

May 22, 2020

Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority
Stakeholder Engagement Committee Members

Subject: ***Materials for the May 27, 2020 Regular Committee Meeting***

Members of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee:

The eighth regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Stakeholder Engagement Committee is scheduled for a remote video conference on **Wednesday, May 27, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.**

Please join our meeting from your smartphone, computer or tablet.

<https://meetings.ringcentral.com/j/1496671968>

SEC Members are asked to join the meeting at 2:45pm to ensure priority entry by the meeting hosts and to resolve any technical issues prior to the start of the meeting.

Enclosed are the materials for the committee meeting in a PDF file, which has been bookmarked for your convenience.

- **Meeting Agenda**
- **Meeting Minutes**- April 22, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting

Please note that DCA will provide each member with a flash drive of all meeting materials in advance of the meeting. All files presented during the meeting will also be available at dcdca.org by the Monday following the meeting.

Regards,



Sarah Palmer, DCA Board Member
Stakeholder Engagement Committee Chair



Barbara Keegan, DCA Board Member
Stakeholder Engagement Committee Co-Chair



DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, May 27, 2020

3:00 p.m.

Remote – Conference Access Information:

Phone Number: 1 (623) 404-9000 **Access Code:** 149-667-1968

Electronic Meeting Link:

Please join our meeting from your smartphone, computer or tablet.

<https://meetings.ringcentral.com/j/1496671968>

In compliance with the Governor’s Executive Orders and based on the recent Sacramento County health order and similar orders statewide, the meeting will be held electronically only through the listed meeting link and telephone number. Assistance to those wishing to participate in the meeting in person or remotely will be provided to those requiring accommodations for disabilities in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Interested persons must request the accommodation as soon as possible in advance of the meeting by contacting the DCA support staff at (916) 347-0486 or info@dcdca.org. Members of the public may speak regarding items on the agenda when recognized by the Chair as set forth below. Speakers are limited to three minutes each; however, the Chair may limit this time when reasonable based on the circumstances. **Persons wishing to provide public comments remotely on Agenda Items must email claudiarodriguez@dcdca.org by 3:15 pm.** Additional information will be provided at the commencement of the meeting.

The purpose of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee is to create a forum for Delta stakeholders to provide input and feedback on technical/engineering issues related to the DCA’s current activities. Please note, this meeting is **not** part of the Department of Water Resources’ California Environmental Quality Act public outreach process related to a potential Delta Conveyance project and therefore comments made in this meeting will not be recorded or tracked for those purposes. All items are information only. Members of the public may speak regarding items on the agenda when recognized by the Chair. Please note that Item 4 is a single discussion item. Subparts are listed for clarity. Speakers are limited to three minutes each; however, the Chair may limit this time when reasonable based on the circumstances. Persons wishing to provide live remote comments are requested to email claudiarodriguez@dcdca.org by 3:15pm with their name, phone number, or other identifier and the Item number(s) (3, 4, 5, 6 and/or 7) that they wish to comment regarding. The public may also provide written public comment by email to claudiarodriguez@dcdca.org. All written comments received prior to the conclusion of the meeting will be included in the written record for the meeting but will not be read during the meeting.

- 1. WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL/HOUSEKEEPING**
- 3. MINUTES REVIEW: April 22, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting**
- 4. STAFF PRESENTATION & COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**
 - 4a: CEQA Process Update
 - 4b: Presentation Traffic Impacts and Logistics Improvements
 - 4c: Update on DCA Follow-up studies in response to SEC comments
 - 4d: SEC Questions or Comments on April 22nd Presentation
 - 4e: Proposed Alignment Tours and Map Book
 - 4f: Public Comment on Agendized Items
- 5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
- 6. NON-AGENDIZED SEC QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS**



DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE
MAY 27, 2020 REGULAR MEETING AGENDA, CONTINUED

7. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS

This is the time and place for members of the public to address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction but that are not on the agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes each; however, the Chair may limit this time when reasonable based on the circumstances. Persons wishing to speak are requested to email claudiarodriguez@dcdca.org by 3:15pm with their name, phone number or other identifier. As these items have not been agendized, the Committee is not legally able to discuss these items at this meeting unless a recognized exception applies.

8. NEXT MEETING

9. ADJOURNMENT

* * * * *

Next scheduled meeting: June 24, 2020 Regular Stakeholder Engagement Committee Meeting at 3:00p.m.



STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

Memo

Contact: Valerie Martinez, SEC Facilitator

Date: May 27, 2020 SEC Meeting

Item No. 3

Subject: Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes from SEC Meeting 7 (April 22, 2020) are attached for your review. Please send any edits to hannahflanagan@dcdca.org by **noon Tuesday, May 26, 2020**. Since the SEC is not a voting group, this process will facilitate the review process and allow us to efficiently address the minutes at the meeting.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 22, 2020

3:00 PM

(Paragraph numbers coincide with agenda item numbers)

[Editor's Comment: Minutes are provided to ensure an accurate summary of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee's meetings. The inclusion of factual comments and assertions does not imply acceptance by the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority.]

1. WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Stakeholder Engagement Committee (SEC) was called to order via RingCentral video conference at 3:06pm.

Director Palmer welcomed the SEC and meeting guests and thanked all for their participation. The meeting is being held via phone and video conference pursuant to Governor Newsom's Executive Order N2920 in response to the COVID-19 State of Emergency.

Ms. Palmer wished everyone a happy Earth Day and noted she was part of gathering signatures 25 years ago to mark this special day.

The purpose of the SEC is to create a forum for Delta stakeholders to provide input and feedback on technical and engineering issues related to the DCA's current activities. The SEC is a formal advisory body to the DCA Board of Directors. As such, and like the DCA itself, the SEC is subject to public transparency laws applicable to local public agencies like the Brown Act and the Public Records Act. It is important to note that the SEC and its meetings are not part of the Department of Water Resources' (DWR's) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) public outreach process related to any potential Delta Conveyance project and therefore comments made at this meeting will not be tracked or recorded for those purposes. SEC member comments at this meeting will be recorded and tracked, but only for the purposes of the DCA.

2. ROLL CALL/HOUSEKEEPING

Committee members in attendance were Angelica Whaley, Anna Swenson, Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla, Cecille Giacoma, David Gloski, Douglas Hsia, Isabella Gonzalez-Potter, James Cox, Jim Wallace, Karen Mann, Lindsey Liebig, Malissa Tayaba, Dr. Mel Lytle, Mike Hardesty Philip Merlo, Peter Robertson and Sean Wirth. Ex-officio members Gilbert Cosio and Michael Moran were also in attendance. Tribal representative alternate Jesus Tarango also attended.

DCA Board Members in attendance were Director Sarah Palmer (Chair) and Barbara Keegan (Vice Chair) [Editor's Note: Ms. Keegan joined the meeting after the roll call was taken]. In addition, DCA and DWR staff members in attendance were Kathryn Mallon, Valerie Martinez,

Joshua Nelson, Phil Ryan, Graham Bradner, Nazli Parvizi, Claudia Rodriguez, Jasmine Runquist and Carrie Buckman.

Ms. Palmer reviewed meeting guidelines and norms. All meetings are subject to the Brown Act. The chairperson presides over meetings and the vice-chairperson presides over the meeting in her absence. Discussion will be guided by the meeting facilitator, Valerie Martinez. Staff will provide technical information to support the committee's work. Each meeting will be goal-oriented and purpose driven. The information provided is for purposes of discussion only and is subject to change. The committee holds no formal voting authority. We will seek consensus. All views will be listened to, recorded and reported. Participation in the SEC does not imply support for any proposed conveyance project.

Ms. Palmer reviewed housekeeping items. Members of the public can request to speak during the public comment period by emailing claudiarodriguez@dcca.org. Written comments will be added to the record but not read during the meeting. Patience is appreciated, as this is the first teleconference for the SEC. DCA will work to ensure everyone is heard and receives the information needed.

The meeting is being recorded and will be posted on the website following the meeting. Please be mindful of your background, and please mute your microphone and/or stop your video if you need to step away during the meeting. In order to provide organized comments and allow SEC members to speak without talking over one another, SEC members are asked to use the "Raise Hand" feature in order to be recognized to speak during the meeting by Meeting Facilitator Valerie Martinez.

Ms. Palmer said that over the last few weeks, DCA has received comments from some SEC Members about how to proceed. Some have mentioned that they would like to pause SEC efforts until a later date, when the COVID-19 issue is over or relaxed. Others want deeper, more focused discussions now about specifics in the design process.

The DCA values the SEC. The state of California has never seen a process such as this, where we are working together to identify areas where we can find improvements, and even community benefits where possible, that the engineers can integrate into the design upfront. This collaboration sets a new bar for engagement, and the DCA is eager to continue the discussion.

That said, there are details that need attention prior to the committee weighing in on dates and topics for future meetings, including the fact that important infrastructure projects across the state, this one included, are not pausing. Frankly, choices about future committee meetings require a thorough discussion, with all members providing thoughtful input. For these reasons we have agendized this discussion as Item 5. By waiting until after the technical discussion, which is Item 4, we will be able to complete the deep dive into the Southern Complex Facilities, which will round out our system overview, wherein we've taken each of the components and reviewed their siting, construction logistics, and potential future benefits. At that point we can have an informed discussion about the timing, intent and opportunities for future meetings.

Ms. Palmer asked if there was consensus to first discuss the items as ordered on the agenda before discussing Item 5 and then asked Ms. Buckman to address the timing of the CEQA process and the related design.

Ms. Buckman said it was good to see all the committee members and that she hoped all members and their families are staying healthy. The scoping period closed last Friday, April 17, and DWR is working to process all 800 comments received. The next step is to develop the Scoping Summary Report, which will summarize the comments and feedback and provide copies of all the comments received. DWR intends to post the report on their website once it is finished, in about two months.

Ms. Buckman said she would also like to address another issue. Director Nemeth, Secretary Crowfoot and Governor Newsom received a number of letters requesting that planning for Delta Conveyance pause during the COVID-19 crisis. They have indicated it is important to them to continue critical water projects at this time, including Delta Conveyance. However, they also understand the difficulties of public interaction during this sensitive time and that staying healthy is everyone's priority. The public health situation is pushing for greater creativity in public involvement efforts. All methods of reaching the public are likely to be difficult for some people, so DWR is trying to use a broad range of options to reach as many people as possible. It is our hope that these methods will help improve communications and open new avenues for engagement. The next opportunity for formal review and comment as part of CEQA is unlikely to be sooner than 2021 and in the meantime, DWR is open to your public engagement ideas and input is welcome.

Ms. Martinez said that Ms. Palmer had indicated two options: discussing the future SEC meetings now or discussing later. Ms. Palmer was looking for consensus to discuss it later. Mr. Wirth and Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla have asked if we can discuss now instead of later in the agenda.

