

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.01	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will there be real-time disclosure of existing issues discovered during soil testing or field work?	<p>The actual draft and final soil testing results will be initially shared with property owners. If the property owners wish to disclose the information prior to publication of the geotechnical report, that information may be provided by the property owners. The geotechnical report will include the results of the soil testing.</p> <p>If any hazardous materials or other environmental hazards are encountered during the field work, property owners will be notified and notification of federal, state and local agencies in accordance with applicable laws and policies will be coordinated with the property owners.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.02	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Are you going to coordinate markers on each soil collection point so levee impacts can be tracked by RD's?	Yes. The exploration locations will be documented with a survey coordinates using current datums and a metallic pin will also be buried in the top of the wet backfill grout at each exploration to allow for future locating with metal detection equipment.	Graham Bradner	1/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.03	1/6/2020	David Gloski	Flow at the intake – At the last meeting someone asked about negative or reverse flow in the river at the intake. There was an instant response of no, never negative, but I sort of wonder what that looks like at high or low tide. That is a big issue out here and I personally would like to understand those flows at the intake during the complete tide cycle. Top, bottom, half tide rising (flooding), half tide falling (ebbing). At full “take” what are the flows just above, just below, and going out of the system? I assume that just below there is always a positive downstream cfs there even when it is peak flooding. Specific numbers like that would help. Probably good to do during the driest drought time, low river flow. If we can get those flows we, I, can put stuff like that to bed when talking with people.	<p>The project would not significantly impact the magnitude of reverse flows that would already occur in the river/Delta system.</p> <p>The project would divert water until the tidal flow in the river approaches a preset minimum outward flow rate (i.e. towards the ocean). The diversion rate would be reduced proportional to the reduction in the outward river flow rate as the tide comes in. At some preset minimum outward river flow rate, diversions would be stopped by closure of the intakes. In summary, the project would only divert at the maximum capacity when the river flow rate exceeds a specific high preset outward flow rate. The diversion rate would be reduced in steps as the outgoing river flow rate declines and stop completely if the outward river flow rate reaches the preset minimum rate prior to a dominant incoming tidal flow rate.</p> <p>Flow histograms illustrating the river and diversion flow rates across tidal cycles will be generated from an extensive modeling process as part of preparation of the EIR.</p>	Phil Ryan	1/22/2020	Responded
2.04	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Can we add to Map 8: Historical sites, cultural resources, Indian Burial grounds?	Public disclosure of the locations of archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources, including human remains, may make those resources vulnerable to theft and vandalism as well as be in violation of both federal and State laws. Because of this, these resources cannot be mapped for, or shared with, the public. Federal regulations include, but are not limited to, Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 United States Code [USC] § 307103) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC § 470h). State regulations include, but are not limited to, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq. and Section 6254 et seq. Other State regulations such as Public Resources Code Section 5097 et seq. and Health and Safety Code Section 7050 et seq. cover the unanticipated discovery and treatment of human remains.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.05	12/11/2019	Phillip Merlo	Is there a map reflecting the history of settlement of Native peoples (Mr. Merlo offered to help coordinate data collection)?	DWR, as the CEQA Lead Agency, will conduct a CEQA analysis on the proposed Delta Conveyance Project that includes analyzing potential impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources, including descriptions of the settlement of Native peoples in the project study area. However, DWR does not have a map of these settlements at this time.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.06	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will you be identifying and protecting native plant species around the Clifton Forebay used for tribal medicinal practices?	DWR, as the CEQA Lead Agency, will conduct a CEQA analysis on the proposed Delta Conveyance Project that includes analyzing potential impacts to biological, cultural, and tribal cultural resources among many other resource areas. To analyze potential impacts to biological resources, an evaluation of the project study area, including Clifton Court Forebay, will be conducted to identify plant communities and determine if existing conditions provide habitat for any special-status plant or wildlife species or is the location of any tribal cultural resources. As part of the cultural and tribal cultural resources review, DWR will be providing Tribes the opportunity, through consultation as required under AB 52 and DWR's own Tribal Engagement Policy, to share information concerning native plant species that are used for tribal medicinal practices and potential measures for avoidance or mitigation. Cultural Resources work will be initiated consistent with release of the Notice of Preparation. DWR has initiated pre-AB 52 discussions with the Tribes with potential ancestral territories in the Delta.	Carrie Buckman	1/22/2020	Responded
2.07	1/3/2020	Jim Wallace	NEPA is the National Environmental Policy Act, not ..."Protection" Act.	Yes, NEPA is an acronym for the National Environmental Policy Act; the glossary has been corrected	Nazli Parvizi	1/22/2020	Responded
2.08	12/27/2019	David Gloski	Directory for DCA employees?	DCA staff directory will be provided to SEC members at the January 22, 2020 meeting.	Nazli Parvizi	1/22/2020	Responded
2.09	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	What is the definition of "temporary" in terms of years?	The term "Temporary" in the CEQA document will be defined based on the resource area and the nature of the activity. As part of the initial EIR preparation, this term will be defined for each resource. Generally, for an EIR, "temporary impacts" range up to 2 years.	Carrie Buckman	Responded	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
				<p>DWR, as the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), will decide the range of reasonable alternatives for the environmental impact report (EIR).</p> <p>CEQA requires that an EIR include a detailed analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to a proposed project. CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate alternatives to the proposed project that are potentially feasible and would attain most of the basic project objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening the project’s potential impacts. Likewise, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that a range of reasonable alternatives that meet the purpose and need statement of the action be analyzed at an equivalent level of detail in an environmental impact statement (EIS). Generally, a range of reasonable alternatives is analyzed to define the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among the options.</p> <p>CEQA requires that the lead agency consider alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project. However, numerous alternatives that have slight variations are not necessarily required. The lead agency determines the alternatives to be analyzed in detail in an EIR. Section 15126.6[a] of the State CEQA Guidelines provides that:</p> <p>[a]n EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public</p>			
2.10	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Who decides what a reasonable alternative is, what makes an alternative qualify as “reasonable” and to whom is the alternative deemed reasonable?		Carrie Buckman	1/22/2020	Responded
2.11	12/11/2019	General	Clarification about how DWR will reflect and characterize SEC participation in the EIR?	See attached memo	Carrie Buckman	1/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.12	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Incorrect data on Map 7, cropscape is historically wrong. Will this be corrected?	The data presented in the "Land Use Map" at the December 2019 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting was actually a "Vegetation Map" and not a "Land Use Map." The map was based on 2016 satellite data. The DCA has acquired 2018 crop type data from United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and updated this map. The DCA has compiled land use data from adopted general plans of Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo counties and is developing a Land Use map to be presented in a March Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.13	12/11/2019	General	What constitutes a recreational facility in terms of representing sensitive receptors?	<p>The map presented at the December Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting was prepared with information collected in past studies. The recreational areas shown on that map included fishing marinas, parks, and wildlife viewing areas, that could be affected by noise, light, and air quality emissions. The database used for this map also included support facilities for the recreation areas, such as power poles. The database has been updated using information from California state agencies and the updated map with recreational facilities is being presented at the 2/26/20 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting.</p> <p>The database has been updated and a map including public schools, hospitals, fire stations and local law enforcement was developed to represent sensitive receptors. It is being presented at the 2/26/2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting.</p> <p>A separate map with publicly-available marinas, boat launches, refuges, and habitat preserves has been completed and is being presented at the 2/26/20 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting. This map was also developed in response to Comment 2-15.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.14	12/11/2019	General	Is there a map reflecting existing water infrastructure and facilities such as intakes, diversion works and conveyance facilities?	This map will be presented to the SEC during the February 12 meeting.	Karen Askeland	1/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.15	1/16/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Would it be possible for the upcoming packet to get a map with the alignment for the tunnel that has the following: 1) Highways, railroads -- any major infrastructure that is easy to label. It needs a few more markers for users. 2) A legend for miles. 3) Names of the islands through which it passes and refuges -- public boat launches if time permits. That would be helpful. It will make discussions easier. Across the board, people in the community are frustrated that the NOP map is hard to read. We understand that it may be more conceptual; my request is for readability.	All maps presented since January 2020 at the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings include major highways, railroads, legend in miles and names of the islands. A separate map with publicly-available launches, refuges, and habitat preserves has been completed and is being presented at the 2/26/20 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.16	12/11/2019	Angelica Whaley	DWR plans for levee maintenance in regards to the intakes and flood protection?	The DCA is working with the US Army Corps of Engineers (levee owner) to ensure that the construction of the intakes poses no additional flood risk. The current plan for keeping the levees intact during intake construction was presented during the January 22, 2020 presentation on intakes. To address this issue, the DCA prepared a construction sequence animation which showed how the levee and flood management protection would be maintained throughout the entire construction period. This material is available online at dcdca.org.	Luke Miner	1/22/2020	Responded
2.17	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	How long the bridges have to be up and when for DCA construction barges?	There are two bridges on one of the potential barge routes (from West Sacramento to either barge landing) including the Rio Vista Bridge and Three Mile Slough Bridge. The operations timing of the bridge would be dependent on the specific bridge, river conditions and barge configuration, and is estimated to be 15 to 30 minutes at each bridge.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.18	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	What are round trip barge calculations?	This would be dependent on the port location, specific route, river conditions (including tide, flow, and wind), and barge configuration. For example, for the route between the Port of Stockton and Bouldin Island (a one-way route of 17 nautical miles), under ideal river conditions, the barge cycle could be completed in approximately 8 hours with 1 hour to load at the port, 2 hours transit to Bouldin Island, 2 hours to return to the port, and 1 hour to moor at the port.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.19	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Do the conveyor belts go across the island?	In order to reduce truck trips and roadway congestion, conveyor belts can be used to transport reusable tunnel material (RTM) from launch shaft sites to storage locations. RTM conveyance will be discussed further at February and March SEC meetings.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded
2.20	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Features that could end up being permanent?		Luke Miner		For Future Discussion
2.21	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Fuel stations aesthetics, whether they will be temporary or permanent, if they will be underground or above-ground tanks, their proximity to schools and people and what safety operations are going to be used to ensure against contamination?	As currently proposed, fuel tanks would be located at the larger construction sites, including intakes, larger tunnel shaft sites, and the Southern Complex. During construction, the fuel tanks would be installed within security fences and would be above ground structures surrounded by lined spill-prevention facilities. During operations, fuel tanks would likely need to be located at the intakes and pumping plant for emergency engine generators. These fuel tanks also would be located above-ground within security fencing and lined spill-prevention facilities to protect surface water and groundwater. The fuel tanks would not be located within the high-water mark of any on-site or adjacent drainages. All fuel facilities would require permitting by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.22	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Batch plants effects on air quality?	Dust issues at batch plants primarily occur as the dry ingredients are mixed together prior to the addition of water to make the concrete, slurry, or grout. The batch plants would be required to install the equipment that receives and mixes the dry ingredients within a shelter that includes large fans and air filtration equipment to minimize particulate matter (dust) from leaving the construction site. DWR will complete a full analysis of the potential effects on air quality and potential mitigation measures as part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance effort.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
2.23	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Map that depicts an interaction with the bridges?	Related to barge routes, the only bridges along the potenial barge routes would be the Rio Vista Bridge and Three Mile Slough bridge for goods delivered from the Port of West Sacramento. No bridges would be crossed for goods delivered from the Port of Stockton or Port of Antioch. Goods delivered from ports along San Francisco and San Pablo Bays would need to pass under the Carquinez and Benicia railroad bridges. Related to roadway routes, several bridges could require modification depending upon the final roadway options, as are shown in the map books. No railway bridges would be affected by the construction; however, another bridge would be constructed adjacent to the railway bridge across the California Aqueduct and a roadway overcrossing would be constructed over the railway bridge near Holt, California.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.24	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Pile Drivers: How many sites, are they all at once, how close, duration?	Pile driving could be used at numerous locations of the Delta Conveyance project, including the intakes. The January 22, 2020 presentation on intakes described the potential need for pile driving at intake locations. The presentation included exhibits prepared by an acoustic engineer and quantified potential noise effects due to pile driving at the intake sites, and the potential for noise reduction with several construction methods. This material is available online at dcdca.org and further information on pile driving for other components will be presented at upcoming meetings.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.25	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Barges: Size, docking areas, bridges impact, how many barge trips per day, how many docks for barges?	There is currently only one barge landing for the Central Corridor at Bouldin Island and one barge landing for the Eastern Corridor at Lower Roberts Island. Each barge landing would be approximately 1,200 feet long along the bank of the river or slough and would be constructed into the existing levee to minimize extension into the waterway. The number of barge trips per day would depend upon the goods to be barged and the source location (e.g., Port of Stockton, Port of West Sacramento, Port of Antioch).	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.26	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Toxicity from soil strengthening, potential spread and impact on sloughs?	Ground improvement to strengthen the structural foundation of the soils would likely consist of a combination of excavation of unsuitable soils (such as peat soils), placement of compacted suitable and clean fill material to induce consolidation prior to final construction, and mechanically mixing of cement or similar materials to add soil strength. None of these actions would result in introduction of contaminants to the soil or groundwater aquifer.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
2.27	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Air quality around port of Stockton from increased barge and train traffic?	DWR will analyze potential air quality impacts and mitigation as part of the EIR preparation.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
2.28	12/11/2019	David Gloski	What are the anticipated waterway rules and process when DCA construction barges are on the waterways?	Barge traffic along the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel and Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel would operate in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Port of West Sacramento and Port of Stockton, respectively. In addition, the barges and the associated tugboats would operate in accordance with requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard and the Division of Boating and Waterways of the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Notifications would be provided to the U.S. Coast Guard and local marinas.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.29	12/11/2019	General	How the testing, drying, run-off and on-site management of reusable tunnel material will work?		Luke Miner		For Future Discussion
2.30	12/11/2019	General	Specifics of tunneling process, machinery used, material derived and its treatment?	The February 12, 2020 meeting includes a presentation that describes the specifics of the tunneling process.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.31	12/11/2019	General	RTM testing, usage, drying, run-off and on-site management?		Luke Miner		For Future Discussion
2.32	12/11/2019	Gilbert Cosio	Specific discussions about the barge loading locations?	The Central Corridor currently includes a barge landing for Bouldin Island along Potato Slough. The Eastern Corridor currently includes one barge landing for Lower Roberts Island along the San Joaquin River/Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.	Jim Lorenzen		Responded
2.33	12/11/2019	Jim Wallace	Is there siting information available for burrow pits?	SEC Meetings 3-8 break the project up into individual components, each with their individual requirements for imported material. For components where a lot of import is needed, the presentations will include potential import sites and invite committee feedback to provide additional considerations.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded
