC in written and oral comments that while the District is committed to providing reliable water supplies to southern California its strategy will rely less on water from the Bay-Delta and more on a new water management strategy. Most of the future demand will be supplied by water supplied from storage, transfers, voluntary conservation and new recycling. As are result, the District projects that in drought years the Delta will provide 12% of its supply, as opposed to the 30% it has provided in the past. An important purpose for Bay-Delta water is to help maintain the water quality of its supply.

Ms. Borgonovo, Mr. Hildebrand, BDAC members Hap Dunning, Rob Raab and Mr. Quinn engaged in a discussion on the District's future plans. The District will work with interested parties to resolve the Coachella problem. There are still some in southern California that believe that the main benefit of the isolated conveyance will be to improve water supply, not water quality. The District predicts that 2 maf of additional water will come from the water management strategy described above, rather than from water that would be available as a result of completing the State Water Project. The District plans on storing 2 maf of water obtained during wet years for drought year supplies. The district is addressing its water quality problems partially through funding desalination projects, which cost about $200 per af.

The discussion also focused on recent legislation which provides $235 million to the District for to facilitate water transfers between San Diego Water Authority (District member) and the Imperial Irrigation District through its conveyance system. It was suggested the authorization of the funds is inconsistent with water market concepts and that the purpose of the funding was quite general. It was pointed out that the state has paid for other local programs which provide a broad benefit and that the legislation outlines very specific uses for the funds.

Chair McPeak reminded BDAC that next two meetings are scheduled for October 29 and 30, and December 9 and 10, 1998. The meeting was recessed at 4:10 pm.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11

5. Chair's Report (Vice Chair Sunne McPeak)

Vice Chair McPeak opened the meeting at 8:45 am.

6. Report on Public Meeting (Valerie Holcomb)

Valerie Holcomb, CALFED staff, summarized the major comments from the public meeting held the previous evening in Stockton. The public who attended the meeting were very adamantly opposed to a Delta isolated conveyance because they do not believe the assurances CALFED can provide will adequately protect their interests. They also expressed support for the CALFED levee program. BDAC member E.Z. Burts concurred with Ms. Holcomb's assessment of the meeting.

7. Report on the Ecosystem Restoration Program in the Delta (Margit Aramburu, Tom Zuckerman, and John Cain, Ad hoc Delta Group)

Tom Zuckerman (Co-Council, Central Delta Water Agency) provided background on the alternative proposal for the CALFED ecosystem restoration program in the Delta, which was provided in the meeting packets. The current proposal is an outgrowth of an earlier proposal by the Natural Heritage Institute (NHI) which called for converting 350,000 acres of Delta agricultural land to ecosystem restoration purposes. The alternative proposal demonstrates there are many areas where restoration can occur, without displacing agricultural operations.

Margit Aramburu (Executive Director, Delta Protection Commission) discussed the process used to develop the alternative proposal. Working with private landowners, the group identified public lands and private lands (with minimal financial investments) which could be used to protect in-channel islands and provide significantly improved habitat for birds and other animals, primarily in riparian corridors.

John Cain (Environmental Planner, NHI) explained that the plan is relatively short term and it will likely change over time. Many issues are too contentious to develop a 25 year plan that will be acceptable to Delta residents. NHI's goals are to have restoration opportunities identified by the local community, prevent urbanization of the Delta and reverse land subsidence which is occurring in the Delta.

Discussion

- Mr. Hildebrand, Ms. Borgonovo, BDAC member Patrick McCarty opened discussion. It was pointed out that habitat can be restored by reducing wave action. The ad hoc group and Delta Protection Commission were complimented for the high degree of public involvement and the collaborative, solution oriented approach used to address problems with the NHI proposal and the ERP.

- Mr. Dunning, Mr. Buck, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Guy, and Mr. Hildebrand discussed the differences between the new proposal, the NHI proposal and the ERP with the committee members. Wildlife friendly practices on private lands can accommodate actions proposed in the ERP. Also, the proposal negates the need to convert 350,000 acres, at least in the near term. The riparian corridor portion of the proposal is consistent with the CALFED flood and Delta conveyance objectives.

- Mr. Daniel added that the proposal is consistent with CALFED plans to reverse land subsidence and will meet the goals of Stage 1 of the ERP. Adaptive management tools will determine the needed actions in future stages. The proposal's success will depend on finding clean dredge material to convert Frank's Tract to tidal habitat and the willingness of the public land owners to convert the use of their lands to habitat restoration purposes.

- Gary Bobker (The Bay Institute) complimented the group for proposing a constructive alternative. However, the proposal may be inadequate for long term implementation of the ERP and that large scale restoration in the Delta may still be needed. Plans are needed for sustainable land use practices and evaluation of long term use of high risk lands.

- Vice Chair McPeak and Mr. Guy acknowledged the collaborative approach taken by the Delta Protection Commission and suggested that the Commission may be a model for other regional government efforts. Staff was asked to either embrace the concept or to explain, soon, where there are problems with the group's proposal.