Ms. Martinez suggested a straw poll to determine how many committee members would like to move Agenda Item 5 for discussion at this time or proceed with the meeting agenda as originally ordered. Ms. Palmer suggested using the teleconference function to indicate "Yes" for continuing with the agenda as-is, or "No" for reordering Item 5 to be discussed first.

Ms. Mallon asked if all SEC microphones could be activated so that members could speak up as desired. She would like to make a few comments to follow-up on what Ms. Buckman said, but the meeting will not proceed until all SEC members have had the opportunity to speak.

Ms. Palmer asked Ms. Mallon to proceed with her comments and then the SEC members could resume discussion about reordering the agenda.

Ms. Mallon said DCA has been directed to continue engineering work and a lot has been done since the last SEC meeting. There is quite a bit to share with SEC members at this and future meetings, depending on how the committee decides to proceed. Regardless of how the SEC chooses to move forward during the sequestering period, DCA would like to continue to operate in a transparent and engaged manner. There are a number of ways in which engineering information can be released to the public for comment, including webcasts, videos on YouTube, live Q & A sessions and monthly board meetings. Presentations are typically given to the SEC first and then presented to the DCA board, but that process can be switched. The SEC is providing a service to the public that is extremely valuable and difficult to duplicate in

other forums. In this more intimate setting, it is possible to capture the exchange between the engineering presentations and the expertise and passion that SEC members have for the Delta. That exchange is made available to the broader community through the videotaped meetings. SEC members ask questions that members of the public likely would also want answered, and members' understanding of broader issues in the Delta help predict what each member's representative groups would be thinking about.

Ms. Mallon said there are only a few short months before DCA will be submitting its final documents to DWR so they can finalize their environmental analysis. That plan isn't changing, and Ms. Mallon said she agrees with the administration that this is an important project to the state. If SEC meetings are delayed, it only means there are less opportunities in this type of forum to capture SEC comments and ensure they are reflected in the documents submitted. The next main opportunity for commenting will be under the CEQA umbrella. During that CEQA comment period, SEC members will have quite a bit of time to conduct outreach to their constituencies, prepare thoughtful, comprehensive, written comments on the Draft EIR document, but there is a clear demarcation between SEC work and the work associated with CEQA.

Ms. Mallon said she did not want to leave SEC members with the impression that DCA is not listening or not responding to concerns expressed by many SEC members. To that point, the second meetings for April and May have been cancelled and DCA switched to a monthly cadence, rather than bi-monthly. Some members have commented that it is difficult to conduct outreach in their own communities. In this case, DCA can carry a much heavier load in supporting the outreach efforts of SEC members. DCA can host meetings, make engineers available and/or review materials that have been presented to date in smaller groups. DCA has just launched a Facebook page to begin broadening the tools used to solicit feedback. There is an opportunity to engage more people than in the past with some of the tools we are currently using. People are able to participate from home, which increases transparency.

Ms. Mallon said it has not escaped her that some of the calls for halts in the SEC meetings have been at meetings utilizing technology to share presentations, solicit public comment and express committee feedback, demonstrating that it can be done. Technological forms of communications were ubiquitous before the pandemic and are even more ubiquitous now. Technology has only accelerated in the current crisis, so it doesn't seem to be a limiting factor in the SEC's ability to communicate. There may not be a time in the near future where people want to assemble in large groups for public meetings and they'd perhaps rather watch and participate from home. However, for some SEC members, the government restrictions created huge personal commitments and stretches that make it difficult to participate, and DCA would like to provide help however is possible to facilitate continued participation. If members need to take a break, there are always meeting videos that can be watched at the SEC member's convenience until they are able to join the group. The hope is for SEC members to continue to give this process an opportunity to demonstrate effectiveness and that members will continue to share their insights with the broader Delta through this forum.

Ms. Martinez announced that the chat function on the video call is not an officially-recognized part of the discussion and asked SEC members who wished to speak to please use the "Raise Hand" function. The chat function poses a difficulty with Brown Act compliance.

Mr. Gloski said from his perspective, the agenda order is fine as-is and he would like to move on to the meeting presentation.

[Editor's Note: the following discussion about how to proceed as an SEC in light of COVID-19 social distancing orders was a topic agendized as Item 5.]

Mr. Wirth said the tours that were supposed to inform SEC members and their outreach, but they were cancelled because of the COVID-19 situation. There are concerns about SEC members being able to conduct sufficient outreach to their stakeholder groups. It is uncomfortable that there are people selected to represent their constituencies, but they are not able to provide the input they need to. For the Governor and other decisionmakers to want this to happen right now given all the limitations placed on people, it doesn't make sense. Many SEC members have worked on the proposed Conveyance project for decades or more; it is not a new project, per se. It is not clear how waiting would create a negative impact.

Ms. Giacoma said technology is not ubiquitous in the Delta. Many people do not have access to the internet, and those that do have difficulties because there is no broadband in the Delta. Holding meetings in person is the only way to reach the stakeholders Ms. Giacoma typically speaks to. It is questionable that the Governor wants DCA to move forward at this time, and a direct order from him is requested. In a recent DPC meeting, we were all represented as being in favor of going forward, and that is not true.

Ms. Martinez asked Ms. Buckman if there are documents that support the sentiment that state projects should move forward.

Ms. Buckman said there are letters from Director Nemeth as the representative of Secretary Crowfoot and Governor Newsom. The letter addresses the Delta Conveyance project. Ms. Mallon has said the future of the SEC is up to the SEC members themselves.

Ms. Martinez asked Ms. Mallon or Ms. Parvizi to address the expectation of SEC members to conduct outreach at this time, given the connectivity limitations Ms. Giacoma mentioned.

Ms. Mallon said some members will be able to conduct outreach more easily than others. DCA now has a Facebook page and there will be a post that links to a comment form for stakeholders to provide feedback. All presentations will be posted. There is an opportunity to get input from a broader group of people. While it's understood that there are restrictions, we either live with the restrictions or SEC meetings are not hosted. Hosting the meetings is the better of two challenging situations.

Ms. Giacoma said the meetings can wait until a time when everyone can participate. Technology is not ubiquitous in the Delta, as many people do not even have a computer or the internet and communicate solely in person or by phone. That is why they come in person to scoping meetings, because they can't go online and aren't on social media.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said she is disappointed in Ms. Mallon's statements at the DCA meeting last week especially after giving comments and painting a picture of what is going on in terms of trying to reach the environmental justice community. You can't throw up a Facebook page and expect the community to engage, especially on a project that is so technically difficult.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said she is not saying that the SEC should just stop; there is a happy medium. DCA has taken in a lot of materials, questions and recommendations from the committee. SEC members have not yet seen how that input has been reflected in DCA's work. There hasn't been a chart developed for each comment that indicates if the input was incorporate, not incorporated, modified, etc. If SEC members are stating that process is fine as-is, they are not talking to more than 8 or 10 people. Some of SEC members' organizations and groups talk to people in the hundreds and thousands right now. There are concerns about reaching those people. While DCA is incorporating feedback and once restrictions start to ease, SEC members could participate in self-guided (rather than bus) tours. Walkie-talkies could be used to communicate while maintaining proper social distancing. The visual visits are critically important to think things through, understand the conditions on the ground and go back to groups SEC members work with to envision the best option. Ms. Mallon said at the DCA Board meeting that comments could be taken any time later. Rather than conducting another meeting in one month, consider holding it in maybe six or eight weeks. After SEC members can participate in tours, DCA should provide them 6-7 weeks to safely conduct small group outreach in light of limited capacities and social distancing orders. SEC members will need to be creative in how to get information to the DCA, which can be done, but additional time will be needed.

Ms. Swenson said she take the responsibility as a SEC member very seriously. Right now, there isn't much outreach that can be conducted via the internet. Continuing as normal means the affluent will access information because of the inequality of no broadband in the Delta. Only the same people will get the information and other groups will be unable to get the information and provide input. The tours were definitely of interest and hopefully SEC members can still participate in them. What is the rush? DCA previously said they wanted to do the best job possible with input from people who will be directly affected. We have to be realistic about how we can engage with people during the COVID-19 situation. Ms. Swenson said she is willing to fully participate once all restrictions are lifted and at a measured rate as restrictions are eased, but right now many people don't have the internet capability to receive documents. Forwarding files from DCA would result in bounced emails because of lack of broadband. If Santa Clara was willing, it could provide internet service which would help kids in the Delta and directly benefit your cause.

Ms. Martinez asked Ms. Buckman to address the timeline for the proposed project.

Ms. Buckman said DWR is moving the schedule forward because they feel the project is important. It's important to know how the SEC wants to proceed in this planning effort.

Ms. Martinez said the next meeting is set for May 27 and the shelter-in-place orders are in force until May 15. However, the Governor has said it will be less like flipping a light switch and more like a dimmer. There are 96 participants in today's meeting, which is an impressive number.

Mr. Wallace said he understands what Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla and Ms. Swenson have said. There are broadband issues in Courtland, too. Is it for certain that this process will move forward whether or not the SEC remains engaged on the schedule that is currently in place? Will the DCA move ahead no matter what?

Ms. Mallon said that is correct.

Mr. Wallace said he doesn't want to be left behind nor does he want his stakeholder groups left behind. If this is the best we can do and it's 50% of great, that is okay and the process should continue.

Ms. Palmer said that there's no reason why some of the tours couldn't be arranged once some of the restrictions have been eased. The tours can be arranged for a later date to ensure the SEC members have an opportunity to participate.

Ms. Mallon said people may not want to take a bus tour, even once restrictions are listed. DCA could film each of the sites for presentation at the upcoming meeting. There are plans to determine the actual boundaries of the proposed project components and provide more detail to SEC members. People are free to drive and tour sites on their own, so there are a lot of things DCA can do. To be clear, if there are deadlines to hit and SEC work is paused, there are fewer SEC meetings to present information.

Ms. Martinez asked Ms. Mallon if there would be other outreach activities conducted if the SEC decides to pause their work.

Ms. Mallon said the same presentations that have been given to the SEC would be provided to the DCA Board. DCA will also work to provide additional YouTube videos. There is a backlog of information right now that DCA would like to get out there, and the SEC is currently used as that forum. There are other methods to get the word out besides the SEC, but the Delta loses in that because they don't have the benefit of the SEC member input into that conversation unless that can be facilitated at the DCA Board meetings.

Ms. Palmer said Mr. Wallace's comments about not wanting to be left behind are valid.

Ms. Mallon said DCA can facilitate mini-groups to help SEC engage their stakeholders, and she is open to any suggestions.

Mr. Merlo said it took him 40 minutes to get his internet strong enough to be able to function on the video conference meeting app through a Verizon Jet Pack since he doesn't have internet at his home on the Mokelumne River near Thornton. While there have been some directives to proceed with the engineering planning for this project, if the SEC is considered as an outreach opportunity for DWR to pursue engagement with people in the Delta and SEC members struggle with internet connectivity, continuing to hold meetings delegitimizes the SEC in the view of the public. When historians look back at this moment, they will consider it as another example of some parts of California treating the Delta as a colonial geography where they will listen to us if they can but they don't have to. The vast majority of people in the Delta will not be able to engage and there is an issue with political economy.