2.34	12/11/2019	Karen Mann	How barges used by DCA during construction would affect the recreational activities in the waterways?	DWR will evaluate the potential effects of barge traffic and recreational navigation activities in the waterways as part of the EIR preparation.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.35	12/11/2019	Karen Mann	Waterways safety and usage during construction barging?	Barge traffic along the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel and Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel would operate in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Port of West Sacramento and Port of Stockton, respectively. In addition, the barges and the associated tugboats would operate in accordance with requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard and the Division of Boating and Waterways of the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Notifications would be provided to the U.S. Coast Guard and local marinas.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.36	12/27/2019	David Gloski	Fishless intake system? Finds it hard to believe there are no fish in there. Can you explain how this would be fishless including tiny fish?	Intake screens would be sized according to current State and Federal regulations which require that they be small enough to screen out juvenile salmonids and Delta Smelt. In accordance with current regulations, an intake water velocity of 0.2 feet per second would be required to ensure the safety of these fish as they swim close to the fish screens. This question from December 2019 was answered in the January 22 meeting in the presentation on intakes. The material is available online at dcdca.org.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.01	1/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Can we have the question tracking packet in a digital format?	We are working on a searchable Q&A database as a feature for our new website. In the meantime, our Q&A is updated online at <a href="http://www.dcdca.org">www.dcdca.org</a> a few days after our meetings and as needed. This can be found listed under the Round Table section link.	Nazli Parvizi	2/12/2020	Responded
3.02	1/22/2020	Karen Mann	Is there any chance we could have the maps which are being provided to SEC and Scope meetings to actually name the waterways and show the location of Marinas?	<p>The DCA includes labels for the names of the waterways on maps produced for SEC meetings unless the additional text in combination with other information on the map would be difficult to read. A map with marinas will be provided at a future SEC meeting.</p> <p>The maps for the scoping meetings are part of the CEQA process; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.</p>	Karen Askeland	2/12/2020	Responded
3.03	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	What possible impact will the project have on the Park District's several properties in the South-Central Delta that are under irrigation leases?	At this time the corridors shown in the NOP do not appear to include East Bay Regional Park District parks. The Central Corridor does include the land with the Contra Costa Water District intake along Old River; however, the future facilities would not be constructed in that parcel. If the irrigation leases are located on non-park lands, please indicate where those properties are located for further analyses.	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded
3.04	1/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Can members have access to the recent geotechnical data collected?	The geotechnical data currently being evaluated consist of project-specific data collected over the past years by DWR, supplemented by historic data from other agencies. The project data has been compiled and issued as part of the administrative record for prior environmental permitting for the California Waterfix project. The majority of the supplemental agency data are publicly available through Caltrans and the California State Water Resources Control Board. Water well data compiled by DWR is confidential and therefore cannot be shared. There are other limited data provided by specific agencies that are also subject to confidentiality requirements and	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status												
3.05	1/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Can we have the GPS coordinates of the three favorable intake sites?	<p>The approximate GPS coordinates for the intakes described at the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting are provided below. As discussed in the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting, the intake sites are preliminary and sites may shift in location. These coordinates are for informational purposes only and are at the approximate center of the intake sites.</p> <table><tr><td>Intake</td><td>Latitude</td><td>Longitude</td></tr><tr><td>Intake 2</td><td>38.406611</td><td>-121.51307</td></tr><tr><td>Intake 3</td><td>38.380871</td><td>-121.518795</td></tr><tr><td>Intake 5</td><td>38.349012</td><td>-121.532294</td></tr></table>	Intake	Latitude	Longitude	Intake 2	38.406611	-121.51307	Intake 3	38.380871	-121.518795	Intake 5	38.349012	-121.532294	Karen Askeland	2/12/2020	Responded
Intake	Latitude	Longitude																	
Intake 2	38.406611	-121.51307																	
Intake 3	38.380871	-121.518795																	
Intake 5	38.349012	-121.532294																	
3.06	1/22/2020	Jim Wallace	Is there a possibility the geotechnical reports DWR is currently conducting could change where the intakes are located?	It is possible that geotechnical conditions may result in minor adjustments to facility locations within currently identified intake sites; however, major changes are not anticipated at this time.	Andrew Finney	2/12/2020	Responded												
3.07	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	How will the new levee effect the other Delta levees?	The modified levees at the intake locations would be limited to a short lengths on either side of the intake, and would be designed to the most-current U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) standards. The modified levees would be designed based upon numerical evaluations of hydraulic and geotechnical effects on other levees upstream and downstream of the new intake, including the levees across the river from the intake. Per the USACE permit requirements under Clean Water Act, Section 408, the modified levees would be designed to not injure the function of the flood control project levees.	Graham Bradner	2/12/2020	Responded												
3.08	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What are the calculations on the volume of sediment for these flows and for high water events?	Sediment removal quantity calculations at the intakes would be dependent on total diversion amounts which will be developed as DWR completes operational modeling for the EIR. Therefore, total annual amounts of sediment that could be removed at the intakes are unknown at this time. Based upon previous studies for intakes in this portion of the Sacramento River, sediment quantities removed at the intakes could range up to 10,000 cubic yards in a month with peak diversion flows.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded												

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.09	1/22/2020	Cecille Giacomia	Can you provide the truck trip estimates for operational traffic for hauling away sediment?	The estimated amount of sediment to be removed at the intakes will be calculated following the completion of the EIR operational modeling. When the sediment volumes are calculated, the number and frequency of trucks needed to haul sediment during operations will be calculated.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded
3.10	1/22/2020	Jim Wallace	How will this facility be kept operational once it is constructed considering the amount of dewatering that needs to occur?	The bottom of the sedimentation basins at the intakes would be located below the groundwater elevation. As described at the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting, the intakes, including the sediment basins, would be surrounded by a slurry wall. Slurry walls would serve to isolate the sediment basin volume from the surface water and groundwater to minimize the potential for seepage either into or out of the sedimentation basin. Based upon the geological information available for the intake locations, it appears that there are adequate clay lenses below the bottom of the sedimentation basin to isolate the intakes from surrounding groundwater. Therefore, it is currently not anticipated that the basins would require lining except for placement of riprap along the sides. Additional geotechnical investigations would be completed prior to design. The determination to provide linings for the basin would be based upon the additional geotechnical investigations.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.11	1/22/2020	Jim Wallace	Will the sediment basin be lined, and if not, will the basins be in groundwater from 4 or 5 feet below existing ground level and below? Does DCA expect the slurry walls to keep them out of the groundwater?	After construction, the water level in the facility would be higher than the surrounding groundwater. Also, the site would be surrounded by a slurry cutoff wall. Based upon existing geotechnical information, it is anticipated that the slurry walls would be extended to clay lenses to essentially isolate the site from surrounding surface water and groundwater. Dewatering would be expected to be a more significant issue during the early construction phases than during the operation phases. The DCA is currently evaluating the estimated dewatering needs to maintain groundwater levels suitable for construction. The DCA is also currently evaluating estimates for operational dewatering needs, which will be limited to periodically dewatering the basins for infrequent maintenance. At this time, only limited geotechnical data is available near the intake sites. Additional geotechnical investigations would be completed prior to design. Final determinations for protecting the sites from seepage into or out of the site and to quantify the dewatering needs would be revised following the geotechnical investigations.	Andrew Finney	2/12/2020	Responded
3.12	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	Is there any correlation with outside bends and in-migration and out-migration of fish?	See Attached "A"	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.13	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Can SEC members get answers to questions about the river bends even if it comes from fish biologists, since there is a difference of opinion within the fish biology community?	Consistent with the attached response to Comment 14, DWR intends to consider and document analyses and other relevant biological information supporting the assessment of siting, constructing, and operating intake facilities on the Sacramento River in the EIR. Input from fish biologists, as well as other relevant experts, and evaluation of alternatives using best available science, will be a key component of the environmental planning process going forward.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.14	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will the impact analysis of the fish screen brushing on the food web be performed to a microscopic level?	DWR plans to assess changes to primary and secondary productivity resulting from new operations as part of the analysis in the EIR. Operations and maintenance of the fish screens would be intended to minimize the buildup of biological material on the screen itself. If additional needs or details, with regard to finer-scale food web changes associated with the project, are identified through the scoping process or the effects analysis, those will be considered as well. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.15	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	Is there any consideration given to any type of unexpected wildlife that gets stuck in the sedimentation basin, such as monitoring of eggs?	The DCA intake analyses to date have focused on development of the fish screen configuration. Operational issues, including those related to wildlife management and protection, would be evaluated as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded
3.16	1/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	How will this facility be ensured to not kill Delta smelt, as has been reported to be happening at Clifton Forebay?	The proposed intakes will include fish screens specifically designed to exclude Delta smelt from entering the system prior to diversion using state-of-the-art fish screening meeting all regulatory requirements for Delta smelt as developed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Clifton Court Forebay is configured in a manner that fish screens cannot be installed at the existing inflow location to Clifton Court Forebay.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.17	1/22/2020	Sean Wirth	Is it possible to incorporate a riparian zone into the design of an intake facility, and would that be easier with the cylindrical tee screen or vertical flat plate type?	It could be possible to provide some type of vegetation at portions of the intake locations following construction. Riparian habitat disturbed upstream and downstream of the intake during construction could be replaced in accordance with USACE and DWR criteria. Other areas on the intake site could also be considered for habitat plantings. Upland habitat could be considered between the intake structure and the highway at the same elevation as the top of the levee. Irrigation could be provided to help facilitate the diversity of plants. These concepts would be independent of the type of intake screens.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded
3.18	1/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	What is the fish screen noise in decibels?	Specific decibel levels are not known for the screen cleaner mechanism. DCA anticipates further studies and analysis by acousticians.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded
3.19	1/26/2020	Karen Mann	It was mentioned that there would be new barge routing and landing “overlay maps”. Do you know if they are available yet for either the proposed eastern route or the westerly (original route)?	The DCA is developing maps that indicate areas along the Delta waterways that could be used by different size barges, areas that may not support barge traffic, and the relative potential for waterways to support construction and operation of barge landings to serve potential construction sites within the NOP corridors (which included the Central and Eastern Corridors). The information will be used by DCA to determine the accessibility of potential tunnel launch shaft sites, as presented in the February 12, 2020 SEC meeting presentation.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded
3.20	1/22/2020	Karen Mann	Would the barge mapping change depending on which corridor is ultimately selected?	The DCA is developing maps that indicate areas along the Delta waterways that could be used by different size barges, areas that may not support barge traffic, and the relative potential for waterways to support construction and operation of barge landings to serve potential construction sites within the NOP corridors. The information will be used by DCA to determine the accessibility of potential tunnel launch shaft sites, as presented in the February 12, 2020 SEC meeting presentation.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.21	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Can you provide an effects comparison chart for SEC members to compare the effects between rail, barges and roads? The chart should include effects on water quality, boating, truck trips, etc.	<p>The DCA is developing comparisons of many factors to identify locations of tunnel shafts, intakes, and forebays. There are numerous factors considered in these comparisons, including availability of road, rail, and barge access to construction locations. Examples of these comparisons will be discussed at the February 12, 2020 SEC meeting and subsequent SEC meetings.</p> <p>However, the environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance, including determination of effects on water quality, boating, traffic, recreation, and other environmental resources will be completed as part of the EIR by DWR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded
3.22	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	Are there yet any proposed locations for tunnel shafts?	Proposed shaft locations will be developed by the DCA and presented to DWR for final selection of alternatives to be evaluated in detail in the EIR. The initial basis of the DCA launch shaft siting analysis will be presented to the SEC during the February 12, 2020 presentation. During the February 26, 2020 SEC meeting, the DCA will ask the SEC for feedback to help finalize the proposed launch site locations.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded
3.23	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will there be discussion about the flow capacity used and will it be pressurized or not pressurized?	The NOP described the project with a capacity of 6,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) with a possible range in capacities of 3,000 to 7,500 cfs. At this time, the DCA is considering tunnel sizing design criteria for gravity flow from the intakes to the pumping plant near the Southern Forebay. The DCA is not considering design criteria for pressurized flow in the tunnel.	Terry Krause	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.24	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will there be real-time disclosure with water quality issues found during construction?	The State Water Resources Control Board or Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board will issue a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) permit to regulate water quality of stormwater and non-stormwater runoff from the construction sites. It is also possible that these regulatory agencies would issue a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit to regulate non-stormwater runoff from the construction sites. These permits would include monitoring and reporting requirements, such as the collecting and analyzing water samples of runoff from the construction site and in the receiving water body. The results of these analyses would be submitted to the regulatory agencies and could be posted to a publicly-available website.	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded
3.25	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Why aren't there more meetings in Antioch and Rio Vista? Concern that the scoping meetings are not broad enough for the project.	Locations, frequency, and times of scoping meetings are determined by DWR as part of preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. DWR informed us that four scoping meeting locations are in the Delta to provide multiple options for Delta residents, and that the venues were driven largely by space availability and size. DWR has indicated to us that the DWR staff would be available to attend additional meetings hosted by community groups to share information about the EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP) and to facilitate the submittal of scoping comments. DWR has assigned several staff to Delta Conveyance Project outreach, including staff that are actively reaching out to Disadvantaged / Environmental Justice Communities to schedule these types of meetings in locations convenient to the local groups. Anyone interested in more information about the EIR and associated scoping outreach, including for Disadvantaged / Environmental Justice communities, is encouraged to email the department at <a href="mailto:DeltaConveyance@water.ca.gov">DeltaConveyance@water.ca.gov</a> or contact their consultant, AG Innovations, at <a href="mailto:shelly@aginnovations.org">shelly@aginnovations.org</a> ; 707-823-6111 x 290. Please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Janet Barbieri	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.26	1/22/2020	Jesus Tarango	Can additional scoping meetings for Northern, Central and Southern tribes be held?	DWR identified scoping meetings as part of the environmental compliance effort. Based on feedback during initial scoping meetings, DWR is adding a scoping meeting in Redding. DWR is also planning to consult with interested tribes under Assembly Bill 52 and DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.27	1/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	Is the corridor that was proposed through the Deepwater Channel with an intake near Rio Vista still a possibility?	DWR did not identify the corridor through the Deep Water Ship Channel as part of the proposed project in the NOP. However, this approach may be considered as an alternative. These types of alternative concepts should be submitted to DWR through the scoping process for consideration during the alternatives formulation process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.28	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Why all of this for one region?	With these new proposed intake locations, the State Water Project would have greater flexibility to adapt to climate change, manage rising sea levels, function in the event of a natural disaster, and safely move water during high flow events. This project could deliver water to a broad geographic area to State Water Project Contractors and, potentially, Central Valley Project contractors.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.29	1/22/2020	Mike Hardesty	Will there be some information provided to the committee regarding hydraulic impacts such as water surface elevations and velocity?	DWR will perform hydraulic and hydrodynamic modeling for the proposed project and alternatives as part of the CEQA analysis. Modeling will be used to estimate changes in velocity and elevation in the waterways at intake locations and other locations in the Delta under different hydrologic conditions. This information will be presented as part of the CEQA process. DWR is planning a separate public outreach process related to CEQA to discuss this and other issues addressed by the EIR.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.30	1/25/2020	David Gloski	Asking for initial modeling results around intakes per a prior email. Drought in wet years, various tides including the slack tides, min and max take flows. Points of interest include the flows at the downstream end of the intake, and even of there is a stronger take on the upstream end of the intake leading to what is necessary or optimum size along the river.	DWR is modeling the proposed project and alternatives as part of the CEQA environmental analysis. DWR will identify operations criteria so that bypass flows (flows that remain in the Sacramento River immediately downstream of the new intakes) are sufficient to minimize impacts, including conditions that occur on the incoming (or upstream) tides in the river system. DWR is planning a separate public outreach process related to CEQA to discuss this and other issues addressed by the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.31	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Why were Southern California reservoirs full when Northern California reservoirs were empty during the last drought?	