10. Financing the CALFED Program (Steve Ritchie)
(This agenda item was taken out of the order listed on the agenda to accommodate BDAC member schedules). Mr. Ritchie reviewed issues being addressed by the Finance work group and reviewed the Stage 1 cost sheet provided in the meeting packet entitled "Estimated CALFED Stage 1 Program and Capital Costs in Millions".

Discussion

- Mr. Hildebrand and Vice Chair McPeak discussed with Mr. Ritchie issues regarding funding of storage facilities. Assigning construction and operation costs of storage facilities to beneficiaries will need to take into account the purpose of the facility (whether or not it will provide flood control) and the revenues (such as those from power generation) its operations will or will not generate. The cost allocation will most likely take place during Stage 1.

- Mr. Izmirian, Mr. Buck, BDAC member Mike Stearns, Vice Chair McPeak and Mr. Ritchie discussed funding for ecosystem restoration, conservation and recycling. While most of the Stage 1 costs for ecosystem restoration will be borne by the state and federal governments, the user fee share for Stage 2 ecosystem restoration actions is unknown. A question was raised on whether a broad based user fee would address ongoing mitigation for past water diversions. Further discussion is needed on the appropriate costs and funding split for conservation and recycling. It was pointed out that state and federal funding should be used to promote local investments in conservation and recycling, but should not be used to supplant those funds.

- Mr. Buck, Ms. Kamei, Ms. Davis, Vice Chair McPeak and Mr. Ritchie focussed on the projected water quality program costs. Projected costs may be too low, unless the Program will primarily focus on source control. The projected costs for water quality will be revised, pending conclusions from the Water Quality Technical Group. If other water quality investments will be required, then water districts will need help explaining the purpose of and necessity for paying for actions that are not related to water quality. It was suggested that water districts need a water quality permitting system that acknowledges salinity and other contaminants as pollutants, so that financial resources can be used to treat those pollutants. The permitting system is needed regardless of whether an isolated conveyance or surface storage are constructed.

- Mr. Raab, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Davis, Vice Chair McPeak, Mr. Ritchie and Lester Snow discussed funding for storage and conveyance. Clarification is needed on the amount of funding which has already been committed and the amount of "new" money which will be required. It was pointed out that much of the Stage 1 costs are for planning and design of the facilities. Those costs will be reimbursed by the parties which will use the new facilities. It was explained that pre-permitting includes those actions necessary to select the sites, including environmental review.

E-018922

- Ms. Kamei, Mr. Buck, Ms. Borgonovo and Vice Chair McPeak concluded discussion. It was pointed out that the public will have difficulty understanding the difference between public funds and user fees, the Program should address salinity and contaminants in Delta water, that public investments in mitigation measures benefits all stakeholders and that more discussion on assigning costs to beneficiaries of new facilities will be needed.

8. Water Quality Program: Highlights from the CALFED Expert Panel on Bromides (Rick Woodard)

Rick Woodard, CALFED staff, opened his presentation with a status report on the water quality program (included in the meeting packet). He then discussed the Bromide Expert Panel, who's written report should be available on October 1, 1998.

Major conclusions from the panel's deliberations on September 8 and 9, 1998, were that organic carbons were of concern, some treatment technologies (including reverse osmosis) remove bromide, organic carbon and pathogens at an estimated cost of $10.00 per household, near term treatment approaches for Delta water supplies are needed to meet upcoming changes in water quality regulations, and addressing the bromide problem will require an evolving process and strategy.

Recommendations from the panel focussed on developing and providing information for the regulatory process, evaluating the relative importance of bromide recycling in the San Joaquin river, refining existing models, evaluating new treatment processes, working with utilities to develop a common metric to describe plant performance, refining risk assessments, developing additional data on Delta island drainage, and monitoring parameters of potential future concern.

Discussion

- Mr. Dunning and Mr. Frick commented that more precise cost data is needed and that the projected costs for treatment are substantial.

- Mr. Hildebrand discussed with Mr. Woodard, Mark Cowin (CALFED staff) and Lester Snow the relationship between the water quality issue and Delta conveyance. Some soils can filter out organic compounds, but the effectiveness varies. The problems with bromides and organic carbons can be eliminated if water is conveyed through eastside waterways. However, conveying water along that route would preclude maintenance of proper fish flows in the lower Sacramento River.

  Water quality actions can work in coordination with water use efficiency actions to reduce salinity concentrations in the San Joaquin system. South Delta salinity can be dealt with by installing tidal barriers and San Joaquin drainage issues will be addressed by programs other than CALFED.

- Mr. Buck, Ms. Davis and Vice Chair McPeak further discussed the panel's conclusions. It was suggested that more discussion was needed to determine whether a through Delta conveyance would cause conflicts between water quality and fish protection and enhancement goals. It was pointed out that reverse osmosis (use of membranes) substantially increases water use. In addition, the eastside alternative for Delta conveyance will direct fish to areas where they may be harmed. BDAC was also informed that an isolated conveyance may not help southern California meet water quality standards because the water will be mixed with lower quality water in San Luis Reservoir.