Mr. Moran said Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla's idea of self-guided tours was great and said it would be great to have a document or letter stating the tours were an essential function in the event law enforcement was concerned.

Mr. Hsia said the process should slow down because of the unique situation and he doesn't understand why SEC members are rushing themselves to keep up with the timetable.

Ms. Martinez said a few comments indicate there is a misunderstanding that DCA is controlling the timing of the design process. In fact, DCA is not determining the timetable but rather trying to ensure there is consistent information into the process. What happens if the SEC is meeting or not meeting is that the SEC has input or doesn't have input. Pausing the SEC will not pause the design process.

Ms. Mallon said input opportunities will still be provided at the DCA Board meetings if the SEC chooses not to continue meeting. There are also other avenues available and that are being utilized by lots of public organizations who are continuing to seek public comment. DCA's due date will not move. The question is whether or not the SEC will be used for engagement in addition to other tools such as the Facebook page or if DCA moves exclusively to other forums. It is up to SEC members how they want to continue, and Ms. Mallon said she can understand the situation and is fine with whatever the committee members decide.

Ms. Buckman said one of the results of the pandemic is awareness of the vulnerability of systems and how it is necessary to be prepared to address emergencies in any form. This is one of the reasons the state wants to take the appropriate steps to protect its water supplies and responsibly engage in efforts now instead of later. The underlying reasons for studying this project is the threat of sea level rise, climate change, and storms that will not pause for a pandemic. DWR is planning to forge ahead and would like to do so collaboratively in order to protect those resources.

Mr. Robertson said it is necessary to change how outreach is conducted because it is not possible right now to address large groups. If DCA can provide speakers to small meetings, how quickly can a speaker task force be assembled? What will their availability be? Can they have materials available in both electronic and printed format? A lot of the facilities used up until six weeks ago have now been locked down. It is difficult to find a space where you can have even a small group of people. Even when restrictions are lifted, people will be gun shy about getting together.

Ms. Mallon said there are team members who are local but there are also team members who work remotely. SEC members have 100% support from the DCA in order to address stakeholder groups so long as it can be done so safely and legally. Whatever members need, please let us know. DCA can host RingCentral calls, provide small-group presentations to spread-out audiences, or whatever else is legal under country rules.

Mr. Wirth asked what the deadline is that was mentioned earlier. In regards to Ms. Buckman's comment about addressing water issues during the pandemic, the proposed project is only one potential solution to those problems, and we aren't looking at any of the other potential solutions.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked when is the DCA's deadline. To Mr. Wallace's earlier comment, 50% is not good enough for the second largest and most expensive infrastructure project in California. Delta stakeholders have fought for years to be included in the process, and SEC members want to bring the community together to answer questions related to the project.

SEC members are not looking at a slow down without providing input, but there is a need for follow-through. The videos suggested are not the same as visiting the sites and being able to talk to a representative. If it takes eight weeks longer to do it right through the SEC, let's do it right.

Ms. Mallon said it appears this meeting is working right now and we should continue meeting to have as many SEC meetings as we can and then we will figure out how to do this tour. Perhaps SEC members drive their own cars and have headsets where they can hear from a staff member. There are lots of ways we can try to tackle this as long as we are complying with all county and state regulations.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said SEC members just need time to do social distancing meetings after that point. Also, participation on the calls is likely less than it appears because some people call in and use their computers, too.

Ms. Martinez said it sounds like SEC members are not saying they don't want to do outreach but are asking how it can be done and how we can find creative ways to address the challenges efficiently, effectively and within an appropriate timeline. It doesn't sound like anyone is overtly saying to stop or pause the SEC, but are rather asking to engage DCA's toolkit of tactics to engage stakeholders in a different way. To summarize, DCA should look for new and innovative ways to push information out and receive input. DCA staff may want to connect with Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla on some of those tactics and to identify pockets of stakeholders for engagement using those methods. The SEC wants to continue and to provide input into the process. Is that correct?

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said she is 100% with it and that a rush to meet a deadline is just going to add more time onto the back end. Also, SEC members would really like to see how and where their feedback is being incorporated.

Ms. Martinez said there are some elements on today's presentation that address feedback received from the SEC members. It seems the discussion has come full circle and that everyone understands there's a need for stakeholder engagement discussions in a meaningful way, which this committee has been able to do. The SEC members would like to move forward with the DCA, ensuring their input is heard, but a greater level of creativity is needed in how information is shared and feedback is received. There is now a Facebook page and there may be webcasts and/or a speaker's bureau in the future.

Mr. Gloski said it looks like the deadline will not change. Ms. Mallon has made it clear there are deadlines and targets to hit and the process is moving forward. As a Delta resident, he'd like to have as much input into the project as possible. The DCA process is really good. Maybe it needs to evolve. Mr. Gloski said he has a Facebook page that he uses to disseminate information and share his opinion, and he is able to reach yacht clubs. Some of the participants on the call are there because of agenda items that are very important to them. They are texting to ask when the meeting will discuss the items they are on the call to hear about. The SEC should move forward, and this meeting is an example of using technology to get more participation from Delta residents that need to have their words heard.

Ms. Martinez said this was a nice way to end the conversation. DCA will contact SEC members to find new and creative ways to assist with outreach given the dynamic.

Ms. Mann said the actual dates of the deadlines have not been shared. How has SEC member input been enacted or considered? Perhaps there is a way DCA can help; if the Governor says the SEC can continue working, he should open up small businesses for work again.

Ms. Palmer said the discussion covered Agenda Item 5.

Ms. Palmer asked if there was any public comment for this item.

Deirdre Des Jardins, California Water Research, is concerned about the engineering schedule. Comments were submitted in June of 2019 expressing concern that DWR seemed to be keeping their original schedule for WaterFix to complete the design in three years. It is not enough time to consider new design information or to incorporate community feedback.

Ms. Martinez asked Ms. Mallon to address topics for future discussion.

Ms. Mallon said the Southern Facilities will be discussed today. The first substantive feedback was provided at the last meeting, when SEC members provided feedback about where to place components. There has been feedback about the location of the intakes, and DCA has shared its opinion that the intake locations are driven by regulatory requirements. Based on the comments from a couple SEC members, the DCA team will go back through all of the comments received to see which should be added to the next meeting presentation. At tonight's meeting there will be an opportunity to provide comments on the information received at the last meeting. At the next meeting, information will be presented on traffic modeling, air quality mapping and the final site boundaries, which will be a good companion to the driving tours. The June and July meetings were going to be based on going back through all the comments to ensure they've been captured. We will also go through all of the major facilities and cover the major impacts, then at the following meetings, all other issues recorded in the database will be addressed. There isn't a more specific agenda than that for the June and July meetings.

Ms. Martinez said if SEC members have some major engineering and design concerns, please email the DCA team so that information can hopefully be addressed as part of future meeting discussions.

Ms. Mallon said the team is able to answer most questions, but those requiring geotechnical data are causing a bit of a delay because that data is not available yet. Today's presentation will demonstrate the starting of the process of incorporating feedback.

3. MINUTES REVIEW: March 11, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting

Ms. Palmer asked if there were any comments on the minutes, which were distributed to members. Any changes can be reported to Jasmine Runquist. No objections or changes were reported, but Ms. Martinez noted that Mr. Tarango would be providing some revisions separately. Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla provided written comments at last meeting that will be provided for this meeting's minutes.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS

[Editor's Note: Item 4 is a single discussion item. Subparts are listed for clarity.]

a. SEC Questions on March 11th Presentation

Ms. Mallon said the last meeting reviewed all proposed sites along each corridor as well as the proposed routes to reach those sites. The comments provided during the meeting were captured, logged and provided to members in the SEC tracking package. If there are more comments on that meeting, they can be discussed at this time.

Substantial comments were received from Jan McCleary, a contact of Ms. Mann. DCA will be entering those questions into the database, following up with Ms. McCleary on the responses and sharing the responses to the SEC. Please limit comments to content of March meeting.

Mr. Gloski asked to discuss the proposed Bouldin Island Barge Landing.

Ms. Mallon indicated the topic would be addressed as part of this meeting's presentation.

b. DCA Response to Key SEC Siting Comments from March 11th Meeting

Ms. Mallon said tonight's presentation will review six of the ways the SEC feedback has been incorporated. These are not the only comments that DCA is responding to, but these are the topics that are best graphically presented rather than addressed in writing.

There was discussion at the last meeting about what would be left behind the Glanville Tract Launch Shaft Site. This is a major site and the DCA has provided some food for thought by showing the proposed utilization of the entire tract. The site was selected because of its proximity to a rail spur. Utilizing rail will enable the reduction of truck traffic on I-5 for tunnel liner segment delivery and also the delivery of RTM around the Delta. The launch shaft itself is depicted on the other side of I-5. The DCA team had the idea of a conveyor to link the production of material from the launch site over to Glanville site for sampling, processing, drying and storage. A lot of the material will be transported to the South Delta to build up the Southern Forebay embankments. As far as what is left behind, the launch shaft will stay as a DWR access point, and access roads to that shaft are shown on the slide. The land used for the RTM will have been disturbed during construction. DCA has received feedback from agricultural community that compaction and construction activities may remove the land from productive agricultural use. DCA welcomes advice from SEC members about what could be a desired leave-behind. For this site, SEC members expressed the opinion that leaving a rail spur behind would not provide a benefit to Delta industries. However, there is a significant need for Reclamation Districts (RD) to have RTM for levee work. This could be a site where RD's pick up borrow material, and only a portion of the initial overall site would be needed. The Port of Stockton runs a similar facility in the South Delta. SEC members can begin thinking about the leave-behinds at some of the affected sites and comments are welcome.

Mr. Gloski asked if there was any gateway to the Delta on the I-5, like a visitor's center. That is an idea of what could be done there.

Ms. Mann said Ken Shiedigger is trying to put a visitor center together at the corner of Hwy. 160 and Hwy. 12. Will the affected property owners get an easement or reimbursement for the land taken for construction and operations?

Ms. Mallon said the land would have to be purchased as part of the project and there are processes in place for that.

Ms. Mann asked if that has already started, and Ms. Mallon said that is a way down the road.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said it would be great if there were smaller, satellite centers that could work in conjunction with the centers Mr. Shiedigger is planning. With many entry points to the Delta, there should be many points of access for visiting the Delta. Land cannot be returned to productive agricultural use, and that has to be accounted for in regards to lost revenue and property taxes to the county's tax base. As much of the land as possible should be turned back into habitat that is compatible with the natural Delta. Opportunities for biking and trails with that type of restoration would be a good feature to have at a visitor's center.

Mr. Hsia said only intakes 2, 3 and 5 are shown. What happened to intakes 1 and 4? Ms. Mallon said that the intake locations included in the NOP were intakes 2, 3 and 5. Intakes 1 and 4 from the previous analysis were not included in the NOP, and DCA is working off of the NOP boundary conditions.