See Attached "B"	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.32	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	How much water is being pulled out and from where?	In the Notice of Preparation, DWR identified that the proposed project could divert up to 6,000 cfs with two intake facilities. These intake facilities are indicated on the NOP map along the Sacramento river between Freeport and the confluence with Sutter Slough. DWR would not be seeking new water rights for these diversions, but would apply to the State Water Resources Control Board change in the point of diversion for its existing water right.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.33	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Concerns include water quality, water levels rising and falling and how that will affect fish and plants?	DWR will assess potential impacts to fish and wildlife (including plants) and associated habitat during future environmental compliance activities, including the CEQA environmental review process. This includes potential changes in water quality conditions, as well as potential changes in surface water elevations and associated effects. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.34	1/22/2020	James Cox	Will the pile driving vibration effects on the fisheries be studied?	DWR will assess potential impacts to fish species as a result of pile driving vibration during future environmental compliance activities, including the CEQA environmental review process. In addition, it is expected future studies will be developed to gather more information on pile driving activities and associated effects, including potential alternative pile driving methods to reduce impacts to fish species. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.35	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	What effect will restoration plans and mitigation plans have on state parks?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance has not yet started. Mitigation plans have not been developed for the Project and restoration locations have not been identified. Preliminary mitigation and restoration information will be developed during the CEQA environmental analysis process. The environmental analysis is intended to identify potential impacts and, where feasible, potential mitigation for those impacts. DWR will assess potential impacts to State Parks through the CEQA environmental analysis process. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.36	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	What is the process in place for any undocumented cultural sites that might be discovered during construction?	DWR routinely includes a set of best management practices in construction contracts to address the potential for unanticipated discovery of archaeological materials. The environmental analysis will discuss the potential for impacts and will define mitigation measures aimed at reducing the potential for cultural resources to be disturbed or destroyed. This includes a measure that addresses the potential for “unanticipated discoveries” during construction, including specific requirements for tribal consultation, pre-construction awareness training, and requirements for stopping work in the vicinity of such discoveries until such time that a professional archaeologist is able to assess the discovery and work with DWR, in coordination with the appropriate regulatory and/or tribal authorities, to develop a plan for appropriate treatment. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.37	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Do people in Southern California know that the project is impacting villages in Northern California?	DWR has initiated environmental analysis for Delta Conveyance through issuance of the NOP. The environmental analysis is intended to identify potential impacts and, where feasible, potential mitigation for significant impacts. DWR will notify interested parties, including the public, throughout the State, including areas in southern California, as a part of the CEQA environmental review process. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
4.01	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Does the project set up a system where taxpayers are paying for the construction and also for the ramifications of the construction?	As described in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (published January 15, 2020), the proposal is for physical improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) Delta conveyance system, as such project beneficiaries will pay project costs.	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded
4.02	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What construction is going to be happening simultaneously throughout the whole project?	At this point in the project, the sizes and locations of the facilities under the proposed project and the potential alternatives are being developed. As more information becomes defined, the construction schedules for facilities would be developed.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.03	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Is there a cumulative analysis in order to understand the true impact of the project, especially for AB 617 communities in Stockton who commute to Sacramento or the Bay Area for work?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cumulative impact analysis of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will also include air quality impact analysis. These results could be considered in relationship with items included in AB 617. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.04	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	When will members receive information about the cumulative impacts of the project?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cumulative impact analysis of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.05	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	How do you analyze the cumulative effects of existing chemicals combined with new chemicals introduced into the environment by the project?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe existing water quality and evaluate changes in water quality related to construction and operation of the proposed project and the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.06	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Will members be receiving a cumulative analysis of noise, air, water, etc. impacts for all the construction that will be taking place throughout the Delta?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cumulative impact analysis of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions as part of the EIR. The cumulative impact analysis will be completed for each environmental resource considered under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including noise, air quality, water flows, and water quality. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.07	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Has there been outreach done to COG's for traffic analysis, and what are the real economic impacts?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe existing and future traffic conditions without and with implementation of the proposed project or the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.08	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	How will increased barge, rail and truck traffic out of the Port of Stockton affect Stockton's economic recovery?	The EIR will describe existing and future conditions in accordance with adopted city and county plans. The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe existing and future road, rail, and navigation traffic conditions without and with implementation of the proposed project or the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.09	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What is the trade-off analysis between jobs generated by the project and potential jobs losses from small businesses that close due to construction?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will evaluate changes in employment in a range of sectors with implementation of the proposed project or the alternatives as compared to existing and future conditions without the project. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.10	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What kind of outreach is currently being done with the Port of Stockton?	The primary outreach effort to communities and agencies, including the Port of Stockton, will be conducted as part of DWR's EIR process. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.11	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Can you provide information about harmful algal blooms?	DWR will evaluate the potential for harmful algal blooms through a comparison of conditions with and without implementation of the project and alternatives. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.12	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	DWR's boring data should be released to SEC members without a PRA.	<p>The geotechnical data currently being evaluated consist of summary reports, well drilling reports, and/or soil investigations by DWR (including flood projects), Caltrans, and other state agencies. These data files include confidential personal information (e.g., property owner names). Due to the confidential nature of these files, most of the individual well logs and soil borings cannot be released. Soil boring data was provided for several locations in previous conceptual engineering reports for canal alignments in the eastern and western Delta and a central-Delta tunnel alignment. Soil boring data was also summarized in the following reports as part of previous studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Phase I Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Isolated Conveyance Facility West, 07-12-2010, DWR.</li> <li>• Draft Phase I Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Isolated Conveyance Facility East, 07-12-2010, DWR.</li> <li>• Draft Phase II Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Pipeline/Tunnel Option, 08-22-2011, DWR.</li> </ul>	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.13	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	How far upstream and downstream will new infrastructure such as riprap or levee raises be put in place?	Transitions of the final restored highway location to the existing highway would extend about 1000 to 1500 feet upstream and downstream of the intake structures, depending on the site. The final roadway grade would include small levee raises (about 1-3 feet). Riprap would extend a few hundred feet, or less, upstream and downstream of the intake sheet pile training walls. The exact extent depends on the hydrodynamic modeling that has not yet been conducted.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.14	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	How far upstream and downstream will the levees be affected and what kind of mitigation will be used? How do changes to the East Bank affect the West Bank, and what kind of mitigation will be used?	Hydrodynamic modeling has not yet been conducted. However, it is expected from previous modeling that the intake structures would not materially impact the water levels in the river during high flows. The Project may reduce water levels at some time periods. Water level impacts are expected to be below the USACE threshold for action. Therefore, levee improvements for water level impacts upstream of the structures would not be expected to be necessary. Hydrodynamic modeling is also planned to be conducted to evaluate more localized erosive conditions, which could lead to the need for slope protection on some locations along the levees. Those impacts are expected to be limited to a few hundred feet, or less, upstream and downstream of the intake sheet pile training walls.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.15	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	Where will water pumped in the dewatering process go?	The dewatering water would be tested to determine if on-site treatment would be required prior to reuse or removal from the site. The treatment could range from removal of sediment to removal of other constituents. The treated water would be considered for on-site reuse, including use for dust control or mixing with slurry, grout, or cement materials. At this time, the volume of dewatering flows and water supplies have not been calculated for each construction site. Therefore, the need for off-site disposal of dewatering flows is not known. However, the dewatering flows would not be discharged to local drainages and stormwater facilities in a manner that would reduce capacity for continued use of these existing facilities by local lands or cause a rise in groundwater and seepage problems on lands adjacent to the drainages.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.16	2/12/2020	General	How will dewatering affect subsidence?	As described at the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting, the intake construction site would be surrounded by a slurry wall. Slurry walls would serve to isolate the site from surface water and groundwater to minimize the potential for seepage either into or out of the construction site. The construction activities would require minimum dewatering and would not affect short-term or long-term subsidence. Additionally, based upon the geological information available for the intake locations, it appears that there are adequate clay lenses below the excavations to isolate the site from surrounding groundwater.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.17	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	Why is the Western portion of the Delta not being considered for this project?	DWR did not identify a western corridor as part of the proposed project in the NOP. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.18	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What are the construction impacts of building the infrastructure needed to support the project, such as power lines, additional roads, barge landings, rail terminals, etc.?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe impacts to the physical, biological, and human environment related to construction and operation of the proposed project and the alternatives as part of the EIR. The description of the project and the alternatives prepared by the DCA will include the conveyance facilities and modifications to existing infrastructures, including modifications or new power lines, roads, railroads, and barge landings. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.19	2/12/2020	Mike Hardesty	What are the impacts to the hydrology, water levels and water quality in the areas around Prospect, Briar and Liberty, and how will those impacted be made whole?	Construction in the proposed central or eastern corridors would not occur near Prospect, Briar, or Liberty islands which are located in the western Delta and along the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel and lower Yolo Bypass. The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe impacts to hydrology, surface water elevations, and water quality throughout the Delta related to operation of the proposed project and the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.20	2/12/2020	Jim Cox	Why have intakes in the Delta at all?	DWR did not identify locations of intakes outside of the Delta as part of the proposed project in the NOP. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.21	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	How will you overcome the challenge of not disrupting RD routine levee maintenance during periods of high flood? How will we mitigate for the required seasonal and annual inspections to ensure reclamation districts are able to keep the community safe?	Reclamation Districts (RDs) have important requirements for maintenance, monitoring, and flood fighting. These efforts will need to continue during construction and operation of the Delta Conveyance facilities. During design, the DCA will coordinate with potentially affected RDs to understand their typical processes and annual schedules to minimize disruptions. The DCA will also work closely with the RDs to develop strategies and contingencies for high-water conditions to ensure their ability to maintain, monitor, and implement flood-fight activities during construction and operations.	Graham Bradner	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.22	2/12/2020	Isabella Gonzalez-Potter	Is there is a comparison document that compares WaterFix to the new proposed project and highlights the key differences from the administration's perspective and why those changes are being made?	In July 2017, DWR had previously approved a conveyance project in the Delta involving two tunnels referred to as "California WaterFix." In his State of the State address delivered February 12, 2019, Governor Newsom announced that he did not "support WaterFix as currently configured" but does "support a single tunnel." On April 29, 2019, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-10-19, directing several agencies to (among other things), "inventory and assess... [c]urrent planning to modernize conveyance through the Bay Delta with a new single tunnel project." The Governor's announcement and Executive Order led to DWR's withdrawal of all approvals and environmental compliance documentation associated with California WaterFix. The current CEQA process being completed by DWR will, as appropriate, utilize relevant information from the past environmental planning process for California WaterFix but the proposed project will include new alternatives and undergo a new stand-alone environmental analysis leading to issuance of a new EIR. It would be difficult to compare the California WaterFix alternatives to the new EIR alternatives because they are different projects and due to the time lapse, some analysis may be updated. of different assumptions used in the current CEQA process as compared to previous analyses. This comment could be related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.23	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Has there ever been three intakes of a similar size utilizing tee screens within the same proximity on the same river?	Intake fish screens constructed along the Sacramento River near the City of Sacramento or in the Delta were smaller than the intake fish screens being considered for the Delta Conveyance project.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.24	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Will acousticians conduct on-the-ground surveys in the actual Delta?	The DCA may consider on-site acoustical surveys near potential construction sites to develop site-specific noise reduction methods. These types of surveys would not be conducted until specific construction sites and methods have been developed.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.25	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Will the other levees across from the proposed intake sites will need to be raised, widened, etc.?	Since water level impacts would not be expected to require levee modifications, impacts to the bank opposite the intakes would be evaluated using the same river modeling described in a previous response regarding localized erosive conditions. Given the results of similar modeling previously conducted, impacts on the opposite bank would be expected to be minimal.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.26	2/12/2020	Mike Moran	Is there a possibility that the project itself could be used as a flood control mechanism?	DWR did not identify flood management as an objective of the Delta Conveyance project in the NOP. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.27	2/12/2020	Cecille Giacoma	What will be the impact of dewatering and excavation on aquifers?	As described at the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting, the intake construction site would be surrounded by a slurry wall. Slurry walls would serve to isolate the site from surface water and groundwater to minimize the potential for seepage either into or out of the construction site. The construction activities would require minimum dewatering and would not affect short-term or long-term subsidence. Additionally, based upon the geological information available for the intake locations, it appears that there are adequate clay lenses below the excavations to isolate the site from surrounding groundwater.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.28	2/12/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Can members have a detailed map identifying groundwater and aquifers in the Delta?	At this time, DCA does not have knowledge of detailed maps of the groundwater aquifers in the Delta that extend across county boundaries to form a uniform map or dataset. Agencies within Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo counties are currently preparing groundwater management plans in accordance with the California Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. Information from those efforts may be available in the future to prepare a uniform map.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.29	2/12/2020	Jim Cox	Where will water extracted during the dewatering process be disposed?	The dewatering water would be tested to determine if on-site treatment would be required prior to reuse or removal from the site. The treatment could range from removal of sediment to removal of other constituents. The treated water would be considered for on-site reuse, including use for dust control or mixing with slurry, grout, or cement materials. At this time, the volume of dewatering flows and water supplies have not been calculated for each construction site. Therefore, the need for off-site disposal of dewatering flows is not known. However, the dewatering flows would not be discharged to local drainages and stormwater facilities in a manner that would reduce capacity for continued use of these existing facilities by local lands or cause a rise in groundwater and seepage problems on lands adjacent to the drainages.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.30	2/12/2020	Jim Cox	Will the dewatering process create odors?	The largest extent of dewatering flows on the Delta Conveyance project construction sites would probably be from the vertical tunnel shaft locations which would extend less than 200 feet below the ground surface. During design, soil investigations would be conducted which would include observations of groundwater levels and odors from the borings. If odors, especially due to high sulfide constituents, are present during soil investigations, the on-site dewatering treatment process would include methods to minimize noxious odors on adjacent properties.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.31	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What can be done with soil to create habitat projects due to legacy mercury?	All soils excavated during construction, including reuseable tunnel material (RTM), would be tested for the presence of constituents, including mercury. The concentration of these constituents would be compared to criteria developed by the SWRCB, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service prior to use in habitat projects, as well any other disposal proposal. For soils with constituent concentrations higher than allowed criteria, soil treatment could be used to remove specific constituents or other disposal plans would be developed.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.32	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Do soil conditioners aggravate the methylenation of mercury?	The addition of soil conditioners (surfactants) is not anticipated to increase methyl mercury in the RTM.	Andrew Finney	2/26/2020	Responded