- Ms. Kamei, Ms. Borgonovo, Mr. Izmirian and Mr. Woodard expressed a need for more modeling to address uncertainties expressed by the panel and plans to incorporate the panel's recommendations into the Stage 1 actions.

Public Comment
Laura King (San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority) generally supported the beneficiaries pay principle but details on crediting and water users' portion of storage costs need further discussion. The agriculture/urban water caucus will release its financing proposal within the next two weeks.

Amy Fowler (Santa Clara Valley Water District) supported Ms. King's statement, but wants to make sure the beneficiaries pay principle is applied fairly. She warned that Stage 1 costs may exceed water quality and supply benefits. She called for implementation of the Bromide Panel's recommendations and suggested that pilot studies are needed to test methods for treating organic carbons, managing Delta drainage and relocating drains.

Bruce Mackler (Environmental Protection Agency) stated that the CALFED Water Quality Program will include a drinking water component. Constituents of concern are pathogens, organic compounds and bromides, turbidity, nutrients and algae, and total dissolved solids. Development of new regulations will include enhanced surface water treatment rules and disinfectants and disinfection by-products rules. Concerns go beyond the legal Delta.

9. Report on Restoration Coordination Program (Cindy Darling)
Cindy Darling, CALFED staff, reviewed the recommended 1998 restoration coordination funding package and related materials handed out at the meeting. The Program is striving for a balanced program, with respect to funding recipients, geographic areas, and types of projects. The package does not include funding for acquisition of water.

Public Comment
- Rogene Reynolds asked that names of the CALFED decision-makers, their meeting dates and schedule be posted on the Internet. She supports the results of the ad hoc Delta group. The Restoration Coordination Program's proposal solicitation process did not allow for adequate

public review of the funding package. Additional water quality regulations should focus on urban discharges and more time should be provided to allow for more public review of the water quality program.

- Jeanne Moran (citizen, geochemist at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory) called for more research on identifying sources of bromides and for removing organic carbons. Salt loads can be reduced through conservation.

- Peter Kiriakos (Sierra Club, San Gregorio Chapter) admonished BDAC members for leaving prior to adjournment of the meeting. He called for removing the isolated conveyance from the preferred alternative, more water conservation in southern California and the Bay Area, consideration of new storage only after full implementation of conservation, individual rainwater capture systems in southern California, dual water systems, and addressing water pollutants at the source of the water.

2. Discussion of the Draft framework for Selecting a Draft Preferred Alternative (continued)

Responding to an earlier request from Mr. Pyle, Vice Chair McPeak reopened discussion on the draft framework document. It was noted that the staff presentation on September 9 was lengthy and did not leave enough time for BDAC discussion.

The Vice Chair presented the following three questions and asked BDAC to respond to those questions within their respective caucuses and to report back to the full BDAC at the next meeting:
- What three priority changes would you require to support the six common program elements?
- Storage -- What changes in the draft framework would be essential to obtain your support?
- Conveyance -- What changes would be essential to obtain your support?

Vice Chair McPeak, Mr Pyle, and Mr Hildebrand provided further comment on the draft framework document and the draft policy framework . It was suggested that the larger document be renamed "Framework for a Preferred Alternative." It was mentioned that the current three year planning effort has not developed information nor has it engendered public acceptance of the CALFED proposed approach. In regards to the draft framework document, there was a call for greater detail describing the Common Programs. For example, the objective for the water supply reliability portion is not clear. The current draft does not discuss how new water supplies will be developed nor how future demand will be met. It also does not describe the water supply capabilities of the system. In addition, the water transfers program needs better definition and its relationship to surface storage should be clarified.

In regards to the proposed strategy, it was suggested the "primary strategy" for the isolated facility should be renamed the "initial strategy" and the "contingent strategy" should be renamed the "continuing strategy for moving forward over the next seven years". The existence of a contingent strategy will prejudge decisions on which conveyance option should be pursued. A through Delta conveyance option can be designed to reduce bromide levels. Conveyance related actions should include studies to determine which conveyance will best meet the CALFED goals. For one member, public financial support is acceptable for the portion of surface devoted to ecosystem restoration actions. Surface storage should be a separate, stand alone CALFED element. It should not be contingent on progress made in other CALFED program areas.

Mr. Raab, Howard Frick, Mr. Wright and Vice Chair McPeak expressed frustration with the BDAC discussions, in general. BDAC, it appears, is taking a backseat to other discussions, and thus, may be interpreted as being window dressing. It was suggested that BDAC members should have more pointed discussions and state their positions on issues. A request to vote and take positions on issues, as a body, was made. More definitive recommendations are needed because the decisions will be based on political factors. At the next BDAC meeting, the BDAC approach for reaching consensus will be restated and the reasons for taking that approach will be revisited.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.