Mr. Hsia said the entry point for the Delta should be Freeport at the Cosumnes.

Dr. Lytle asked if DCA has been able to determine flood control risk for the proposed site along Twin Cities Rd. and to the west of I-5. In the flood of 1986, the I-5 flooded at that location.

Ms. Mallon noted the ring levee depicted on the slide that is incorporated into the conceptual plans.

Ms. Swenson said there should be collaboration with the Delta Protection Commission to ensure any visitor center plan isn't a duplicated effort.

Ms. Mallon said there was a lot of feedback at the last meeting about the use of Hood Franklin Road. According to the NOP, two intake facilities are proposed; either Intakes 2 and 3 or Intakes 3 and 5. The DCA team has refined the proposed truck routes to the intakes, depending on which two intake locations are selected. For Intakes 2 and 3, Hood-Franklin Road would be used and a new north/south haul road would be constructed between the intakes. For Intakes 3 and 5, Lambert Road would be used and a new north/south haul road would be constructed between the intakes. The presentation slide shows these routes overlaid on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge so SEC members can see both at the same time. The various types of land in the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge are color-coded based on the information available on their website.

Mr. Wirth said he spoke to the Friends of Stone Lakes and the Stone Lakes managers. The north/south roads are very environmentally damaging for the refuge. There are birds foraging on both sides of the entire length of that haul road. These roads would dramatically affect the ecosystem services of that preserve for listed species. The Hood-Franklin Road usage is not great but there is already an existing road. Having a dirt tract with lots of use inside the preserve is very damaging. It is already a very constrained refuge with other existing issues, and it would not be good to impact it any further.

Ms. Mallon asked if the haul routes proposed just outside the boundary are problematic, and Mr. Wirth confirmed.

Ms. Mallon asked if there is another route that could be taken to the intake sites that would be less impactful. Mr. Wirth said he doesn't, but there needs to be a way to address a rather extraordinary impact on a unique Delta preserve ecosystem.

Ms. Mallon said if the proposed haul routes are not used, that traffic would instead be on Hwy. 160. Mr. Wirth said the situation is that either the local residents are affected, or the wildlife species are affected. Ms. Mallon suggested splitting the traffic to reduce the effects on both sides. Mr. Wirth said anything to reduce the length of the roads would help, and splitting it would be better than nothing.

Ms. Mallon reviewed the factors driving the siting of the proposed Bouldin Island Barge Landing. The presentation slide shows the proposed Bouldin Island Launch shaft site and barge landing overlaid with a color-coded map showing proposed uses for the site that were presented at a Metropolitan Water District (MWD) Board meeting. MWD owns the site, and what is depicted was their potential plan for the island as part of WaterFix. The reason the barge landing was placed off of the San Joaquin River is because the area along the southwestern tip of the island was considered prime habitat area and is a really great site for habitat mitigation as part of the program. The proposed barge landing was shifted inland to ensure that land was still available for that purpose.

Ms. Buckman reminded SEC members that none of the planning is finalized at this stage of the project, but DWR did consider the idea of using this land for tidal marsh habitat to mitigate effects elsewhere. Based on fish presence, the proposed tidal marsh habitat restoration couldn't be moved to another part of the island.

Mr. Gloski said it seems insane to destroy a very natural habitat and wildlife-rich area to do a habitat restoration mitigation project. A career barge operator on the San Joaquin said it isn't logical to go into the winding waterways of Little Potato Slough depending on the size of barges. Barges should be out on deeper water on the San Joaquin. Perhaps the Tidal Marsh area should be across the southern end of the island so that an avenue for barge landing access could be out on the main river. There has to be a way to move this around to make it work. Could the shaft be moved to the west a bit to make it closer to a barge on that side?

Ms. Mallon said it is not based on where the shaft is. The barge landing was placed as close to the San Joaquin as possible while avoiding the land marked as potentially viable for a Tidal

Marsh restoration area. The purpose was to show why that barge landing location was selected, but DCA will take Mr. Gloski's comments under advisement.

Mr. Gloski said it may be a good idea to add this area to a tour so that there is a clearer understanding of what is out there.

Ms. Swenson asked for an explanation for some of the terms used in the map legends, including "Regenerative Ag" on the Bouldin Island slide and the terms used on the intakes slide.

Ms. Mallon said the Stones Lake legend was taken from their website and Osha Meserve could probably be helpful in understanding the various land use terms Stone Lakes used. The purpose of the Bouldin Island map was to discuss the potential Tidal Marsh area. The rest of the areas on the island will be subject to change based on the final shaft location.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said there is a lot of subsidence on Bouldin Island and there's a lot of weight in the launch shaft area. There will need to be more details about flooding and how the land will hold up as the project planning progresses.

Ms. Mann said the waterway of the proposed barge landing is known as Little Potato Slough and it has been used for anchorage, fishing and other water sports by Delta families for several decades, so there will be a lot of very angry people. What happens on the landside of the barge landing?

Ms. Mallon said the purpose of the barge landing is to reduce the segment liner delivery truck traffic on Hwy. 12. On the land side there would be a crane that reaches over to extract the liners from the barge and put them onto trucks that would drive it to the launch shaft site where it will be stored and then shifted into the tunnel as the tunnel progresses.

Ms. Mann asked if a noise factor would be involved. Ms. Mallon said there will be noise from the barge and from the crane. Ms. Mann said noise is amplified on water. The residents of Korth's Pirate Lair Mobile Home Park would be subject to that noise. There are also homes along the San Joaquin river that will be affected by the noise. The area is referred to as The Bedrooms by recreational boaters and is used as anchorage by boaters who don't want to harm the environment. There is concern also about trucks driving on the levees.

Ms. Mallon said that the crane will be stationed on one side of the levee and the barge landing will be on the other, so the crane will be reaching over the levee. Traffic will not be on the levee itself. The liners will be barged in along the San Joaquin, the barge will pull up to the landing, and the cranes and lifting materials on the island will lift the liners up from the barge, over the levee, and onto the island.

Ms. Mann asked if the barge would stay there until another barge comes and picks it up.

Ms. Mallon said the number of barge trips will be presented in next month's presentation. That information is also in a meeting packet that was previously provided to SEC members. It is about 2 or 3 barge trips per week.

Ms. Mann asked if this site is only for the Central Corridor option and Ms. Mallon confirmed. Ms. Mann said the Central Corridor option should be scrapped. It is too close to recreational areas and DCA will make a lot of enemies. Ms. Mallon said the comment is noted and all of these factors will be considered as part of DWR's environmental analysis.

Ms. Giacomina asked when the biological surveys be completed for Bouldin Island and where will the burrow fill for the tunnel shaft be acquired. Ms. Mallon said material from the Glanville site would be transported here to help build the first pads that are needed.

Ms. Giacomina asked if team is aware that Bouldin Island is -17 feet elevation. Ms. Mallon said the team is aware. The elevation poses an immense challenge from an engineering perspective.

Ms. Giacomina said the levees on the south side are very fragile.

Mr. Cosio said the DCA might want to check on the volume of material that will be needed to raise the ground to reach the Tidal Marsh elevation. Likely several million yards of material will be needed. If seven million yards is needed for the forebay, there may not be enough material.

Ms. Mallon said Bouldin Island would be a launch shaft site heading to the south and Glanville Launch Shaft will be tunneling toward Bouldin Island. Both sites will be producing substantial amounts of RTM. Mr. Cosio said if 11 million yards of RTM are generated but 7 million yards is needed just for Bouldin Island, that doesn't leave enough material for the forebay levees.

Mr. Gloski asked if where the RTM would be going that is generated by the Bouldin Island Launch Shaft. Ms. Mallon said the DCA team is still working on the RTM balance and hopes to have an answer by the next meeting when the final footprint has been developed.

Mr. Gloski asked if the plan was to use it on the island to raise it up. Ms. Mallon said that was the plan. DCA is aware that more RTM material will be needed for the forebay to build the embankments because there won't be enough material from that tunnel drive heading north. DCA thinks it will be easier to swing material by rail from the Glanville Tract than to transport it by barge from the Bouldin Island site. The question then becomes what to do with any excess RTM generated at the Bouldin Island site. One of the ideas is that this site becomes a stockpile site for Reclamation Districts to take that material during construction, depending on how the numbers end up. It may have sunk during that time because that area has very soft soils. These are some of the issues that the engineers are still working through.

Mr. Gloski said he thinks that would be a great location because it is central, but that would also mean that the barge landing is used for more than just the tunnel segments. Ms. Mallon said if this became a stockpile site utilized by Reclamation Districts, they would likely use trucks on Hwy. 12 and the barge landing would be eliminated unless there was some reason why the community thought this was a good place for a permanent facility for people who use this area during boating. These are one of the things to think about in terms of what gets left behind on all these sites.

Ms. Mallon presented a slide addressing the comments from last meeting about bridges being raised for the barges. For the Central Alignment, the proposed Bouldin Island Barge Landing is shown, and for the Eastern Alignment, there is a proposed barge landing at the Lower Roberts Tract. The three areas where DCA could conceivably be purchasing the concrete liners from are the East Bay Area, Port of Stockton and Port of West Sacramento. Those three areas have existing concrete batch plants that could facilitate the kind of volume needed. Deliveries can reach both landings without any bridges needing to be raised if the liners come from East Bay or Port of Stockton. If the liner segments contract was awarded to a firm near the Port of West Sacramento, the Rio Vista Bridge and 3-Mile Slough Bridge would need to be raised for barges to and from Bouldin Island. It's possible the 3-Mile Slough Bridge could be avoided by going around Sherman Island.

Ms. Giacomina asked how exactly barges would go around Sherman Island. Ms. Mallon asked for input from the SEC.

Ms. Swenson have asked how many Reclamation Districts have signed up to take the RTM. Ms. Mallon said the point in the process where that feedback would be solicited has not yet occurred. The DCA engineers who work with a lot of Reclamation Districts say the RTM would be perfectly usable for the types of burrow materials that these RD's would use.

Ms. Cosio said RD's don't yet know how much material will be available. Both ports do dredging and stockpile material, but it is challenging for RD's to transport the materials in a cost-effective manner. The key will be how much it costs to transport the material to where it is needed. Twenty or 30 years from now, levee work may be completed. The demand is unknown and so is the distance required to transport the material.

Ms. Swenson said perhaps the RTM could be provided to RD's for free. Ms. Mallon said offering it for free is the intention. The issue isn't the cost of the material, but the cost and logistics of transporting it. It is DCA's understanding that RD's pick up material from the Port of Stockton and transport it to where it is needed.

Mr. Cox said going around Sherman Island would require crossing Sherman Lake, which is very shallow. Dredging would be required if barges went through on a regular basis.

Mr. Moran said going down the Sacramento River through 3-Mile Slough would mean going right by Brannan State Recreation Area which is a choke point for a lot of motorized and non-motorized recreation traffic. There would also be people on the beaches at 7-Mile Slough. Beyond that point is Sherman Lake State Wildlife Area. It seems like the next feasible area would be Broad Slough. Do any other members have any ideas about that?