4.33	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What is seepage when tunnel segments are put together?	We do not expect seepage from connecting tunnel segments due to the construction method. The tunnel segments are put together within the cylindrical steel shield of the TBM and seepage is controlled by multiple wire brush seals as the segments are assembled together. The segments themselves are gasketed at all of the joints, essentially providing a completely sealed system.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.34	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What is air pollution from truck traffic and cement construction?	DWR will be analyzing air quality in the environmental review. This comment could be related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.35	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	How much noise will be produced by shaft boring process?	The shaft construction process would require a large crane or milling machine for the slurry panel excavation or panel excavator for if cutter soil mix panels were used. A second crane would be required to support operations for the panel construction (i.e. lifting the steel rebar reinforcing cages into the panel excavations). Based on current information, the loudest construction noise would generally be related to the motor noise from these two pieces of equipment.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.36	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	How many tons of concrete will be poured on the launch shaft site pads?	At a tunnel launch shaft, a gantry style crane probably would be used for support of the tunneling operations, and a temporary concrete pad would be constructed around the shaft to allow for rails of the crane supports and to provide a work area. The concrete pad would be temporary and would be removed following construction. The concrete pad could be approximately 189,000 square feet and about 6 inches thick, or approximately 3500 cubic yards. This amount of concrete would weigh approximately 7100 tons.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.37	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	How much peat dirt will be displaced in the process of excavating?	Excavated soils, with or without peat, would need to be managed on-site to prevent particulate matter, including dust and peat material, from leaving the construction site boundary. At the tunnel shaft locations, the excavated material (approximately 600 cubic yards from the vertical shaft excavation) would be placed in areas to be managed to allow for testing prior to disposal or reuse. This will be analyzed in the environmental document and any mitigation will be provided there. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Andrew Finney	2/26/2020	Responded
4.38	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	When peat dirt is displaced, what mitigation efforts will be made to make sure the peat doesn't increase the asthma problems in the Delta?	Excavated soils, with or without peat, would need to be managed on-site to prevent particulate matter, including dust and peat material, from leaving the construction site boundary. At the tunnel shaft locations, the excavated material (approximately 600 cubic yards from the vertical shaft excavation) would be placed in areas to be managed to allow for testing prior to disposal or reuse. This will be analyzed in the environmental document and any mitigation will be provided there. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.39	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	What types of mitigation will be provided to schools in terms of noise, air quality and water quality?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of each environmental resource considered under CEQA, including noise, air quality, and water quality; and development of mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse effects. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.40	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	How many launch shaft pads are being proposed?	The potential tunnel alignments and shaft locations in the central and eastern corridor are still being developed. At this time, it appears that two tunnel launch shafts would be located within the footprint of the Southern Forebay and 2 to 3 tunnel launch shafts per corridor would be located to the north of the Southern Forebay.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.41	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Do soil conditioners need to be removed from the soil before it is reused?	Soil conditioners would only be removed from the RTM if determined to be necessary as part of the testing program. Generally, the expected concentrations of conditioners in the RTM would not affect whether RTM would be available for reuse or disposal.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.42	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	How is the safety of the soil determined?	The soil material coming out of the tunneling or shaft excavations would be conveyed to a Material Classification Area where it would be placed within smaller segregated areas. These areas would be tested to identify critical constituents related to the disposal or reuse of the RTM, including constituents that would identify the RTM for hazardous materials and contamination. Laboratory results would be used to define the appropriate, pre-approved storage, reuse or disposal locations.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.43	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Can the informational materials please represent barge and rail trips as round trips?	All data related to barge and rail trips presented to the Stakeholder Engagement Committee have been described as "round trips." Future presentations will include the specific units.	Luke Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.44	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Has there been anywhere a tunneling project with this magnitude, soil condition, length, etc. has ever been performed?	There are many places in the world where tunnels with similar features referenced have been constructed or are under construction, including tunnels at the Port of Miami, Hong Kong (China), Madrid (Spain), and Turkey.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.45	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	What is done with saltwater that is brought to the surface?	The dewatering water would be tested to determine if on-site treatment would be required prior to reuse or removal from the site. The treatment could range from removal of sediment to removal of other constituents. If the salinity is too high for on-site reuse or discharge to a receiving water body, on-site water treatment could be considered or the water would be discharged to a permitted disposal facility that allowed for discharge of water with the high salinity. During design, soil investigations would be conducted which would include observations of groundwater levels and quality.	Andrew Finney	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.46	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Is RTM subject to waste discharge requirements?	DWR's environmental review process will evaluate permitting requirements for the proposed project and placement of the RTM at the construction site for either temporary or long-term storage may require compliance with specific measures in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, a type of Waste Discharge Permit issued by the SWRCB and Regional Water Quality Control Boards.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.47	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Do you plan to rehabilitate the levees at launch sites and to what level in order to protect construction operations?	The work areas at the tunnel launch sites would be placed on elevated pads to protect the site from the 200-year flood event, sea level rise, and wind fetch with a specified freeboard height.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.48	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Are there going to be activities such as dewatering, power lines or pipelines between the launch shafts, in addition to construction of the launch shaft sites?	All construction between tunnel shafts is anticipated to be located at the TBM below the ground. Dewatering would not occur along the tunnel alignment between tunnel shafts. No pipelines would be constructed along the tunnel alignment between tunnel shafts. Power line alignments have not been developed at this time.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.49	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Will the SEC members receive information about the soil and water testing program once it has been determined?	Initial soil investigation methods were proposed and are being evaluated through an Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (published in November 20, 2019) by DWR. Water quality testing programs have not been developed at this time.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.50	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Has DWR started consulting with tribes?	Tribal consultation is the responsibility of DWR. DWR is planning to consult with interested tribes as required by law.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.51	2/12/2020	Mike Moran	How should committee members treat hand-outs or other information provided by the public, especially when the source is not clear?	Hand-outs or similar information provided by members of the public should be treated as a public comment. Please ask DCA staff regarding the source of any information if it is unclear.	Josh Nelson	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.52	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Who is responsible for the weekly spoils testing reporting during construction?	During construction, testing of excavated soils would occur in compliance with monitoring requirements adopted by DWR in the Final EIR (with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan) and in permits obtained by DWR and the DCA, including Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans for construction programs. While the DCA would likely conduct most of the testing as part of the construction process, compliance with monitoring plans and permits is ultimately the responsibility of DWR.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.53	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will DWR be publishing soil and water testing data for the public to see?	Initial soil investigation methods were proposed and are being evaluated through an Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (published in November 20, 2019) by DWR. Water quality testing programs have not been developed at this time.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.54	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	How frequently will HAB data be reported and how accessible will it be to the public?	Harmful Algal Blooms (HAB) data currently are not included in most Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan construction permits. Historically, analysis for potential for algal blooms in the Delta rely on operational assumptions, including diversion patterns at the north and south Delta intakes, that will be evaluated in the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.55	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	How many miles are between the Eastern Corridor's Launch Site B to the Port of Stockton?	The potential Launch Site B presented in the February 12, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting was approximately 3 to 4 miles from the Port of Stockton.	Graham Bradner	2/26/2020	Responded
4.56	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Has there been any analysis on how far away the top end of Launch Site B is from urban housing to the east and north?	The screening process presented in the February 12, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting considered avoidance of construction within adopted city spheres of influence boundaries. The initial launch shaft sites were at least one mile from housing.	Graham Bradner	2/26/2020	Responded
4.57	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Will conveyor belts will be moving RTM across farmland to the drying areas?	Conveyors could be located either within a construction site or parallel to roads to minimize vehicle use. The specific uses for conveyors are currently being developed and will be discussed at future Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.58	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Is the build still anticipated to take 13 years?	The preliminary construction schedule is currently estimated at 13 years. More detailed schedules are under development and would depend on identified tunnel drive lengths. Construction schedules will be discussed at future Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.59	2/12/2020	Peter Robertson	What is the anticipated labor load for each shift and the plan for caring and feeding of those individuals?	Labor estimates will be developed on a monthly basis for each construction sites. In addition, use of centralized parking areas, mobile food trucks, and centralized material consolidation centers are being considered as methods to reduce vehicle traffic during construction. These items will be discussed at future Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.60	2/12/2020	Jim Cox	How close is this construction to residential areas?	Specific construction sites are still being identified. However, based on the tunnel launch shaft areas presented at the Stakeholder Engagement Meeting on February 12, 2020, the tunnel launch shaft would be at least one mile from residential areas.	Graham Bradner	2/26/2020	Responded
4.61	2/12/2020	Douglas Hsia	Is it feasible to use barges at all, since opening the bridges stops the traffic in both directions?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of road traffic on operable bridges to allow for barge traffic. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.62	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	Is new rail siding needed on existing rail lines if rail is used, or will DCA build a spur to the launch sites?	Currently, the DCA is considering construction of railyards adjacent to the railroad tracks at locations along the Interstate 5 corridor. Materials would be moved on conveyors and/or trucks from the new railyards to and from the tunnel launch sites. At the tunnel launch shafts in the southern Delta, the DCA is considering extension of the new sidings to the tunnel launch shaft sites. Any changes would be subject to environmental review.	Jim Lorenzen	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.63	2/12/2020	Karen Mann	How will pockets of gas and water be avoided during tunneling?	During the design phase, there will be an exploration program to identify and detect buried and/or abandoned water, natural gas and oil wells to allow for removal of the wells prior to tunnel construction. During construction, gas detection methods will be used for flammable gasses. The mechanisms used for tunnel liner construction would provide a sealed work area and protect the boring machine and workers from water intrusions.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.64	2/12/2020	Karen Mann	What effect does that (i.e., pockets of gas) have on the employees underground?	Tunnels would be constructed in accordance with the laws of the Tunnel Safety Orders (TSO) that are administered by Cal/OSHA to protect worker safety.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.65	2/12/2020	Karen Mann	What happens if you accidentally pierce a pocket of gas, oil or water during tunneling?	During construction, gas detection methods will be used for flammable gasses. The potential condition for encountering a gas or oil pocket is covered under the Tunnel Safety Orders administered by Cal/OSHA. These laws dictate the safe working environment as well as the conditions that may require removal of workers from the tunnel until they are mitigated. One of the most typical mitigations required includes increasing the amount of ventilation to the affected area. The mechanisms used for tunnel liner construction would provide a sealed work area and protect the boring machine and workers from water intrusions.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.66	2/12/2020	Mike Moran	How are the tunnels ventilated?	The equipment placed in the tunnel behind the TBM would include ventilation equipment, as will be discussed in upcoming Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.67	2/12/2020	Mike Moran	If the top of the tunnel is about 100 ft below surface, will these depths still be in the range of human habitation considering the deposition of the Delta over the years and sea level rise?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cultural resources, including potential areas with human habitation. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.68	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	How will first responders be informed of all the construction and be able to respond to emergencies that occur in the tunnel?	Due to the lengths of the tunnel drives and the locations of the potential construction sites, first responders could be required to be located at most of the construction sites to provide response in the required time limits. With or without on-site first responders, all fire, police, ambulance, and hospitals in the area would be notified prior to and during construction of major construction activities and potential traffic considerations along roadways. The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of emergency services. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.69	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	How does tunneling operate in regards to potential for seismic issues due to the tunneling and the motion of the drives?	The greatest ground motions in a seismic event would occur near the ground surface. At the depths of the TBM and tunnel, the structure would probably tend to move together with the surrounding ground and not be adversely affected by seismic forces.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.70	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	What is the subsidence potential for hitting various unknowns such as sand lenses?	During the design phase, soil investigations would identify soil types and groundwater pressures by location to allow for planning of adequate soil conditioners and TBM face pressures. Control of the amount of ground loss through the TBM face would be an important factor in controlling the ground surface and reduce the potential of ground surface settlement. Conditioning of excavated soil would help to control movement of material through the screw auger. The TBM operator would coordinate the TBM advance rate with the amount of material moving through the screw auger and onto the transfer conveyor.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.71	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	How does tunneling work in an unconsolidated soil type?	The applied TBM face pressure would be balanced against the soil and groundwater pressure by the TBM operator.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.72	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	What is the seismic vulnerability of the tunnel itself?	The greatest ground motions in a seismic event would occur near the ground surface. At the depths of the TBM and tunnel, the structure would probably tend to move together with the surrounding ground and not be adversely affected by seismic forces.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.73	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	How is the lining of the tunnel rated on seismic strength?	The tunnel would be designed for seismic ground motions and forces generated using state-of-the-art seismic design modeling. Applicable engineering factors of safety for these dynamic forces would be used in the structural design.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.74	2/12/2020	Sean Wirth	Can the SEC members provide the criteria they find important and have DCA perform additional studies to determine how that geography might change through refinement or by shifting the priority levels?	The purpose of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee is to create a forum for Delta stakeholders to provide input and feedback on technical/engineering issues. The DCA is interested in considering criteria identified by the Stakeholder Engagement Committee. However, it must be noted that this process is not part of DWR's CEQA process which will determine the impacts and identify necessary mitigation measures of the proposed project and alternatives.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.75	2/12/2020	Karen Mann	Should the committee also be considering different sites for the intakes?	DWR identified the general intake locations as part of the proposed project in the NOP. Alternative intake locations should be submitted to DWR through the scoping process for consideration during the alternatives formulation process. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.76	2/12/2020	Cecille Giacomia	Can SEC members please have a copy of the Independent Technical Review Committee assessment results?	The Independent Technical Review Committee assessment is included in the handouts for the February 26, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting.	Luke Miner	2/26/2020	Responded