Mr. Robertson said one of the issues is that the specs on the barges are unknown as far as length, width and spin.

Ms. Mallon said this information could be included in next month's presentation when the final transportation plans are reviewed.

Ms. Giacomina said the ITR stated the RTM was not reusable. Also, the barge depth will need to be compared to the channel depth if you intend to go around Sherman Island.

Ms. Martinez asked Ms. Mallon to clarify some of the confusion regarding the ITR.

Ms. Mallon said the ITR team did not have the documents containing the analysis of RTM from the previous report and its usability. The ITR commented on their experience on other projects in regards to the feasibility of material being used. It was not in their scope to comment on RTM, but the team expressed their experience from other projects. There will be additional work done to demonstrate that the RTM can be used. DCA engineers are confident that the material is appropriate to use for the forebay with proper drying.

Ms. Martinez noted that this information would be added to the Q & A tracking log to ensure it is clarified for SEC members.

Mr. Cox said there are barges that go through Broad Slough but it is uncertain what their drafts are. There isn't an actual channel there, but it is possible to go through there. However, it adds a lot of distance onto the route.

Mr. Moran said to keep in mind the drought barrier that is going in at False River and how that changes the flows and tidal actions coming down from 3-Mile Slough pretty dramatically. It's unknown when it will actually go in, but it is something to keep in consideration.

Mr. Mallon said there was a lot of feedback from the last meeting about where the maintenance shaft had been sited on Staten Island. This is a smaller site and where the tunnel could be accessed for routine maintenance on the TBM. Unlike Glanville, there would be no RTM produced at this site. The original proposed location was on a narrower part of the island. Mr. Wirth pointed out that it would be much better to locate it in a wider area of the island. Based on this feedback, the shaft was moved further north and placed it right along the road to keep the impact closer to the road.

Mr. Wirth said the benefit of this location is that it is located close to a house that has power lines. It would be the least evil place to put it on the island in terms of impacts to cranes.

Ms. Mallon said this site would only be used as part of the Central Alignment, not the Eastern Alignment.

Ms. Mallon said there was a lot of conversation around the impact to recreational facilities. The recreational map provided to SEC members earlier was overlaid with the systemwide maps that were presented at the last meeting. Circles are used to highlight the names of all the proposed facilities in both alignment options. By overlaying with the transportation routes, members can begin to see the impacts that could result from construction, traffic, noise or aesthetics. There is no information on those impacts yet, the purpose was just to present the information in an integrated way. If any SEC member would like a full-size print of the map or an 11x17 print, please email Jasmine Runquist and DCA will print and mail a copy to you. DCA is glad to produce any maps for SEC members.

Ms. Palmer said this map would be good to add to the big book of maps. Ms. Mallon said a recreation map was provided to SEC members earlier and was later supplemented with additional recreational sites, but this is the first map that shows that information layered with the proposed facility sites. It is presented at this meeting to start the conversation since recreational facilities are a topic brought up frequently in SEC meetings.

Ms. Mann said there are a couple of areas that she provided to the DCA staff that would be affected by the Central Route, but those don't appear to be reflected on the map.

Ms. Mallon said Karen Askeland updated the map with the information provided by Ms. Mann. Ms. Mann said the Mildred Anchorage Area is not noted and neither is Byron Elementary School. Ms. Mallon said schools are not shown on this particular map.

Ms. Mann said the only way in and out of Discovery Bay is on the river that this goes right under, and that is an issue. Ms. Mallon said for next meeting, the map for each site will be enlarged so it will be easier to see some of the areas that may not be showing up on this map. SEC members can send any comments about this map to Ms. Runquist. Feel free to copy Ms. Askeland and she will ensure that the map includes those comments. The map showing schools is called Sensitive Receptors and the team can overlay it with the systemwide map for Ms. Mann. Ms. Mann said she also emailed Ms. Mallon about the water treatment plant and sewage plant that serve the residents of Discovery Bay and Byron. The maintenance shaft looks very close to those facilities. That is the only drinking water for as many as 20,000 people.

Ms. Martinez said there were previously several comments about how SEC member comments are being addressed in the design, and hopefully this presentation began to address some of that. It may be time to start addressing the SEC member feedback in writing, perhaps by using a matrix as Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla suggested.

c. Southern Complex Facilities Discussion

Ms. Mallon said all the sites have been discussed and things were taken out of sequence for the March meeting in response to feedback from the SEC. The presentation was done on the overall site layout for the entire alignment, but not a deep dive into the Southern Complex. A reminder that in the next meeting in May, the maps for the facilities will be discussed.

Mr. Ryan said a lot of time the last few months have been spent on intakes, tunnels, siting, and shafts, but have yet to do a deep dive into the Southern end where the two corridors would come together. The water that had been diverted would be lifted out of the tunnel system and delivered into the State Water Project facilities. This presentation is all about those facilities: The Southern Complex.

This is a basic schematic where the flow comes in from the tunnel at the upper right part of the page, it goes through the final shaft which is the shaft that would be used to drive the tunnel to the north. It then flows into the pump station where it is lifted into the Forebay. The Forebay would have an outlet structure that also uses the tunnel shafts to take the water underneath Byron Highway, up the other side through the retrieval shafts. Then there

is a Flow Control Structure, that manages the flow coming out of the Forebay through the tunnels and then into the canal. Since we will be co-delivering into this canal from Clifton Court Forebay, a flow control structure is also needed in the existing canal just upstream on the Clifton Court Forebay side, where we would connect in. This is a 36-ft diameter tunnel. The pump station capacity is a 6,000 cfs for the proposed project. The Southern Forebay would store up to 9,000 cfs. That size is a 12-hour buffer capacity, which is 12 hours of normal peak pumping capacity of the Banks facility. The Banks facility is capable of pumping almost 11,000 cfs but they do not do that on a regular basis, its more typical maximum flow is around 9,000. That 9,000 cfs is approximately 9,000-acre feet, which is the operating volume and about 12 ½ feet of operating level which turns into a 750-acre water surface forebay. Coming out of the forebay, there are two roughly 40-ft diameter tunnels. The reason these are larger and there are two is because it must deliver 11,000 cfs, since that is the bank's flow capacity. These are pretty short tunnels.

Mr. Ryan introduced how the forebay was sited. We looked everywhere we could to site a facility in the vicinity of the delivery points, which is the California Aqueduct. We even looked at opportunities to split the reservoir into a couple pieces to make sure we checked out all the land areas. As you can see in the slides, sites 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 were eliminated. They were either too small for what we needed to do, they had other environmental side effects, poor access, or poor compatibility. That resulted in two alternatives that we compared in additional detail. As you can see from the comparison, Alternative 2 came out better for the operational compatibility, since it is very close to the canal. It also came out better for land use, existing infrastructure, geotechnical conditions, and one of the big drivers, is the logistics. This forebay would also be where the tunnel drive would have to be and the ability to get to Union Island requires massive bridges. It is difficult to get any type of rail service or trucks onto that site, therefore Alt 2 was selected.

Mr. Ryan said he would be diving into the various parts of the facilities. It's divided up into three pieces on this graphic. The northern part is the pumping plant area, which is site A. Site B is the forebay area and Site C is the area across Byron Highway where the flow control structures are. Sites A and B together are almost 2,000 acres of constructed area. The 750-acre forebay is just the water surface. That's not even considering the size of embankments and other facilities. The final site is about 1,275 acres and the tunnels are about 8,000 ft long each. They end in Site C, which is 180 acres, with the final area at 120 acres.

Starting with area A, you can see the pumping plant and the two alignments are shown in blue. You don't really see the tunnel shaft here yet. We will take some of the topsoil and stockpile it up there at the top end. Some of the RTM that ends up leftover, we may end up with excess that we will stockpile in that area. Typical things that you would see for supporting work like this is the segment storage for tunneling, concrete batch plants, contractor laydown area for the pumping plant and the tunnel contractor. There will be offices and such in these areas. The two big red lines are rail access to help minimize truck traffic. The segments would be brought in by rail and so would the aggregate for the batch plant. The rail must have these long, straight lengths we can progressively unload the cars as they get dropped there, either the rail takes them back or refills them.

Mr. Ryan introduced the site of the pump station with a graphical rendering of what it might look like. It has some support features, including an electrical building at the back. The arrow

is pointing to those blue objects which are air conditioning units for the electrical heater. The electric substation is in the back which will feed the electric motors that run the pumps. There is an office building, and equipment storage and shops. The big, light grey object with the crane over it is the tunnel shaft that we use to transfer the water into the pump station, and also to be able to flow out into the forebay area.

This is the same rendering from an angle. You can see the crane at the upper right. The tunnel shaft is at the very right. Water would flow out of that tunnel shaft through the rectangular opening, into the wet well of the pump station. Water would flood into the bottom of that wet well. You can see the pump columns with the inlet bells down at the bottom, they hang inside a cylindrical well, which is similar to an agricultural well. The water would flow down that well, then up through the bell. On left you can see where it would come up through the pump and out behind the level control well. This is to control the head on the pumps that make the pumps function properly. That would mostly be submerged and then flow into the Southern Forebay, where you can see the arrows.

If you look inside the pump station, you can see the motors, which are the brownish things behind the columns. In the far back, towards the roof, you can see the crane that goes across. The concept is that vehicles can drive through the garage door, a tractor trailer rig could fit in there because it's pretty large. The crane could pick up the motor or pump components and set them on a tractor trailer rig set right in there for movement off, for whatever reason, maintenance or repair.

The substation is in the back, the electrical building behind the room, and the enclosure around the air conditioning units. In order to be able to isolate the pump station from the tunnel system for maintenance and safety of workers, there would be a large gate that would be slid down into those slots just on the left of the gantry crane. This crane would also be used to lower a temporary pump if we ever had to dewater the tunnel. A large pump would be lowered into the tunnel with the crane and the water would be pumped out into the forebay.

Mr. Ryan said the areas in green are permanent facility boundaries and the areas in yellow are construction boundaries. It gets a little complicated, there are some areas circled in yellow that we aren't touching at all, so there are yellow circles inside the yellow. That's primarily because they're underneath a large power corridor.

Mr. Ryan presented a more detailed version of the worksite for the forebay itself. The embankment is shown with the black line for simplicity. The concept here is that RTM will be coming out of the tunnel in the area up north, RTM Treatment, for drying and processing. Then, there is a stockpile in the middle that is also going to be RTM brought from Twin Cities Glanville shaft on the railroad. You can see another railroad segment here to deliver that RTM into the floor of the reservoir for use to construct the embankments. There is also the RTM Treatment area for the southern tunnels at the bottom. He said later he will go through a quick construction sequence.

There is a lot of peat in the upper horizons in this area that needs to be removed under the embankment areas. It would be removed and stockpiled at a peat storage area covered so it doesn't do greenhouse gas. You can also see the segment storage for the southern tunnels.

There is a little work area just to the south, where the outlet is on the reservoir by the bottom end for the contractor down there. There is a contractor area to the west of the main reservoir area, that is for the reservoir contractor. We're showing a heliport site here and a first responder site. We know we need to have this on site to support tunnel drives, they must be very close. We discussed with you that some of this might be enhanced first responder facilities in the area that can be shared with the community.

Mr. Ryan said that Mr. Bradner will be covering the forebay embankments.

Mr. Bradner said the first slide will show how the top of the embankment and the spillway level were established. We will also look from an external side. Beginning on the internal side, there is a typical foundation elevation of -8 ft and +2 ft. There is a maximum normal operating water surface elevation of 17.5 ft. Referencing back to what Mr. Ryan was explaining, that is the top of that normal operating band. Above that water surface, there is 3.5 ft for wind and wave runoff, which is a broad reservoir. There could be wind there, we could push waves, so we want to ensure there is enough height above the water embankment, so waves don't splash out of the spillway. There is also the freeboard, which is essentially the same purpose, to provide the extra embankment height.

The spillway invert is the height that water would be able to flow over the spillway and the spillway ties directly into Italian Slough, just north of Clifton Court, and very close to the confluence. The spillway would only be for emergency situations where there's some sort of inflow into the reservoir, water levels are climbing and we must have a way for the water to be able to flow out to the natural water body, Italian Slough. That elevation is 21 ft and then we used a water surface with maximum spill height of 2.5 ft above the spillway invert. That is the maximum height the water would be spilling over the spillway. That's how the width of the spillway was set, by establishing that height. In that type of condition, if we were to have a spill with very high levels in the reservoir, we'd have to bring in the wind and wave runoff to make sure there is enough embankment height to contain all the water that could splash against the side of the embankment.

The top of the embankment has what is called residual freeboard, which is a California Division of Safety of Dams requirement to have a 1.5 ft minimum above the maximum water level elevation. All of that adds up to a top elevation of 28 ft.

Mr. Bradner presented a 200-year flood elevation that includes sea level rise and climate change for year 2100, which is a water surface of elevation 20.8 ft, provided by DWR. Added to that is a freeboard height, which mainly comes from Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations, which dictates freeboard requirements for big bypasses and flood control systems. There is a maximum of 6 ft of freeboard, still exceeding that elevation.

Ms. Mann said a major concern regarding emergency medical assistance is that eastern Contra Costa County was reduced from nine fire stations down to one. It is located on Bixler Road. There is no longer a fire station on Bethel Island or in Byron, which is where this is pretty much at. As it is, there is only one engine unit to support all the homes that have been built out on Discovery Bay and Byron area. She said she wanted to make sure this was known.

Mr. Ryan said they were aware of the limitations and that's one of the things they were hoping to help supplement the community with a facility they would use.

Ms. Mann said they wouldn't have to supplement, they would need to put in a whole new station and the workers. If an emergency happened in the tunnel in that area, that would be the focus and that leaves about 20,000 homes and businesses that are unprotected. That is a real problem. The next station would be Brentwood, which is about eight or nine miles away and that is unacceptable.

Ms. Mann asked if the water goes over the freeboard and into the river, would the water level then increase and be dispersed to the north and the south?

Mr. Bradner responded yes it would be absorbed into the river system. There is still hydraulic modeling that needs to be done to evaluate the impacts of that, but yes, it's connecting to the broader water.

Ms. Mann asked if this occasion hypothetically would happen more towards the wintertime, summertime, or spring? The reason is because many, maybe 4,000 homes are actually waterfront sites and when the dams were released about 10 years ago, they all experienced incredible flooding in their homes. So, is this something they will need to be aware of for their own personal homes and businesses?

Mr. Bradner said the reservoir, which would be a California State regulated facility, would have natural water shed. A couple of different conditions were looked at to try to identify what the critical condition would be for siting. Most reservoirs in a natural water shed, there is water flowing in through the rivers and it has to be sized for precipitation. In this case, it is a fully contained system. It would take an event like the ones discussed, power outages, gate malfunctions, which have a very unlikely chance of occurring, but need to be considered when sizing the spillway. Flooding would be a very unlikely event. It would be very rare, but we could follow up more with additional details.

Ms. Mann said currently we are living through a very unlikely event. The odds of this flooding our properties are becoming more likely.

Mr. Ryan said another perspective is that the maximum flow that could ever spill out is 6,000 cfs, which compared to the flows of the old river, is maybe 1/20th of the maximum flows in there. There will be many levels of safeguards to prevent this from ever happening. It is an unlikely event, but if it were to occur, we don't want the reservoir to fill up and spill out over the embankment which would erode it and potentially cause it to fail. This is a place in the highly unlikely event to allow it to spill without destroying the facility. The embankment going out would be a bigger deal to worry about than water spilling over the spillway.

Mr. Gloski said he's glad to see Italian Slough will be utilized. He said at the last meeting that he would like to promote this as a dual benefit facility. With the issues going on with algae and health with the water down in the south Delta, there is a benefit to be able to take some of this water and flush it back into the Delta during times when there are problems. Have you thought about other plumbing? There might be other options than over a spillway.

Could there be a flow control device needed on one of the forebays into Italian Slough? He asked Carrie if there are plans to look at this as part of the CEQA process.

Ms. Buckman said they are not quite there yet. When it was discussed, they were considering it as a mitigation measure, but they haven't reached the point where the types of mitigation measures necessary have been identified. That would be further down the road. It could be brainstormed with Mr. Bradner but we haven't reached the time yet to identify mitigation.

Mr. Gloski said a lawyer indicated to him that the water in those forebays is actually considered part of the Delta and the water before it is pumped into the aqueduct is part of the Delta. Some law from the 80s says that only water can be pumped out if it would affect the Delta. The water quality in the Delta is bad and there are health issues. There is nice, clear water just over the levee that is actually part of the Delta, it would seem to be natural to try to take care of the Delta before exporting.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said she will send a list of questions she has about the presentation but will only ask two during the meeting. She said in WaterFix, it was known there was a tremendous amount of diesel emissions for construction for this part of the project. Looking at a concrete batch down there. Conversations have been had with Ms. Mallon about moving everything to electric. Is there a commitment by the exporters to fund and will we really get to 100% because those emissions, for health and safety reasons, would require complete relocation for the town of Byron and it would be really dangerous diesel emissions for the kids that go to school nearby.

She said she is not worried about the operation of managing water and flow creating a flood condition. She is sure that will be worked out. Is this being built to a 200-year standard?

Mr. Ryan said 200-year plus 2100 sea level rise and 2100 climate change hydrology.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked if that is from the fourth climate change analysis?

Ms. Buckman said it is from the Central Valley's Flood Protection Board's flood situation coming off the San Joaquin, Yolo, and Sacramento in combination with the 10.2 ft sea level rise of the Golden Gate.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said she would strongly urge a comparison be done to the report from the fourth climate change analysis because her concern is not just the combination of sea level rise hurting facility coming up the San Joaquin but storm events coming down the San Joaquin. The two together seem like the perfect storm for catastrophe.

Ms. Buckman said that is the information they have from the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan but she will complete the comparison so see if there is a difference.

Ms. Giacomina asked what the composition of the forebay embankments are? Specifically she is concerned about liquefaction susceptibility in the event of an earthquake.

Mr. Ryan said if she could wait one slide for that, it is part of Mr. Bradner's presentation.

Ms. Giacomina said she did have one other concern which is the effect of traffic impact on Byron Elementary School.

Mr. Ryan said that will be addressed in more detail at the next meeting in May.

Ms. Mallon said there is a chart on the expected truck traffic coming to the site. It just hasn't been modeled where it is coming from but it will be ready for the next meeting.

Ms. Swenson asked what the ongoing noise would be from the operation on the surrounding communities? She would like to see a map in detail of what the houses would look like and where they are in relation to this. Why would the tunnel ever need to be dewatered? What scenario would make that relevant?

Mr. Ryan said the tunnel is expected to last. We put in all of this investment, time and energy, and disruption to people, which we don't want to have to do, for a lifetime. It will have to be inspected over time and if there were ever a need, to rehabilitate parts.

Mr. Bradner presented a typical cross section of the embankment, which is an earth fill embankment. It was recently discussed to use RTM for this embankment, so long as it meets specifications. It has 4:1 side slopes on the interior and exterior, with top elevation set at 28 ft. For comparison, it can be seen where the max water would sit at 17.5 ft. The interior slope would be lined with riprap to protect against wave damage and erosion of the slope. There is a fine-grained cutoff wall at the center. It is soil mixed with clay, soil bentonite cutoff wall with a fine-grained cap. This would extend down to a depth that keys into a fine-grain layer, until more site-specific geotechnical information is received, it is unknown to what depth that wall will need to extend. The cutoff surrounds the whole perimeter.

Into the foundation, at the bottom there are shear walls that are created with by introducing cement into the subsurface and mixing that material in. They are called shear walls because they are oriented as panels every 15-20 ft along the alignment of the embankment. The purpose of the shear walls is to add strength to the foundation and address concerns like liquefaction and instability of the foundation. We do expect to have peak material within the foundation, potentially soft clays or liquefiable sands. Between the seepage cutoff wall addressing seepage underneath the embankment and the shear walls addressing foundation instability, those are some of the large foundation elements that are included in the reservoir.

Mr. Bradner pointed out some other features, there is a toe drain to capture any seepage that may be going through beneath the embankment. That's a capture system for that minor water. Also, adding gravel access roads for access and patrolling the reservoir.

Mr. Ryan went on to present area C which is the other side of the Byron Highway. In this area, the main feature is the South Delta Outlet and Control Structure. There is also the California Aqueduct Control Structure which would be in the canal. Right beneath the word "laydown" is where the Skinner Fish Facility is located which is the fish screen for flow out of the Clifton Forebay into the California Aqueduct, headed to the bank's pumping station. During construction, we would build a cellular cofferdam on the upstream side of the

California Aqueduct Control Structure and right around where the green line crosses on the downstream side. This would allow us to dry up the canal to build the structures in it. The temporary by-pass is a parallel sheet pile wall where the flow would be diverted around our work area inside this rectangular channel for delivery to the bank's pump station while we're working. There are the contractor's laydown areas.

When the California Aqueduct was built and the soil was excavated, it was piled on the two sides of the canal so there are big dirt piles there. The green line around the structure is mostly a cut slope to remove some of that material back to the original ground. The same thing needs to happen on the right side, in order to put in the bypass channel.

Mr. Ryan presented a rendering of what it would really look like that shows how the structure would be feeding into the canal. It shows the control structure and the forebay in the background. The spillway is not shown here but it would be close to where the Old River confluence is located.

Mr. Ryan said that for someone in Discovery Bay, they would see the pump station. The facility can be seen slightly on the horizon. It is several miles away so it helps diminish the visual impacts to an extent.