4.77	2/12/2020	General	Can members tour intake facilities to see examples of flat panel screens and cylindrical screens?	The DCA has scheduled tours of both corridors for up to 8 SEC members at a time, available on a first-come, first-served basis. Emails with dates and further coordination details have been sent to members. Please contact ValerieMartinez@dcdca.org to sign up.	Valerie Martinez	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.78	2/12/2020	Cecille Giacom	Can members have a list of soil conditioners considered for use? What is the composition of soil conditioners?	<p>Many different types and brands of conditioners are used in tunneling based upon soil conditions present along the alignment. Conditioners are generally categorized as foams, polymers and bentonites. On recent projects, DCA consultants have observed the use of Soilax S products (available from the manufacturer Boraid Products) which are surfactants (i.e. detergents) and mixed with clean water as a foaming conditioner. Sometimes, a cellulose product, like Soilax C, is added into the conditioner mix to provide added strength to the soap bubbles, which helps when the conditioner is injected into certain soil formations. Thickening agents, such as polymers and a bentonite (a naturally occurring clay), are also used for different soil conditions. These include such products available from Mapei Products. These are just examples of some products that could be used. The construction specifications would require any conditioners to be inert (chemically inactive).</p>	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
4.79	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	Is the project subject to the jurisdiction of the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA)?	<p>MSHA has jurisdiction over mines (i.e., places where minerals are extracted) and related facilities. This does not include water conveyance tunnels. (MSHA Program Policy Manual, Section I.4-1) The proposed project would not qualify as a mine.</p>	Josh Nelson	2/26/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.8	2/13/2020	Gil Cosio	A report from DWR documented their observation of cracking that occurred on the Grand Island Steamboat Slough levee during the last drought. As I mentioned yesterday, my observations, which were confirmed by an independent geotechnical engineer hired by Mr. Knickerbocker, lead to the conclusion that the loss of moisture due to the presence of trees on the levee slope and along the property line near the house caused subsidence and cracking of the ground and levee. This is a common feature on levees where trees exist near the landside levee crown, however, this case is much more severe based on the number of trees. It's my concern that as the water table drops during dewatering, the same will occur on a much larger basis as the porous sands (some borings have even shown gravels) in the soil column settle.	DCA intends to provide a response at a future meeting.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Follow Up
5.01	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Where are the alternatives that are being suggested in scoping meetings?	Alternatives are developed by DWR as part of completion the EIR in accordance with CEQA, including consideration of scoping comments. Scoping comments will inform the development of alternatives. At this time, DWR has only asked DCA to evaluate the proposed project corridors specified in the NOP. Because it is more cost-effective to evaluate different flow capacities at one time, DWR also asked DCA to evaluate a flow capacity of 6,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) and three different flow capacities as alternatives (3,000, 4,500, and 7,500 cfs). However, it is not a commitment that the alternate flow capacities will be analyzed in detail as alternatives.	Carrie Buckman		Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.02	2/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Will the alternatives that come out of the CEQA process based off of scoping comments be given the same consideration as the options being presented to the SEC?	All options suggested during the scoping process will be analyzed for their ability to meet the project objectives and/or reduce environmental effects. Based upon the review of the options, DWR will determine which alternatives will move forward for further analysis in the EIR. Many of the scoping comments that have been submitted at this time include a wide range of options to be considered. At the end of the scoping process, the entire range of options will be reviewed, and a final range of alternatives will be identified to be included in the EIR for analysis at a similar level of detail.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.03	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	If the Central Corridor really isn't feasible engineering wise, is it really worth the committee's time?	The ITR report is merely a single data point. As such, it is being considered with the evaluation results of many design, construction, and operations considerations. The ITR report only considered a subset of the engineering and geographical issues relevant to tunnel construction activities as noted by several tunnel construction contractors and tunnel manufacturers, and does not represent detailed conclusions about Central or Eastern Corridor options. Moreover, the ITR expressly did not consider other relevant environmental factors that will be consider through the CEQA process.	Phil Ryan	3/11/2020	Responded
5.04	2/26/2020	General	Inform SEC members immediately when there is a technical report released that may be of concern or interest to the community.	As future ITR reviews are completed, that information will be provided to the SEC. However, consistent with prior DCA Board direction, ITRs will be publicly presented at DCA Board meetings.	Kathryn Mallon	3/11/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.05	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	The ITR report also there are no active fault crossings in the Delta conveyance alignment and that seismic demands are not extreme compared to other projects, and the DCA indicated it agreed on that statement. Why are we building tunnels if seismic issues are not a concern?	The ITR report's note reflects the fact that the current tunnel corridors do not contain active faults and tunneling options themselves would not be uniquely affected by seismic considerations. It was not expressing any opinion regarding the need for or benefit of Delta Conveyance for providing increased seismic reliability to the State Water Project. On this point and in 2014, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) estimated that there was a 72 percent probability of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake (a "major event") occurring in the San Francisco Bay Area by 2043. Levees in portions of the Delta could be at risk of failure in the event of a "major event," such as an earthquake of at least magnitude 6.7. If the levee failures occur in portions of the western, central, or southern Delta, the reliability of freshwater SWP diversions at Clifton Court Forebay could be compromised.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.06	2/26/2020	Douglas Hsia	Should add tribal and historic sites to the evaluation matrix for launch shaft siting.	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cultural resources and historic sites.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.07	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	The DCA should first propose a design and then ask the community what benefits DCA could provide to them.	The SEC meetings that started in December 2019 and will continue at this time have sought SEC feedback on siting design of individual features. The March 11 SEC meeting will present the siting and basic design of each feature and will seek SEC feedback on these topics. The reason that this has not been presented earlier is that the siting and design for this project has only recently progressed to this level, and is continuing to be updated for consideration in the EIR.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.08	2/26/2020	Barbara Keegan	How does the community benefits discussion fit into the CEQA process?	The CEQA process will evaluate benefits, as well as adverse effects, of the alternatives. If there are items related to consideration of developing community benefits as part of an option; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.09	2/26/2020	Barbara Keegan	Request for a time frame of the community benefits discussion to be provided at the next meeting.	Opportunities to include community benefits will be discussed at future SEC meetings following presentation of the DCA plans for the initial options. If there are items related to consideration of developing community benefits as part of an option, please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.1	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Could members have a tour of the proposed intake sites in order to better understand where the facilities would be sited?	DCA will add a tour of the proposed intake sites to the list of tours DCA staff is currently arranging.			Responded
5.11	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	At the last meeting, a letter from a member was shared that said the intakes at these locations could not be approved by the Water Resources Control Board and Delta Stewardship Council during the WaterFix project. What has changed since the previous project to make the proposed intake sites viable?	This statement does not accurately reflect the history of the California WaterFix project. During the previous California WaterFix project, the evaluation of the application for Change in Point of Diversion to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the appeal of the Certification of Consistency by the Delta Stewardship Council were not completed because the California WaterFix project was withdrawn. Although there were many questions discussed in hearings conducted through these processes and requests for additional information, the change petition and Certification of Consistency process did not make final findings regarding on the previous project. As the Delta Conveyance Project continues, new water rights applications and Certification of Consistency, as well as many other permit applications, are expected to be prepared for review by the regulatory agencies.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.12	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Heritage would be an important factor to add to the siting ranking criteria. In one of the previous meetings a comment was made about staying out of environmental considerations. How can at least some high-level aspects of environmental considerations be completely disregarded in the ranking of potential sites?	<p>The DCA siting analyses presented at the SEC are focused on design and construction considerations of physical facilities. Environmental considerations will be evaluated as part of CEQA and may require iterative review of sites through the engineering siting studies.</p> <p>The EIR will describe impacts to the physical, biological, and human environment, including considerations for heritage uses, related to construction and operation of the proposed project and the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.</p>	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.13	2/26/2020	Barbara Keegan	It would be important to put the ITR into context, including how the ITR is the opinion of one group of people.	The ITR report is merely a single data point. As such, it is being considered with the evaluation results of many design, construction, and operations considerations. The ITR report only considered a subset of the engineering and geographical issues relevant to tunnel construction activities as noted by several tunnel construction contractors and tunnel manufacturers, and does not represent detailed conclusions about Central or Eastern Corridor options. Moreover, the ITR expressly did not consider other relevant environmental factors that will be considered through the CEQA process.	Phil Ryan	3/11/2020	Responded
5.14	2/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	The proposed project is a 40-foot diameter TBM that is tunneling 40 miles. There may be four TBM's, but the process is the same. What happens if the TBM gets stuck? What about safety in the tunnels?	There will be multiple TBM's on the project and they are all expected to utilize a pressurized face method of excavation (Earth Pressure Balance and/or Slurry Shield TBMs). Maintenance shaft spacing would be about every 5 miles and would be sized to allow for major repairs of the TBM at those locations, if necessary. Because the TBM would have major maintenance reviews and repairs approximately every 5 miles, it would not require major repairs between the shafts. The specifications would also require that many of the major TBM parts like the main bearing, seals, and other parts would be replaceable from within the tunnel in case some repairs are necessary between shafts. This approach is actually more conservative than that recommended by the ITR. Worker safety in tunnels is dictated by the regulations provided under Cal/OSHA's Tunnel Safety Orders, which are very prescriptive in terms of the working conditions for such essential items as adequate ventilation, illumination, ingress/egress, and other items to comprehensively address worker safety.	Graham Bradner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.15	2/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Will the ITR's recommended adjustments to the NOP corridors be considered as an alternative?	The ITR team's recommendation will be considered as an option in the scoping process in the same way that other suggested options are considered. DWR will evaluate the options to develop alternatives that will reduce impacts.	Phil Ryan	3/11/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.16	2/26/2020	Jesus Tarango	What economics effects will we see if those people reliant on the Delta lose its use?	The EIR will include evaluations of land use, agricultural use, population and housing, aesthetics, public services, recreation, and utilities that could be used by people who rely upon the Delta for their work and homes. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
5.17	2/26/2020	Jesus Tarango	Why are the tribes being forced to sit idly by while they watch the destruction of land that we once called home to our ancestors and remain the final resting place for so many?	The EIR will include evaluation of historic land use and cultural resources associated with people who are presently and historically with the Delta. Tribal consultation is the responsibility of DWR. DWR is planning to consult with interested tribes as required by law. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.18	2/26/2020	Jim Cox	How long would it take a salmon fry to move past ¼ mile of intakes and how many times would that fry have to swim back out of the flow? Is it possible that the outgoing tide at the lower end of the screen will be full of dead fish that didn't have the stamina to continue swimming for the entire length of the intake, and how has that been factored into the design?	The fish passage time across the intakes would depend upon the flow velocity in the Sacramento River, depth of the water, and fish swimming patterns across the river and along the river banks, which varies by fish species. The intake would be designed and permitted in accordance with design criteria established by fish biologists for the National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The permit is likely to include many items, such as requirements for fish refugia along the intake structure to provide a space without fish screens to allow fish to rest. During the permitting process, fisheries biologists will be analyzing the effects of the intake structures and screens on a range of fisheries species, including Delta smelt, salmon, and steelhead. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR and other permitting processes; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.19	2/26/2020	Angelica Whaley	Does the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) undergo the CEQA process in their decision as to where the intakes would go?	The criteria developed by the regulatory agencies, such as California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the federal fishery agencies, have undergone peer review. Application of the criteria are part of description of the alternatives in the EIR and evaluated in the EIR in accordance with CEQA.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.2	2/26/2020	Angelica Whaley	Is there an option to have more intakes with a smaller capacity?	DWR identified three intake locations and a range of capacities to be considered in the NOP, and asked the DCA to develop plans for these options. This comment considering additional options is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Phil Ryan	3/11/2020	Responded
5.21	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Why does the tunnel need to go 40 miles when it looks like there is a straight shot from around Antioch to Clifton Forebay?	DWR identified the proposed project with intakes to be located along the Sacramento River to the north of Walnut Grove and a tunnel that would extend to a Southern Forebay near Clifton Court Forebay. This comment considering additional options is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz	3/11/2020	Responded
5.22	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Would tunnel segments still be lowered into the tunnel from launch shafts even if there was a maintenance shaft available?	As currently proposed, the maintenance shaft sites would only be sized to remove the cutter head. The launch shaft sites would be sized to lift the segments into the tunnel, tunnel boring machine trailing gear, and reusable tunnel material handling and storage. The large launch shaft site would only be required every 12 to 15 miles.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.23	2/26/2020	David Gloski	What is the power source for the tunnel cutter head?	As currently proposed, a dedicated high-voltage power supply would be connected to the launch shaft sites to power the tunnel boring machine cutter head.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.24	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacomia	Do any of the images or videos shared show tunneling through peat soils?	The demonstrations shown likely did not show peat soils. For the Delta Conveyance tunnel, based upon existing available geotechnical information, peat soils would not exist at the depths of the tunnel excavation (approximately greater than 100 feet below the ground surface).	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.25	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacomia	How does the project team know about the soil composition at the depths of the tunnel, which is over 100 feet below the surface?	<p>The geotechnical team has collated data from soil borings conducted not only for the prior project but from other construction projects across the Delta, including design documents for roads, bridges and levee improvements. Based on this data, there is a reasonable understanding of the depth of the competent soils. While there is still some information that needs to be obtained, it appears that the tunnel would not be constructed in peat soils.</p> <p>Additional geotechnical information would be collected prior to the completion of design. If peat soils occurred at depths considered for the tunnel, the design would be modified to lower the tunnel to competent soils below the peat soils.</p>	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.26	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	What happens if a levee surrounding a shaft site breaks, since the shafts will be built on islands that are lower than the surrounding levees? How will the shafts not fill with water if a surrounding levee fails?	The Delta Conveyance project facilities, including tunnel shafts that are currently proposed to remain following construction, would be constructed at elevations greater than the 200-year flood event and projected sea level rise at Year 2100 with considerations for freeboard and wind fetch waves.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.27	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	If heavy concrete is put on top of these soils, how will the sites be stable?	As currently proposed, the shaft would be constructed with a diaphragm wall or concrete shell that would extend to the bottom of tunnel where there are structurally competent soils; and therefore, the tunnel shaft would not be expected to settle. The soil on top of the ground at the shaft locations would be treated with ground improvement methods, as necessary to stabilize the site for equipment and the shaft pads.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.28	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Does the project include plans to eliminate critters that eat away at the levees?	Vector control is an ongoing issue for levee maintenance. The Delta Conveyance project would not affect the continued levee maintenance activities of the existing reclamation districts and levee agencies, including vector control.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.29	2/26/2020	Douglas Hsia	Are the maintenance and retrieval shafts being kept or filled after construction of the project?	Decisions about the post-construction design have not been completed. There are many considerations currently being discussed, including not removing the shafts to allow for access into the tunnel and minimize truck traffic to remove the soil used to form the tunnel shaft pad. If the shaft pads were removed, concrete or other structures would be used to cap the shaft at the ground surface.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.3	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What flood standard is being used to determine the height of the shaft pads compared to what DWR has analyzed in the fourth climate change assessment for storm surge and downstream flood risk?	Over the lifetime of the Delta Conveyance Project, the facilities would be designed for the 200-year flood event, projected sea level rise for Year 2100, freeboard criteria, and wind fetch waves. The sea level rise would be consider the Ocean Protection Council's guidance. The criteria do not require that the facilities need to be initially designed for the Year 2100 sea level rise; but be designed to be adaptable over time to protect the facilities with sea level rise.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.31	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	It would be helpful if there was a map that could provide where all of the shafts would be located in order to understand how much prime ag land would be taken and rendered useless for the project.	Locations of potential facilities, at this time, will be presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting. However, these locations could change in the future.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.32	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Soil test results have been previously requested and members are still waiting for those results. Members would like the data to see for themselves and not be told that the DCA disagrees with the results because they are from a different contractor than the one DCA wants to use. Borings have been taken for the past 7 years. Can members please have the soil analysis results from those borings?	<p>The geotechnical data currently being evaluated consist of summary reports, well drilling reports, and/or soil investigations by DWR (including flood projects), Caltrans, and other state agencies. These data files include confidential personal information (e.g., property owner names). Due to the confidential nature of these files, most of the individual well logs and soil borings cannot be released. Soil boring data was provided for several locations in previous conceptual engineering reports for canal alignments in the eastern and western Delta and a central-Delta tunnel alignment. Soil boring data was also summarized in the following reports apart of previous studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Phase I Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Isolated Conveyance Facility West, 07-12-2010, DWR.</li> <li>• Draft Phase I Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Isolated Conveyance Facility East, 07-12-2010, DWR.</li> <li>• Draft Phase II Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Pipeline/Tunnel Option, 08-22-2011, DWR.</li> </ul>	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.33	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Can members also have a map with approximate locations of all the project components along the NOP corridors as well as the alignment suggested by the ITR team?	Locations of potential facilities, at this time, will be presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting. DWR will review the options suggested by the ITR to formulate the alternatives to be considered in detail in the EIR. Any additional locations or considerations for facilities will be evaluated by the DCA based upon requests from DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	3/11/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.34	2/26/2020	Mike Moran	Does the slide showing truck trips per day reflect the number for one shaft or for multiple shafts? Are all of the shafts constructed simultaneously or is their construction staggered?	The data in the presentation was shown for one launch, maintenance, or reception shaft site. The launch shafts would be located approximately 15 miles from the reception shaft with maintenance shafts located approximately every 5 miles between the launch and reception shafts. Several tunnel boring machines could be operating at launch shafts simultaneously; however, the schedules have not been completed at this time.	Gwen Buchholz	3/11/2020	Responded
5.35	2/26/2020	Mike Moran	Would construction of the maintenance and reception shafts utilize the same staging areas (parking lots, roads, etc.) as the launch shafts?	The locations of the maintenance, reception and launch shafts would be in separate locations so access, support and staging facilities would also be separate.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.36	2/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Are the safe haven shafts included as part of the planned components or if they are only created in case of emergency?	In the previous project, "safe haven" shafts were identified to allow for maintenance and repair of the tunnel boring machine outside of the tunnel. These shafts are referred to as "maintenance shafts" in the Delta Conveyance Project.		3/11/2020	Responded
5.37	2/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	The ITR report sought to determine if CEQA could have an approach for the unknowns. How can that comment be assimilated? The Big Bertha TBM used on the Alaska Way Viaduct got stuck 1,000ft. into the tunnel drive. How is that type of possibility going to be addressed from the engineering point of view?	During the ITR team review, it was discussed that use of maintenance shafts approximately every 5 miles with full maintenance procedures at those shafts would substantially reduce the probability of failure between shafts. In addition, it is understood that tunnel boring machine technology is continually evolving and many of the maintenance procedures can be completed from within the tunnel. The ITR team documented one case study which included a main bearing being replaced from inside the tunnel. Technology will continue to change significantly five years from now when the Delta Conveyance Project is projected to be under construction. During the design phase, additional ITR reviews will be conducted to incorporate new technologies. DCA is being conservative in planning full maintenance shafts every five miles in order to avoid the need for an emergency shaft.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.38	2/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	In order to provide adequate comments on any questionnaires or proposed siting, we need actual maps and coordinates. Stakeholders primarily want to know if it the project comes through their property.	Locations of potential facilities, at this time, will be presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting. However, these locations could change in the future.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.39	2/26/2020	Douglas Hsia	Request for the compensation calculations for landowners displaced due to shaft construction or underground tunneling.	DWR has not initiated any considerations for compensation programs at this time. DWR will initiate these considerations following development and analyses of the alternatives.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
5.4	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Was the road access quality rating based on the quality for Delta residents or for the construction vehicles?	The rankings of roads presented at the February 26, 2020 SEC meeting were primarily based upon driving conditions for construction vehicles, including the presence of tight bends and turns and other factors.	Andrew	3/11/2020	Responded
5.41	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Where did the road quality data come from?	The DCA team members drove along the routes, reviewed pavement ratings published by potentially affected cities and counties, and information compiled for previous projects in the area.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
5.42	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	What are Mr. Bradner's qualifications to accurately survey roads?	Mr. Bradner used the information compiled by other DCA team members to identify potential sites for shaft locations. The DCA team includes transportation engineers who are familiar with road and pavement evaluations, railroads, and barges.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.43	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Should verify the schools in all areas are reflected on the map.	The DCA has reviewed the maps with school locations. There are three schools in Clarksburg in the GIS metadata; however, the school "markers" on the map are not discernable due to the scale of the maps presented at the SEC meeting.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.44	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	Are the railroads just being considering for siding to off-load equipment and take muck south, or is the DCA still considering spurs? The purpose of the question is that the railroad parallels Franklin Blvd and the rail beds are about 8 or 9 feet higher than the road. It seems like it would take maybe a 2-mile spur to get off and get back on the main line.	Rail-served material depots with rail sidings for unit or manifest trains are being considered near Franklin Boulevard and Twin Cities Road and near Byron Highway and Southern Forebay location for both the Central and Eastern corridors; and on King Island for the Eastern Corridor.	Graham Bradner	3/11/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.45	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	There will need to be a drive route along both corridor options that her group can evaluate independently. SEC members need their own checklists for what to see and evaluate that is independent from the DCA, but there will be issues accessing certain places like Bouldin and Rindge Tract. Perhaps a bus tour or a led tour with a caravan is the answer, but it is essential to try to put the pieces together and would enable a better response.	DCA will add a tour of the proposed intake and launch shaft sites to the list of tours DCA staff is currently arranging.	Graham Bradner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.46	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Recommended Rose Marie charter boat currently docked at Tower Park Marina to tour both corridor options.	DCA will consider this transportation option for future tours.	Graham Bradner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.47	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Having accessors' parcel numbers on printed maps during the tour available would be helpful.	Locations of potential facilities, at this time, will be presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting. However, these locations could change in the future.  The maps include parcel lines. Specific assessor parcel numbers have not been included on the map for readability. The DCA does have a list of the assessor parcel numbers for the facilities shown on the maps presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	3/11/2020	Responded
5.48	2/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Are the launch shafts about 100 acres?	The size of the tunnel launch shaft construction area would be based upon the drive length between the launch shaft and the reception shaft because the launch shaft location would include area for tunnel segment storage, RTM testing, RTM dewatering and treatment, and RTM storage. The longer drives would need more area for tunnel segment storage and RTM handling and storage. For each launch shaft, the area could range from 250 to over 400 acres.	Jim Lorenzen	3/11/2020	Responded
5.49	2/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Are the maintenance and retrieval shafts about 10 acres?	The maintenance and reception shaft construction areas would be approximately 10 acres in size.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.5	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Has DCA determined if these trestle bridges would be a hazard for either the trains or the workers in the dig areas? Will the TBM be tunneling under the bridges?	The tunnel alignment would be constructed over 120 feet below the ground surface, including foundations of trestle bridges. Prior to the completion of design, geotechnical field investigations would identify the soil types/location as well as the groundwater pressures along the entire alignment, including areas of concern such as levees and bridge foundations. Based upon the results of the geotechnical information, the TBM operator would control the rate of boring to minimize changes in the soil structure above and below the tunnel boring machine.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.51	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Where would barges be parked at nights and on weekends?		Gwen Buchholz	3/11/2020	For Future Discussion
5.52	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Asked about the timing of the scoping meetings. A ton more scoping letters would have been received by residents from Locke and Walnut Grove if they were aware of not only the intakes but about all the other project components that are required. It feels like the scoping meetings are ill-timed compared with the information that is being given to people who are going to be directly affected.	The NOP that initiated the scoping process included a map with three intakes and two options for tunnel alignment corridors. The NOP also included a preliminary description of the facilities, including intake facilities on the Sacramento River, tunnel reaches, tunnel shafts, forebays, pumping plant, and South Delta conveyance facilities.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
5.53	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	There was no mention of launch shafts, maintenance shafts or retrieval shafts at scoping meetings. How can you do this process right if you are not disclosing this information to the public up front?	The NOP describes the use of tunnel launch and reception shafts.  The primary purpose of scoping meetings is to provide an opportunity for attendees to inform DWR of their concerns and issues that could be evaluated in the EIR. DWR also discussed at the SEC meetings in January and February that if there were concerns raised during the SEC meeting related to the proposed project options, those comments should be submitted to DWR through the scoping process.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
6.01	3/11/2020	Mike Hardesty	Will project sites be seen from the freeway? Are the sites going to be recovered afterwards and not be an eye sore? What will shaft sites look like at end of project?		John Caulfield	3/11/2020	For Future Discussion
6.02	3/11/2020	Mike Hardesty	What percentage of sites will be recovered at the end of the project?		Jim Lorenzen		For Future Discussion

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.03	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	When will landowners be notified that their properties are the targets and by what means does DCA intend to take their land?	DWR sent scoping notices to 14,000 landowners within the Central and Eastern Corridor (as identified in the DWR Delta Conveyance Notice of Preparation (NOP)). The scoping notices asked the landowners to submit comments as to the potential location and configuration of the project facilities. DWR has not begun real estate acquisition and, assuming DWR moves forward with Delta Conveyance, would not do so until the CEQA and other applicable regulatory processes were completed.	Carrie Buckman		Responded
6.04	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	What should landowners do if they didn't receive a scoping postcard. Things have been sent out that landowners never received.	Landowners may email their address for inclusion on future mailing lists to DWR Scoping at: <a href="mailto:DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov">DeltaConveyanceScoping@water.ca.gov</a> or mail their comments as Delta Conveyance Scoping Comments, Attn: Renee Rodriguez, Department of Water Resources, P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236.	Carrie Buckman	4/22/2020	Responded
6.05	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Will Hood Franklin Road be widened or will a parallel haul road be constructed?	The conceptual facilities plan presented to the SEC for feedback on engineering considerations includes use of Hood Franklin Road as an access road to the intake sites. This plan included widening Hood-Franklin Road to include an additional lane in both directions and wider shoulders. The conceptual plan did not include a determination on whether the widened road would be dedicated to construction traffic.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.06	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	The Hood Franklin interchange is a clover leaf already. What kind of improvements are necessary to go over I-5?	The conceptual facilities plan presented to the SEC for feedback on engineering considerations included widening the off-ramps and on-ramps, including 12-foot wide lanes and 8-foot wide shoulders to accommodate large trucks.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.07	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Haul roads have a specific purpose and are usually just designed for a project. Would the project's proposed new haul roads be removed and reclaimed at the end of the project?	Until a final project is approved by DWR, this is unknown. Moreover, the use of haul roads will likely depend on operational issues with the purview of DWR. Based on the DCA's current understanding, there would be infrequent need to access the key project features during operations. However, for some features including the intakes and pumping plant, more frequent operational tasks may be conducted. For example, sediment trucks would need to remove and haul sediment from the intakes to an approved disposal site. Shared community use of haul roads for agricultural and emergency services may be possible.	Andrew Finney	4/22/2020	Responded
6.08	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Will there be sediment trucks hauling muck out of shafts during construction as well as trucks removing sediment during operations?	The frequency and volume of sediment captured and removed from the intakes would be determined by the diversion patterns at the intakes as to be developed by DWR. For example, higher diversion patterns during high sediment periods following wet weather may result in higher sediment captured by the intakes. These diversion patterns will be developed by DWR during the on-going CEQA process and following the Scoping Period which will be completed on April 17, 2020.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.09	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Would there be a lot of trucks running on the roads once the project is built?	The frequency and volume of sediment captured and removed from the intakes would be determined by the diversion patterns at the intakes as to be developed by DWR. For example, higher diversion patterns during high sediment periods following wet weather may result in higher sediment captured by the intakes. These diversion patterns will be developed by DWR during the on-going CEQA process and following the Scoping Period which will be completed on April 17, 2020.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.1	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Instead of prioritizing a construction lane, there should be a dedicated road for residents and for moving farm equipment. The construction traffic should be timed to be most advantageous for the people of the Delta. There should not be an assumption that the construction project has priority.	The options developed by DCA in its conceptual plan of facilities included widening several roads by adding a lane in both directions. For example, widening either Lambert Road or Hood-Franklin Road to access the intake construction sites; Dierssen Road, and Twin Cities Road to access tunnel launch shafts at Glanville Road; and State Route 12 to access either a tunnel launch shaft on Bouldin Island or a tunnel reception shaft at Terminous Tract. Rules for use of the additional lanes during and following construction have not been developed at this time.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.11	3/11/2020	Mike Moran	Could there possibly be two roads to the intake sites that could be alternated?	In the conceptual facilities plan presented to the SEC for feedback on engineering considerations, intake construction sites would be accessed by a road on the western side of the abandoned railroad embankment. Access to this new road could be from Lambert Road and/or Hood-Franklin Road.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.12	3/11/2020	Mike Moran	Would there be traffic on both Hood Franklin Road and Lambert Road every day, or will the truck traffic would be on one of the roads on certain days and on the other road on the other days?	In the conceptual facilities plan presented to the SEC for feedback on engineering considerations, intake construction sites would be accessed by a road on the western side of the abandoned railroad embankment. Access to this new road could be from Lambert Road and/or Hood-Franklin Road. If Intakes 2 and 3 are utilized, the access could be from Hood-Franklin Road. If other intake combinations are utilized, the access could be from Lambert Road. It would also possible to widen both Hood-Franklin and Lambert roads for intake construction. This still needs to be determined.	Phil Ryan	4/22/2020	Responded