There is a summary of the expected truck trips. In the early parts of the work, the rail and access facilities are being built so there is a lesser amount of truck trips supporting that. Once the groundwork begins for the reservoir, the pump station pads, and begin building the tunneling, then there will be more trucks and about four trains per day during the main tunneling period. The trains would be hauling in tunnel segments, one would be hauling RTM, and about one a day would be hauling cement and aggregates. That would be the peak load during that time. It would average out to more like two trains per day. As the North tunnel picks up, truck traffic picks up for a few years while all the construction is going on at once.

Mr. Ryan showed an image of the construction schedule for over the years that lays out what will be done and when.

He displayed an animation of what will happen to the site through the 12 years of construction.

Year 1, they started building the roads so that traffic on the Byron Highway can be moved around the worksite.

Year 2, those roads are being completed and the rail sidings are being brought to the site.

Year 3, they start building the onsite roads, start to clear the areas for work areas, and start to use the material for ground improvements at the pump station pad.

Year 4, the reservoir area is cleared, begin stockpiling the topsoil at the top, and start building the shafts. The area in the south is starting to get set up for work to begin for those tunnels. Roads and rail are fully complete. All the worksites are set up.

Year 5, the peat is moved out. Not a lot of action is shown on the other sites because it is just continued work. Ground improvements at the south and building the shafts for the tunnels. The pump station wet well is beginning.

Year 6, the peat is covered with topsoil and the tunnel has begun. Starting to generate RTM from that tunnel and starting to work on the embankments for that reservoir.

Year 7, the shafts are in the south and the tunnel is advancing. There is continued work on the embankments with RTM.

Year 8, both tunnels are running. RTM and embankment work is taking place. There is work going on at the pump station site.

Year 9, the first part of the south tunnel has been finished.

Year 10, the second tunnel is almost to the South Delta shafts.

Year 11, the tunnels are complete and the structures are mostly complete in the south. The embankments are starting to take more shape. The spillway is in place.

Year 12, everything is cleaned up, work is finished up, and they commission the facility.

d. SEC Comments on Agendized Items

Mr. Moran asked how much peat is going to be moved out? How much is going to be put in storage? Why is it being covered up and not being used elsewhere for restoration projects?

Mr. Bradner said there are a lot of assumptions right now as they await some data along the potential alignment of the embankment, but they are estimating now about one million yards of peat that will have to be removed from the foundation and stockpiled. The plan is to keep it onsite because a better use for the material has not been identified, so it will be covered with topsoil so that it doesn't oxidize.

Mr. Wallace says the DCA has a high-level of confidence that the RTM will meet specifications for constructing all the embankments, but he is confused because the material is homogenized as it comes out as RTM. Will the material be sorted? Or do you just anticipate the homogenized material will meet spec? I assume this has to be an engineered fill. It says "fine-grain" which has a pretty geotechnical definition. How will the RTM be managed? A lot of it is being used to build some important structures.

Mr. Bradner said yes, it is homogenized so what is in the subsurface might not be reflected in the RTM as it's coming out, once it's been excavated, blended, and brought up to the surface. The treating process itself will add another level to the blending. It will go through several cycles of blending and homogenizing. In order for it to meet spec for embankment material, it must have at least 20-30% fine for the broad portion of the embankment and based on the available data, it does appear that the intervals the tunnel is going to be excavating through are going to generate material that will comply with that requirement. Some of the other requirements will be the maximum particle size, so if there are large

diameter cobbles and such, that material will need to be excluded, which is pretty common in sorting of materials. Regarding the embankment core, at this point there is no plan to use RTM for the fine-grain core, it would be a clay core, which should be able to be done on site. There is a lot of reasonable clay material or as a last option, it could be imported.

Mr. Wallace asked if the fine-grain core was the feature at the top?

Mr. Bradner confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Giacoma said given sea-level rise, the outside of the embankments would be underwater and she does not see any riprap on them.

Mr. Bradner said the Byron Tract in general is protected by levees, but that is correct. The external water elevation at year 2100 is high at 20.8. He would like to take it as a comment and contemplate if anything can be done.

Ms. Giacoma asked if the trucks hauling borrow fill are included in the truck traffic graphic?

Mr. Ryan said the plan is to bring in the RTM by rail.

Ms. Barrigan Parrilla said that in WaterFix, it was estimated that the existing pumps would be used without tunnel operation 52% of the time. Isn't this the time to go back to Cal Fed and fix the fish screens for when the existing pumps are used? It seems like it should be engineered in because there is so much opportunity there to improve that set of conditions at the same time for fisheries.

Mr. Ryan said that is being considered as a separate project that the DWR is evaluating.

Ms. Buckman said this is something that is important to State Water Operations in general, so it is under consideration as a separate effort.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked if that then means it would be incorporated into construction at this time or would it be run separately?

Ms. Buckman said it is a separate project.

Mr. Hsia said he is also interested in the fish screen because he read that Clifton Forebay has a nonperforming fish screen getting all the smelt. He is more interested in why that cannot be fixed.

Ms. Buckman said there are a number of alternatives being studied for how to address the Clifton Forebay fish protection, so it's not that they can't figure out an option but the study is in progress to determine how to manage that.

Mr. Hsia asked if we would have that problem for the Southern Forebay?

Ms. Buckman said our fish screens will not be at the south, so by the time the water reaches the forebay it will already be screened at the intakes on the Sacramento River.

Mr. Cox said this should be incorporated into the project, not a separate project. It has been delayed and stalled for years. Fishermen have gotten to the point where we don't believe anything that is said about this because there have been so many promises in the past. He urged to keep in mind that Clifton Court is the biggest fish killing location in the Delta. Once fish get in, they do not get out. It really needs to be addressed. There is a project that demands an improvement of habitat, this would be the biggest habitat that could be improved in the Delta.

Ms. Giacoma asked where the borrow comes from?

Mr. Ryan said the RTM is generated from the tunnel drive up North by the Glenville Shaft and the Twin Cities processing center at the Twin Cities Road and the freeway. There are two tunnel drives, one north towards the intakes and one south.

Ms. Giacoma said she was referring to the clay to mix with the fines.

Mr. Ryan said that is dug out of the floor of the forebay.

Mr. Bradner said grading of the floor of the forebay, as well as excavating out the upper six ft of the foundation underneath the embankment. That material, where suitable, will provide that borrow.

e. Discussion on DCA Board Presentation by SEC Representative

Ms. Mallon said when the process began, there was a commitment to allow a representative member of the SEC to do a report out to the DCA Board to make the connection between the SEC process and the Board. The Board is made up of representative members from three of the state water contractors. There are two from Metropolitan, Ms. Palmer is a representative of Zone 7's Board, and then Tony Estremera from Santa Clara Valley. She said she would like to open this up to comment for having a committee member do a presentation report out to the Board. Ms. Mallon proposed that it be a rotation so it's not just one person presenting at each meeting. It could be a random selection, it can be a nomination process, but the initial purpose of this was to ensure that the Board members heard directly from the SEC regarding their thoughts, recommendations, and general findings on effects of the project.

Ms. Mallon offered to have this start at the next Board meeting. She reminded that the person who takes on this responsibility will prepare written comments that would need to circulate to the other SEC members who would have the opportunity to provide their own comments, as well. It should be a broad representation of the thoughts of the SEC members. This process then would continue monthly at the DCA Board meetings.

Ms. Mallon asked if the committee thinks this is an appropriate time to start this aspect of engagement.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said it is a good idea and so is doing it with a rotation. It's a good idea to have the committee member get feedback from everyone and it even removes pressure from staff to be in the middle.

Ms. Swenson said she agrees with Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla about rotating the committee member. It would be good to have representation at the Board meetings, as long as we circulate around and ensure that we all have input to have a balanced report from everyone.

Mr. Moran said he is in agreement and thinks it is a great idea.

Mr. Wallace said he agrees as well. It is time to have an SEC member in front of the DCA Board.

Ms. Martinez clarified with Ms. Mallon that it could be a rotational situation.

Ms. Mallon said there is a difference of opinions among the SEC members, so rotating speakers would ensure a broad range of faces and voices among the group.

Mr. Gloski agrees as well.

Ms. Mallon proposed Mr. Wallace to be the first to present, which would include helping to establish a process and a framework. Putting together an agenda, how to solicit and present. Early on, a framework with a majority and minority was discussed, but it could be what they want it to be. The first report out might take a little more work to establish the process. She opened up conversation for Mr. Wallace to be the first to present.

Mr. Wallace said he is willing to do it and it is an important responsibility that he would do with trepidation because it needs to be done evenly. He would not want to do it unless there is significant input and everyone has a chance to chime in. He is happy to do it one time to lay down the template, if that is what everyone would want him to do.

Ms. Swenson suggested taking a vote for who should start.

Ms. Mallon reminded that it would be a rotation and it could be worked through everyone.

Ms. Swenson said she understands but the committee members should be able to choose who will be first.

Mr. Wallace said if someone else would want to do it, it is okay with him. Someone else can nominate themselves, but he was approached to do it and is willing to do it. If he's not the right one, that can be decided.

Mr. Wirth asked if the first presentation would cover everything they have done as part of the SEC?

Ms. Mallon said that at every Board meeting, there would be a different presentation. This first one would be good to go through, in general, the presentations that have been done to date but also to establish this as an ongoing part of the SEC's responsibility to report out to

the Board. It is up to you to come up with the agenda. She said although you could, she would hope this isn't used as a forum to protest the project because that is not the goal. The goal is to establish the process with the SEC and provide feedback to the Board on the findings.

Mr. Wirth said it might make sense to allow more time for the first presentation than the subsequent ones.

Ms. Mallon said another option is to reduce the scope and cover the content in the second Board meeting, just using this first one for introductory remarks on the process. She thought it would be better for them to be in front of the Board soon than later, instead of Ms. Parvizi reporting the newsletter. She said she was curious if this was something that they wanted to start sooner rather than later.

Mr. Hsia asked how many more Board meetings there are.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said for the first meeting, and since it's longer, she would make a small steering committee out of the SEC, so there are no Brown Act violations. Perhaps, three or four people that are more recreation focused and more North Delta focused. Maybe fisheries or EJ related. Let them get the summary of comments in. One person can go report it, but that way you have the input right from the start. Then, there will be the template that can just be handed off person to person.

Ms. Palmer agreed that having a group of four to five people would be good because the first one is a big job, figuring out what needs to be done. Having a group to brainstorm and coming to an agreement would be really good.

Mr. Nelson said an ad hoc committee does avoid a potential Brown Act issue where if they wanted to receive input from every member, there would need to be a special meeting.

Ms. Liebig said she was going to offer a similar suggestion of a group or having the presentation done by one or two people that way there is more diversity and all the work isn't put on Mr. Wallace's shoulders. It would be a big undertaking and this allows for more input.

Mr. Moran asked if folks envision this small committee also being on a rotational basis so everyone has a chance to become a part of this process?

Ms. Parvizi suggested everyone who is interested sending her an email and she'll go down the list forming groups of four.