6.13	3/11/2020	Angelica Whaley	Has there been investigation into extending Elk Grove Blvd. instead of using Hood Franklin Road.	The conceptual facilities plan presented to the SEC for feedback on engineering considerations did not include an extension of Elk Grove Boulevard as this would require a new roadway through areas of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). Given this, it has not been considered to date by DCA.	Phil Ryan	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.14	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	How many acres are anticipated for the Glanville Launch Shaft Site footprint and how any acres are specifically for RTM storage? Will the RTM storage be on the site long term, or only during drying? When will the land used for RTM storage be relinquished from the project and allowed to go back in production, if possible?	At Glanville Tract, the two tunnel launch shafts, including tunnel segment storage, is currently proposed to be located on about 35 acres. The RTM testing, dewatering, and storage areas are proposed to be about 460 acres. This RTM could be used in construction of the Southern Forebay embankments. Any necessary long-term storage area at this site would be dependent upon the rate and the volume of RTM removed for re-use in embankments or other uses.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.15	3/11/2020	David Gloski	Would there be a conveyor belt going from the launch shaft to the RTM storage area?	At Glanville Tract, a conveyor is currently proposed to move RTM from the launch shafts under the Interstate 5 to the RTM handling areas on the eastern side of Interstate 5.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.16	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	How high would the RTM storage elevation and the perimeter berm be at Glanville Tract Launch Shaft, because the airport there would have Part 77 airport space restrictions for penetration.	As currently proposed, the perimeter levee around the RTM handling and storage areas could be up to 10 feet high and the RTM could be up to 20 feet high at maximum storage volumes. Construction activities at Glanville Tract, including the tunnel shaft and RTM locations, would include height restrictions to comply with the Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77 criteria for obstruction clearances and approvals from the Federal Aviation Administration and California Department of Transportation would be obtained prior to construction.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.17	3/11/2020	Doug Hsia	Why would West Walnut Grove Road need to be extended from the railroad to Mokelumne River?	***Please note that subsequent to the March 11, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting, it was determined that West Walnut Grove Road is not currently being proposed to be modified to access the New Hope Tract or Staten Island tunnel maintenance shafts.***	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.18	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Is DCA only considering levee work for Bouldin, or also for levees across from the project? It's an interconnected system and when one area is improved but another isn't, that area can be put at risk.	As currently proposed, levee modifications at Bouldin Island and Lower Roberts Island would occur on the landside levee and no work would occur on the waterside of the levee. Therefore, and subject to necessary further evaluation, flow rates between the levees would not be affected.	John Caulfield	4/22/2020	Responded
6.19	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	How many acres is the Staten Island Maintenance Shaft?	Staten Island Tunnel Maintenance Shaft construction site are currently proposed to be about 15 acres.	John Caulfield	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.2	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	How many acres of the Bouldin Island Launch Shaft Site would be used for RTM storage?	As currently proposed, the Bouldin Island site would include a tunnel launch shaft and a tunnel reception shaft. The RTM handling and storage area would be about 200 acres for the Bouldin Island Tunnel Launch Shaft.	John Caulfield	4/22/2020	Responded
6.21	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Is DCA is working with the Reclamation Districts to ensure there is great data, experience and all the goodness that Reclamation Districts can bring?	During preparation of its engineering work, DCA representatives have met with Reclamation Districts in the project area.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.22	3/11/2020	Mike Moran	Would the proposed new barge site on Bouldin Island be used to transport RTM once it is tested, dried, etc.?	Re-use opportunities for RTM at the Bouldin Island Tunnel Launch Shaft have not been developed at this time. However, the proposed barge landing could be used to move the RTM from Bouldin Island.	Graham Bradner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.23	3/11/2020	Doug Hsia	What is the sequence of the construction of all the shafts?	For all tunnel shaft sites, the construction sequence is currently anticipated to be as follows: the areas would be cleared, security fencing and gates would be installed around the perimeter, slurry walls would be installed around the shaft diameter to minimize connections to surrounding groundwater, earth fill would be placed to form a raised pad at the shaft opening at an adequate elevation to protect the opening from flooding, the shaft would be drilled vertically and shaft liners would be installed to the design depth, a tremie concrete base would be installed at the bottom of the shaft to seal the shaft, and water inside the sealed shaft would be removed.	John Caulfield	4/22/2020	Responded
6.24	3/11/2020	Mike Hardesty	Will new bridges constructed for the project be permanent or temporary?	It has not been determined at this time if the bridges and access roads would be permanent following construction and would be determined by DWR with input from the local agencies and communities as part of the CEQA review process.	John Caulfield	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.25	3/11/2020	David Gloski	Is the proposed new barge landing on Bouldin Island on the south side of the island because it is more barge accessible than the north side? It would be closer to Hwy 12 if it was on the north side.	In the conceptual facilities plan presented to the SEC for feedback on engineering considerations, placement of a barge landing on Bouldin Island along the South Fork Mokelumne River was considered as an option to a barge landing on Potato Slough. Initial analysis indicated that a South Fork Mokelumne River barge landing would be more difficult. Access to the South Fork Mokelumne River at the northern side of Bouldin Island for barges would be limited from the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel due to the Mokelumne River Swing Bridge and several narrow areas. A barge landing on the South Fork Mokelumne River would require crossing of State Route 12.	Graham Bradner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.26	3/11/2020	David Gloski	Mr. Gloski said DCA might consider getting the barge landing right out on the San Joaquin River, west of where it is currently shown on the conceptual site plan map.	DWR has indicated to the DCA that the western boundaries of Bouldin Island are an area with high potential for restoration of managed wetlands and/or tidal marsh that could be used by DWR for future habitat mitigation efforts. The mitigation plans have not been developed at this time; however, barge landings were not identified in the conceptual facilities plan in these areas due to the high potential for habitat restoration.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.27	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Delta bridges are part of the Delta's appeal. How is the historic value of a bridge retained if a bridge is upgraded to a modern level? Who is involved in the process of determining which bridge will receive an update and how the upgrade will be done? Will DCA invite stakeholders from the community to have input?	In the conceptual facilities plan presented to the SEC for feedback on engineering considerations, the DCA proposed several bridge modifications to accommodate widened roads for construction traffic access. However, specific architectural criteria have not been developed at this time. DWR will consider the historical values of the bridges and potential effects of the bridge modifications during the CEQA review process.	Phil Ryan	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.28	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Does the aggressive amount of infrastructure on Bouldin Island have anything to do with who owns the island?	Conceptual tunnel shaft locations were identified based upon the expected operational abilities of the Tunnel Boring Machine. Under the current conceptual facilities plan, the typical distance between the tunnel launch shaft site to the tunnel reception shaft would be up to 15 miles. Tunnel maintenance shafts would be located approximately every 4 to 6 miles between the launch and reception shafts to provide for an opportunity to repair equipment that cannot occur from within the tunnel. It was determined that the most northern launch shaft would be at Glanville Tract (primarily to access the intakes) and the most southern launch shaft would be at the Southern Forebay. To determine the location of the launch shaft between Glanville Tract and Southern Forebay was based upon the maximum tunnel drive of 15 miles, need to avoid sensitive habitat, ability to access the launch shaft site by at least two modes of transportation (road, rail, and/or barge), geotechnical conditions, presence of existing infrastructure, and existing land use. Bouldin Island was located within the mileage criteria, could be accessed by roads and barges, has minimal infrastructure, and no adopted changes in future land use plans.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.29	3/11/2020	David Gloski	Would new bridges be built to certain height specifications in consideration of boaters? There will be an advantage if boaters are not waiting for bridges.	As currently anticipated, the bridges would be of adequate height for boaters that currently use the water body and avoid the need for operable bridges that could slow construction access.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.3	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	If there are historic railroads, would DCA build a parallel railroad?	In the conceptual facilities plan presented to the SEC for feedback on engineering considerations, the rail-served materials depots would be constructed adjacent to the existing railroads with connections to the new rail facilities to allow trains to enter and leave the new facilities. No changes would be made to existing railroad bridges or embankments.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.31	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	If RTM can't be reused, what would DCA do with the RTM and how would the project supplement the materials needed for the project?	Based on all available information, RTM would be suitable for construction of the Southern Forebay embankment. If the RTM was not available, the embankment fill material would be purchased from commercial facilities most likely located in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.32	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Is there any plan to upgrade the aqueduct that connects with the project since it is currently subsidizing, is at a very heavy earthquake risk and is losing 30% of its water because it is not enclosed? Is there any plan for this project to correct that so we aren't building a multi-million dollar plumbing system and then putting it in a sieve?	DWR continues to evaluate and repair existing facilities, as required, to maintain the State Water Project operations. One of these projects includes evaluation of necessary improvements on the California Aqueduct where subsidence has occurred. This project is a separate project from the Delta Conveyance Project and its implementation is not connected to the Delta Conveyance Project.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.33	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Would there be a third-party verification of the determination about RTM's usability so the public knows it's not DWR's sole decision and that it's a decision based on the realities of science and research?	DWR and DCA anticipate completing engineering and environmental health evaluations. These evaluations will be provided for review when available and appropriate.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.34	3/11/2020	Peter Robertson	Are the project's workdays five days with double shifts?	As currently anticipated, many of the features would be constructed only during the daytime, including shaft construction. Some features could be completed after sunset if critical work was not completed. Some features would require continuous construction over longer periods of time, such as tunneling operations scheduled to be continuous for 24-hours/day on a 5-day basis using two 10-hour shifts for tunnel operations and a 4-hour shift for maintenance each day.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.35	3/11/2020	Peter Robertson	Will barges or other commercial vehicles be moved on the weekends?	There are currently no known restrictions to moving barges or commercial traffic on the weekends. DWR and DCA may work with stakeholders to determine if less weekend barge travel during certain times of the year would be preferable.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.36	3/11/2020	Peter Robertson	Weekend construction barging restrictions at the proposed new barge landing near the bedrooms would be helpful.	There are currently no known restrictions to moving barges or commercial traffic on the weekends in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel or Potato Slough during the weekends. Input from the SEC would be considered related to weekend project traffic. Water traffic patterns will also be analyzed in the CEQA analysis.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.37	3/11/2020	David Gloski	There is currently a problem with algae in the South Delta during the summer. Could the project perhaps help address the bad water and algae, either through its design or through mitigation efforts, by taking some of the water and flushing it back into the Delta if there is a challenge there?	The key conceptual facilities plan prepared by the DCA does not include considerations of operations. DWR will likely develop and analyze operational options and develop mitigation measures for significant adverse impacts during the CEQA process.	John Caulfield	4/22/2020	Responded
6.38	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Is the Southern Forebay an above ground facility, and if so, how tall is the levee that will create the forebay?	As proposed in the conceptual facilities plan, the Southern Forebay embankments would be constructed above the existing ground surfaces. The existing ground surfaces at the site range from -8 to 4 feet. The elevation of the top of the Southern Forebay embankment would be approximately 28 feet.	John Caulfield	4/22/2020	Responded
6.39	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Will the Southern Forebay be subject to the Division of Safety of Dams (DOSD)?	As proposed in the conceptual facilities plan, the Southern Forebay would be a Division of Safety of Dams jurisdictional facility based on the storage volume and embankment height.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.4	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	What kind of studies have been done to ensure that the noise and vibrations from tunnel boring won't affect the cranes? How do we know that the cranes will stay?	The CEQA process will include evaluation of the construction effects of the proposed project on terrestrial species, including Greater Sandhill Cranes.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.41	3/11/2020	Jesus Tarango	Tribes have already expressed that the intake locations affect sacred, religious sites. Why are the intakes not being moved for tribal people? All three intake sites are highly sensitive.	The intake locations presented in the SEC meetings were selected as the most viable sites located along the Sacramento River between Freeport and the confluence with Sutter Slough, as described in the Notice of Preparation published by DWR on January 15, 2020. DWR is consulting with tribes under AB 52 and DWR's tribal consultation guidelines to assist in the evaluation of potential effects.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.42	3/11/2020	Jesus Tarango	A road would not be placed through Stone Lakes in honor of the wildlife there, so why isn't there a response to the concerns for wildlife from native peoples?	During the DCA analysis of the conceptual facilities plan, publicly available information related to sensitive land uses, including wildlife habitats, was used to develop sites for intakes, tunnel shafts, Southern Forebay, and South Delta Conveyance control structures. Locations of sensitive tribal areas were not publicly available to the DCA. DWR will consider information developed during tribal consultation to evaluate impacts related to tribal cultural resources.	Graham Bradner	4/22/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.43	3/11/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Why is a 40-mile tunnel being planned through the biggest equestrian [editor's note: I think she meant estuary?] on the west coast? The locations of the intakes are so sensitive to tribes, that it is unclear why they are even an option. The project wouldn't be built through someone else's cemetery. Besides the pipelines, there are other factors.	During the DCA analysis of the conceptual facilities plan, publicly available information related to sensitive land uses, including wildlife habitats, was used to develop sites for intakes, tunnel shafts, Southern Forebay, and South Delta Conveyance control structures. Locations of sensitive tribal areas were not publicly available to the DCA. DWR will consider comments submitted during the CEQA process to evaluate impacts related to environmental resources, including tribal considerations.	Graham Bradner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.44	3/11/2020	Malissa Tayaba	No one is talking about salmon or the animals. Native peoples have a direct relationship with the animals, land and water. Why haven't these factors been considered?	During the DCA analysis of the conceptual facilities plan, publicly available information related to sensitive land uses, including wildlife habitats, was used to develop sites for intakes, tunnel shafts, Southern Forebay, and South Delta Conveyance control structures. Locations of sensitive tribal areas were not publicly available to the DCA. DWR will consider comments submitted during the CEQA and tribal consultation processes to evaluate impacts related to environmental resources, including tribal considerations. DWR also will develop and evaluate options related to operations of the intakes along the Sacramento River and at the existing	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.45	3/11/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Tribes are still waiting for their AB 52 consultation. There are huge concerns with where the intakes are going and with the new roads. Those areas are all very important issues that tribes are waiting to discuss and adjust in their meetings with DWR.	DWR is conducting the AB 52 consultation and will consider information discussed in those consultations during the CEQA process.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.46	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Can members get a post-construction map that represents the truck traffic, activity and noise that will be present during operations?		Gwen Buchholz		For Future Discussion
6.47	3/11/2020	David Gloski	Is it possible at some point to develop an overlay of the benefits such as parks and other facilities that might be developed?		Gwen Buchholz		For Future Discussion
6.48	3/11/2020	Mike Moran	Is the New Hope Maintenance Tract at the same latitude on both corridors but closer to I-5 on the Eastern Corridor?	The information presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting related to the New Hope Tunnel Maintenance Shafts was incorrect. Updated material was provided at dcdca.org with the correct locations of the New Hope Maintenance Shafts for Central and Eastern corridors. The New Hope Maintenance Shaft for the Central Corridor is located to the northwest of the New Hope Maintenance Shaft for the Eastern Corridor.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.49	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	How will the new access road on Rough and Ready Island be connected to I-5?	In the conceptual facilities plan, access to the Lower Roberts Island Tunnel Reception and Launch Shafts would be from existing roads on Rough and Ready Island. New access roads would extend from Fyffe Street on the western side of the Port of Stockton lands to a new bridge over Burns Cut and continuing on Lower Roberts Island.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.5	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Can maps be revised to show how the roads connect to I-5?	An overall project logistics presentation will be provided in a future SEC meeting, including detailed truck and employee vehicle corridors to access each proposed construction site.	Gwen Buchholz		Responded