Ms. Mann said she thinks the idea was having four diverse, as in from the North, from the South, fishing, etc., because everyone has different specialties.

Ms. Parvizi said trying to steer clear of Brown Act violations, they could email her so she can list the names with areas of specialty and residence, to see what makes sense.

Ms. Martinez suggested having the conversation now to find consensus on the four people so that everyone is weighed in.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said she doesn't want to have to do all of them so we can rotate people, but does want someone to rotate with her so that they can work on the air, pollution, and water quality considerations consistently.

Ms. Mallon suggested that Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla be on the June Board meeting team to be able to represent air quality.

Ms. Parvizi suggested if we have the Board meeting agendas at least a month in advance, to use them to figure out the makeup of the four.

Ms. Martinez said she thinks it's best to make this an agenda item and have the same conversation each month.

Ms. Palmer said the steering committee can also help navigate that.

Ms. Mallon said she thinks Mr. Wallace and Ms. Liebig would be good and that way agriculture can be represented which is important. She asked for someone to represent the South.

Ms. Mann said she is happy to represent the South.

Mr. Moran said he is happy to join.

Ms. Mallon suggested having Mr. Robertson lined up for the next meeting for recreation.

Mr. Wirth asked if the first topic is the North Delta.

Ms. Martinez said it is only to establish process and how the SEC process has gone from the perspective of the committee.

Ms. Mallon said the SEC members can decide on what they think is important to present, hoping that it stays to the confines of the SEC.

Ms. Palmer said this first one is important to lay the example of the template.

Mr. Hsia suggested giving opportunity to tribal for the following Board meeting.

Ms. Martinez said Mr. Moran, Ms. Liebig, Ms. Mann, and Mr. Wallace will receive deadlines to be able to prepare slides for presentation purposes. The staff is available to support in whichever way.

Mr. Nelson clarified that because the subcommittees will only be for a certain amount of time, they will not be subject to the Brown Act. Meetings of those committees will not be agendized.

f. Public Comment on Agendized Items

Ms. Palmer asked if there are any comments on agendized items.

Ms. Rodriguez said there is a comment from Deirdre Des Jardins and Osha Meserve.

Ms. Des Jardins, California Water Research, said she represents the public interest, science, and engineering. There is no spot on the SEC and there is no opportunity to comment or ask questions on the individual items. Three minutes is not enough time to participate. She is working with NGO that was not represented on the committee. Would like to note that with three minutes, it is excluding public interest, science, engineering, and NGOs that are not specifically represented by individuals. The SEC is not working in a format for that kind of participation and design.

Ms. Meserve, Local Agencies of the North Delta, said does not think the process is going well. She does not know what is going to happen throughout the meeting and what to expect. She said she appreciates the correction to the Stone Lake map, but it took a long time to receive. The discussion was not clear about what to do with the stakeholder process. They should have to vote for if they want to continue. Instead, they were told if they did not continue with the meetings, they would not be considered, that is not correct. No deadline was given and the timeline presented to the DCA Board shows the conceptual engineering done at the end of September, so there is time to take a break from phone meetings. In DWR's May Q and A, they said that Delta communities would be involved in this new approach and this is not a reasonable substitute. She said she is disappointed in the process and it is hard to participate.

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Editor's Note: This agenda item was discussed earlier in the meeting. Please see Section 2.

6. NON-AGENDIZED SEC QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

Ms. Palmer opened discussion for SEC members to provide information on outreach or questions and any other non-agendized items.

Ms. Swenson said DWR sent out guidelines for their participation with the project and it clearly stated how they intend to participate with the Delta. She said she does not see how that is possible with the current state. She will email it for the record. There is a specific section talking about how they will engage with the communities and there is no way to legally do what it states. They need to either change their guidelines to say that they will be able to participate with anyone who has computer and internet access. It's locking out anyone who does not have internet access or anyone who is lined up at the food banks in the Delta because of this global pandemic.

Mr. Merlo asked to join the subcommittee on heritage concerns with Douglas and the tribal members because that's where his expertise would be most valuable.

Ms. Martinez said it is up to the SEC and between now and the time for the next meeting, they can discuss it, but he can be put on the list.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said the deadline for the NOP just passed and out of the EJ groups they work with, they only had one or two groups file comments independently. On the conversation of who has access and who doesn't have access, she said she is still fearful of this. Many people from non-profits are showing up at food banks every day. It has been incredibly stressful. We did a webinar with 140 people and about 25-30 were agency people. The rest were retirees who follow from outside of the Delta. With our outreach, we could only get 20-22 participants for that effort. Keep in mind that for people that live in more urban areas, you tend to have better access and more affluence. Try to keep that in mind and try to be sensitive. Think about those who are not at the table when you prepare your report and moving forward. We should be for all the people.

Ms. Martinez reminded that offline conversations to brainstorm how to get more creative with reaching out to folks will happen.

Mr. Hsia said there was talk about organizing a tour to the locations. What will be happening in the coming weeks?

Ms. Martinez said it is a work in progress. In the next few days, they will have something to discuss with everyone.

Ms. Mallon said she needs to look into what is legal within the counties and how to get permission to travel out there. They will be doing research.

Ms. Martinez said a Docusign will be sent to everyone regarding stipends. Be aware, because it will be the official sign in.

Ms. Rodriguez clarified that the email will be coming from Docusign.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS

Ms. Palmer opened public comment for non-agenda items.

Ms. Rodriguez said there are two comments from Deirdre Des Jardins and Osha Meserve.

Ms. Des Jardins said she sent a letter to the SEC and requested that everyone clarify with the DCA exactly which Delta stakeholder organizations they have agreements to represent. They have a legal memo. The DCA does not have the authority to appoint or remove representatives for classes of Delta stakeholders. This has been ongoing confusion. The application has a box that asks to be checked if you represent stakeholders, but there is confusion regarding continued use of the word "constituents." No one is represented unless there is an agreement with them directly to represent them. It is clear that plans have changed with liaisons, everyone had a plan in their application with outreach, but it is obvious they have changed. We request that members clarify who they are able to liaison with because it is important as you are negotiating about mitigation for impacts on property and people. The SEC and DCA need to be clear. The SEC does not represent the entire Delta. It especially can't during a pandemic. A memo was sent to the members and the chair.

Ms. Rodriguez informed the group that Ms. Meserve dropped off the call.

8. NEXT MEETING

Ms. Martinez said the next meeting is anticipated to be online on May 27. She encouraged the committee to share any strong thoughts they have on items that should be discussed moving forward.

Ms. Palmer thanked the committee for their comments and input. She reminded to email Ms. Rodriguez with anything they would like to discuss.

Ms. Keegan said she enjoyed the spirited discussion and listening to all the comments. She appreciates all the participation and thanked the staff.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Palmer adjourned the meeting at 6:44 pm.

WRITTEN COMMENTS SUBMITTED SEPARATELY

Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2020 6:21:50 PM
To: Claudia Rodriguez <ClaudiaRodriguez@dcdca.org>
Cc: Nazli Parvizi <NazliParvizi@dcdca.org>; Julie Spezia <jaspezia@gmail.com>
Subject: Moran Minute Additions for 4/22/2020 DCA Mtg

Hi Claudia,

I will be submitting comments on the entire 4/22/2020 meeting and presentations but wanted to quickly submit the following to get it into the minutes. I was trying to comment during the meeting but had tech glitches that kept me off this part of the presentation.

Kathryn Mallon's Presentation, Graphic 1, Glanville Tract RTM

David Gloski mentioned constructing visitor centers at "entrances" to the Delta, perhaps specifically at the RTM site on Glanville Tract. Please note the Cosumnes River Preserve Visitor Center is located on Franklin Boulevard one mile south of the Franklin Boulevard – Twin Cities Road intersection. The train carrying RTM will be upon tracks that run just behind that visitor center and through the Preserve. The Preserve may be able to provide data on train disturbance to the Preserve's wildlife and other resources, including recreational use. Perhaps a welcome kiosk/rest stop/interpretive pavilion may be appropriate with the existing Visitor Center so close by.

If the site cannot be returned to agricultural production, or it is decided to do something else with it, consider early conversations with the Cosumnes River Preserve to see if they have any interest in expanding to that point (the area is presently used seasonally by migratory waterfowl), or if they might provide insight into best use (as part of the Preserve or not). Consider similar early outreach to the communities of Elk Grove, Galt and others.

Barbara Barrigan-Parilla mentioned a park with trails. I don't know if her perception was something like the wetland & boardwalk model of the Preserve. I ask all to keep non-habitat, land-based recreation in all considerations. This may be mixed in with habitat development (see Oak Grove Regional Park in Stockton) or in a classic "city park" form. Mixed park offerings, from wildland/wildlife reserves to highly developed parks with paved paths, restrooms, etc. provide connections with a broader swath of the public.

Discussions around parks and recreation opportunities remind us to expand our mitigation definitions of Delta recreation to beyond boating, wildlife watching and ag tourism. Similarly, much of the appeal of recreation in the Delta comes from the opportunity to find it anywhere, either through a car window, on a bicycle or a quick pullout to see cranes in a field. Mr. Gloski's and Ms. Barrigan-Parilla's ideas show the wide spectrum of possibilities in size, purpose and level of development. I hope we add this level of mitigation (as appropriate) to the matrices including tidal wetlands and grasslands.

I express my great gratitude for the wonderful work the entire DCA staff is doing, especially in this uncertain time. I am extremely impressed with the ceaseless kind professionalism. I was very pleased with the quality of the meeting, and the technology (the glitch was all mine) that allowed it. That 90 (or even 45, if people are counted twice) attended is a testament to the legitimacy of using this format as necessary, while recognizing, and working to minimize, its limitations.

Thanks much. Stay well and happy.



Michael Moran
Supervising Naturalist II | Big Break Visitor Center at the Delta
East Bay Regional Park District
69 Big Break Road, Oakley, CA 94561



WRITTEN COMMENTS SUBMITTED SEPARATELY

Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2020 at 6:36 PM

To: Nazli Parvizi <NazliParvizi@dcdca.org>, Kathryn Mallon <KathrynMallon@dcdca.org>, Jasmine Runquist <JasmineRunquist@dcdca.org>, Claudia Rodriguez <ClaudiaRodriguez@dcdca.org>

Subject: Please add this to today's notes on the meeting

Hello,

Please add this to today's meeting minutes.

6. Will Delta communities be involved in this new approach?

Yes. Participation and collaborative problem solving will be critical to our success. The Newsom administration wants to engage with Delta communities to hear their ideas and concerns. The administration will also reach out to legislators, state agencies and other policymakers and continue a public dialogue that will allow any Californian engaged in water policy to hear the options and provide input. Our agencies are committed to making the public, especially the Delta community, a part of this new strategy to prepare the state for climate change. There will also be many opportunities for public input as a part of the planning and environmental review process for Delta conveyance. Their voices, input and active engagement will be critical to ensuring a solution that will protect water supply reliability, but in a way that minimizes impact and cost and maximizes overall benefit.

Thank you.