6.51	3/11/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Ms. Giacoma said she previously requested a list of the soil conditioners that will be used. The tracking packet said the request was responded to, but that list has not been received.	Page 38 of the response packet issued at the Feb 26 meeting and online at <a href="https://www.dcdca.org/pdf/2020-02-26-4a-FollowUpRoundtableonFebruary122020SECMeting.pdf">https://www.dcdca.org/pdf/2020-02-26-4a-FollowUpRoundtableonFebruary122020SECMeting.pdf</a> says: Many different types and brands of conditioners are used in tunneling based upon soil conditions present along the alignment. Conditioners are generally categorized as foams, polymers and bentonites. On recent projects, DCA consultants have observed the use of Soilax S products (available from the manufacturer Boraid Products) which are surfactants (i.e. detergents) and mixed with clean water as a foaming conditioner. Sometimes, a cellulose product, like Soilax C, is added into the conditioner mix to provide added strength to the soap bubbles, which helps when the conditioner is injected into certain soil formations. Thickening agents, such as polymers and a bentonite (a naturally occurring clay), are also used for different soil conditions. These include such products available from Mapei Products. These are just examples of some products that could be used. The construction specifications would require any conditioners to be inert (chemically inactive).	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.52	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Get BASF to provide material safety data sheets on soil conditioners	Material Safety Data Sheets for 2 of the conditioners previously evaluated have been included in the upcoming SEC materials.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.53	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Ms. Swenson said the Delta Protection Commission (DPC) is pushing forward the National Heritage movement in the Delta and she is dismayed at the parallel processes in light of Ms. Mallon's comments that DCA is working with them. DCA needs to work with everyone existing in the Delta, because while DCA is planning, the DPC is implementing a plan that you might be dropping a feature on top of or DPC might be doing improvements on an area that might not exist after the project. The DPC's actions with the Delta's National Heritage status shouldn't be wasted on areas that won't be of significance or relevance due to the project. There has to be more collaboration and close collaboration. DWR and DPC are both state departments that should be talking to one another.	The DCA and DWR are collaborating with the DPC and the other organizations and stakeholders within the Delta. Kathryn Mallon of DCA and Carrie Buckman of DWR have been coordinating with the Delta Protection Commission (DPC).	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.54	3/11/2020	David Gloski	The question tracking packet numbering was changed and it was difficult to find his earlier questions. Can members have an Excel version of the table so questions and status can be filtered? Also, a "closed" status could be helpful to distinguish between questions that received a response but are still outstanding and questions that have been completely resolved.	The DCA requests that SEC members identify questions that appear to continue to need further discussion or additional information to respond to the comment or question.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.55	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Can SEC members invite guests to attend the tours?	The DCA cannot provide public access to the tours due to logistics of the tours with the owner of the facility, liability concerns, and other constraints. Tours are intended to be an educational opportunity for SEC members and individual tours cannot include a quorum of SEC members due to Brown Act requirements.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.56	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Can members of the public follow the tour vehicles?	This question appears to be related to a tour of the facilities and other areas of the Delta. All tours, including the Delta Tour, have been postponed at this time. Once rescheduled, DCA will determine if non-SEC members could follow the SEC member tours in the Delta or if an itinerary or similar accommodation could be provided.	Andrew Finney	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.57	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	In a perfect world, what's the start date for construction year 1? Are we talking 2024? 2025? When will the project be started?	As described by DWR in the Scoping Process, the CEQA and permitting process would not be complete until at least the end of 2022. Design efforts could be completed in phases; to allow for initial early design projects, such as development of access roads or habitat mitigation areas. However, even the early design projects would not be initiated until after 2022. A schedule for design, land acquisition, final permitting, and construction have not been developed at this time.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.58	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Are we talking about a start date of 2027?	As described by DWR in the Scoping Process, the CEQA and permitting process would not be complete until at least the end of 2022. Design efforts could be completed in phases; to allow for initial early design projects, such as development of access roads or habitat mitigation areas. However, even the early design projects would not be initiated until after 2022. A schedule for design, land acquisition, final permitting, and construction have not been developed at this time.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.59	3/11/2020	Philip Merlo	What types of goodwill campaigns are you considering?		Josh Nelson	4/22/2020	For Future Discussion
6.6	3/11/2020	Gil Cosio	What's the estimated cubic yards needed for the new forebay levees?	Based on the conceptual facilities plan presented to the DCA, there would be approximately 10 to 12 million cubic yards of RTM depending upon the corridor and capacity of the Project. Approximately 60 to 70 percent of the RTM would be used in constructing the Southern Forebay.	Josh Nelson	4/22/2020	Responded
6.61	3/11/2020	Gil Cosio	What will go along the pipeline itself at the surface? Will those properties be impacted at all? The last plan included dewatering along pipeline. Is that going to happen this time?	As currently proposed, tunnel construction activities the tunnel alignment would occur at the tunnel shaft locations and tunnel shaft auxiliary areas, and along the modified or new corridors to connect the shaft locations to existing roadways. There would be no other construction activities within the tunnel alignment, including dewatering, at the ground surface between the tunnel shaft locations,	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.62	3/11/2020	Michael Moran	As far as the mitigation and goodwill effort, these things go in a sequence. Is there a way we can make that sequence public? That way folks can see there is that mitigation coming down the line and there could be some public benefit coming down the line. Talking to county's HCP and other jurisdictions that might be eager to look at mitigation funding and projects where this takes place and have that up front.		Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	For Future Discussion
6.63	3/11/2020	David Gloski	It sounded like you mentioned the Eastern one is easier to do, yet, the schedule looks like it's the same number of years. Is it the same cost? Does the "easiness" have anything to do with time and money?	The schedules for the Central and Eastern Corridor conceptual facilities plans presented at the previous SEC meetings were similar. The schedules are being further developed with more detailed analyses. Access to the tunnel shafts from major roadways would be more flexible under the Eastern Corridor as compared to the Central Corridor which could increase production rate of construction.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.64	3/11/2020	Douglas Hsai	If it takes longer to build the Eastern alignment, is there any other reason not to go for the Eastern alignment?	The CEQA process will analyze construction and operational changes to the physical, biological, and human environment as compared to existing conditions; and then, compare the results between the alternatives to identify the proposed project.	Graham Bradner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.65	3/11/2020	Gil Cosio	The recent NOP described the finished product as a tunnel dual conveyance. Will the DCA work on timing and the improvements needed for levee stabilization along the pathway?	DWR continues to evaluate and develop programs to improve levees throughout the Delta. These programs are separate projects and will be implemented with or without the Delta Conveyance Project.	Andrew Finney	4/22/2020	Responded
6.66	3/11/2020	Cecille Giacoma	There was the allusion to using spoils to improve the ability to carry on agriculture in area, as a by-product of this project to make improvements in the Delta, but how can agriculture carry on when water is diverted out of the Delta? Species have suffered from over drafting of water. Now you're going to put three more separate intakes in addition to the through Delta water removal, how will you support species and agriculture when so much water is being removed?	Potential use of RTM from the Delta Conveyance Project on agricultural lands has not been developed at this time. This type of opportunities to work together with the communities will be discussed at future SEC meetings. With respect to changes in water resources, the CEQA process will evaluate changes to water resources under construction and operation of the alternatives as compared to existing conditions.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.67	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	When will members see the impacts on properties across from the intakes? Would like to see some more detail about what will happen to the levees, the homes, and the folks that are directly across from intakes. Can those levees be armored? Do homes need to be set back? Which properties could potentially be in that footprint of impact directly across from the intakes?		Phil Ryan		For Future Discussion
6.68	3/11/2020	Sean Wirth	Since there is some flexibility in terms of the placement of the maintenance and the reception shafts, how would you bracket those on the map, in terms of the wiggle room north to south?	Based on the current conceptual facilities plan, the tunnel reception shaft locations can be moved if the tunnel drive length from the tunnel launch shaft remains within 15 miles. The tunnel maintenance shaft locations can be moved if the lengths between the adjacent shafts are within 4 to 5 miles. As noted in previous SEC meetings, the DCA has moved the shaft locations as new information becomes available. For example, following the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting, the tunnel maintenance shaft locations were slightly moved based upon information related to Staten Island.	Phil Ryan	4/22/2020	Responded
6.69	3/11/2020	Michael Moran	Where the barges are coming from and where are they going to? If you're so close to rail, why would you have barges?	<p>Barges are anticipated to be launched at existing ports near the Delta, including Port of Stockton, Port of Pittsburg, and Port of West Sacramento as well as commercial mooring facilities (e.g., facility in Rio Vista used to load barges with rock).</p> <p>Tunnel launch shaft sites were identified in the conceptual facilities plan to provide at least two forms of transportation from the options of roadways, barges, and/or rail. For example, tunnel launch shafts at Glanville Tract and Southern Forebay would be accessed by roadways and rail-served materials depots. However, because it would be difficult to access Bouldin Island by rail, the tunnel launch shaft site would be accessed by roadways and barges.</p>	Graham Bradner	4/22/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.7	3/11/2020	Philip Merlo	Regarding the rail possibility, to be clear, the RTM would go to Stockton for companies interested in using it for concrete?	Reuse of RTM by others has been discussed; however, detailed plans have not been developed at this time. The RTM is currently anticipated to be stored at the tunnel launch shaft sites and could be moved by barge or rail if those facilities remain following construction.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.71	3/11/2020	Douglas Hsai	In Santa Clara muck was being shipped to Tracy. Does anyone know where in Tracy they're shipping to?	The DCA has requested information from the Silicon Valley Clean Water Program related to reuse of the RTM.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.72	3/11/2020	Michael Moran	Does material coming out of Lower Roberts site need to go to the Southern Forebay?	As set forth in the conceptual facilities plan, RTM for construction of the Southern Forebay embankments would primarily be from the tunnel launch shafts located near the Southern Forebay and delivered by rail from the Glanville Tract tunnel launch shafts to reduce RTM storage.	Phil Ryan	4/22/2020	Responded
6.73	3/10/2020	David Gloski	I think it was said that the standard regulation is 27% open area but I think it was also said that in California the reg is 50% open area. Can someone explain this and explain why California allows twice the open area?	Land use planning is completed by local agencies, generally by cities and counties. The State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research issue General Plan Guidelines which include guidance for local agencies to establish open space goals for the regional plans. These open space goals could be included in local community development plans.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.74	3/10/2020	David Gloski	I'd like to hear a discussion about the risk of overruns and loss of budget. How can the project be structured so that everyone in the Delta can be assured that the project is not stopped half way due to budget problems and the land, facilities and everything is just left in some limbo state?	Delta Conveyance would be funded by the water users that would use the project, not the State of California. Specific financial plans have not been developed at this time; however, those plans will need to be complete prior to initiation of construction.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.75	3/10/2020	David Gloski	Regarding the tables associated with estimates of trucks, barges, trains, etc. At one point it was said that these tables will be constantly updated. Can we get dates on the tables then so we know what version we have when we have one in front of us or two and we don't know which one is the latest.	Dates will be provided on future copies of the logistics tables.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.76	3/13/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Can you tell me how much RTM there will be?	The actual amount of RTM would depend upon length and diameter of the tunnel. Based on the conceptual facilities plan, RTM would range from 10 to 12 million cubic yards.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.77	3/11/2020	Philip Merlo	What types of archaeological studies are going to take place?	DWR's CEQA process would include archaeological evaluation of potential changes due to the construction and operation of the Delta Conveyance alternatives as compared to the existing conditions. DWR is leading the AB 52 and DWR's tribal engagement policy. DWR will consider information discussed in those consultations during the CEQA process.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.78	3/11/2020	Peter Robertson	Had the DCA been able to produce an overlay for the maps with channel markers?	Potential barge routes evaluated by the DCA did consider channel widths and depths as provided by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Nautical Charts and DWR bathymetric data and based upon discussions with Delta maritime contractors. This information, as well as information related to bridges, was used to identify waterway reaches in the Delta that could and could not support barge operations.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.79	3/30/2020	Peter Robertson	Who is going to communicate with boaters about in-water work? Coast Guard or DCA?	During construction, frequent notifications would be sent by DCA to the Coast Guard and California Division of Boating and Waterways of on-going in-water construction activities, and these agencies would post these notifications. In addition, signs would be posted alerting boaters of on-going in-water construction activities. Approvals of in-water construction activities would be obtained from the Coast Guard during the permitting process.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.8	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will we have a session where we can review and discuss DWR's HABs data and the SCCWRP HABs Impacts Study that was discussed on the Region 5 Water Board HABs Committee update Monday? What I am looking for is how alignment choice will impact development of HABS and if there is an opportunity to use the project to increase water circulation in hotspots to mitigate HABs early on/and in later years of project operation.	Water quality and HABs will be part of the environmental analysis that DWR will conduct in the EIR.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.81	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Observation: 10 feet perimeter levee seems too low to protect RTM with flood at Twin Cities Rd.		Gwen Buccholz		For Future Discussion
6.82	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	New Hope Maintenance Tract: Walnut Grove Rd. is loaded with farm trucks. What will impacts be on Greater Sandhill Cranes on Staten Island with road extension and truck traffic?		Gwen Buccholz		For Future Discussion
6.83	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Bouldin Island -- the bedrooms are impossible around the first 8 days of July for barge traffic; same for other holiday weekends.	During construction, frequent notifications would be sent by DCA to the Coast Guard and California Division of Boating and Waterways of on-going in-water construction activities, and these agencies would post these notifications. In addition, signs would be posted alerting boaters of on-going in-water construction activities. Approvals of in-water construction activities would be obtained from the Coast Guard during the permitting process.	Carrie Buckman		Responded
6.84	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Byron Tract -- Is there RTM? containment of soil for schools in Byron is a concern				For Future Discussion
6.85	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will RTM at South Forebay cover plants essential to Native American practices found in that area? And burial grounds? (I don't need answer; tribes do)				For Future Discussion

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.01	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	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. I am not worried about the operation of managing water and flow creating a flood condition. I am sure that will be worked out. Is this being built to a 200-year standard?	DWR will analyze potential air quality impacts and mitigation as part of the EIR preparation. However, currently available technology includes a range of options to reduce air quality emissions. For example, dust issues at batch plants primarily occur as the dry ingredients are mixed together prior to the addition of water to make the concrete, slurry, or grout. The batch plants would be required to install the equipment that receives and mixes the dry ingredients within a shelter that includes large fans and air filtration equipment to minimize particulate matter (dust) from leaving the construction site. The maximum amount of dust leaving the construction site would be regulated by the Regional Air Quality Management District. In addition, many earthwork types of earthwork equipment are currently being provide as hybrid diesel-electric engines to reduce emissions. Electric engines would be used for generator sets, air compressors, and other equipment to the extent practical.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.02	4/22/2020	David Gloski	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?	Little Potato Slough is shallower than Potato Slough. The proposed barge landing along Bouldin Island would be located in Potato Slough with nearby access to the San Joaquin River.	Jiim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.03	4/22/2020	Sean Wirth	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. 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.	If this comment is associated with Staten Island maintenance shaft site, the proposed shaft site was moved north of the previously identified site.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.04	4/22/2020	David Gloski	It may be a good idea to add this area [Bouldin Island Barge Landing] to a tour so that there is a clearer understanding of what is out there.	This area would be considered as part of future tours of potential DCA facility locations.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.05	4/22/2020	Anna 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.	The term "Regenerative Ag" on Bouldin Island was included in a presentation to the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. The term generally means a combination of farming based on a combination of biodiversity, watershed improvements, agroforestry, and enhanced ecosystems that includes capture of carbon in soils and associated biomass (including covering peat soils) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.06	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	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. What happens on the landside of the barge landing?	The proposed barge landing along Bouldin Island would be located in Potato Slough with nearby access to the San Joaquin River. The barge landing would be approximately 1,200 feet long along the bank of the river or slough and would be constructed into the existing levee to minimize extension into the waterway. The barge landing would extend approximately 600 feet to the landside of the existing levee. Trucks would drive on the landside of the levee and move materials from barges to the launch shaft site.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.07	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacomia	How exactly would barges go around Sherman Island?	Barges from the Port of West Sacramento would enter the Sacramento River and navigate under the Rio Vista Bridge and Three Mile Slough Bridge to the proposed barge landing on Bouldin Island. Barges from the Port of Stockton would navigate the San Joaquin River to Potato Slough without crossing under any bridges.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.08	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	Would a noise factor be involved? 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.	DWR will evaluate the potential effects of barge traffic on noise in the waterways as part of the EIR preparation.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.09	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	Would the barge stay there until another barge comes and picks it up?	The tugboat would remain with the barge until it would be unloaded, and then the tugboat would return the barge to the main port.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.1	4/22/2020	James Cox	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.	Under the current options, the barge routes would remain in the San Joaquin River/Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel and would not enter Sherman Lake and the Lower Sherman Island Wildlife Area.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.11	4/22/2020	Michael Moran	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.	Under the current options, barges would travel Three-Mile Slough only if the goods were being transported from the Port of West Sacramento. All other barges would remain the San Joaquin River/Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.12	4/22/2020	James Cox	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.	Under the current options, barges would not enter Broad Slough or the Lower Sherman Island Wildlife Area, and would remain the San Joaquin River/Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.13	4/22/2020	Michael Moran	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.	It is recognized that the proposed barge route between the Port of West Sacramento and the proposed barge landings at either Bouldin Island or Lower Roberts Island would include several reaches that could cause delays due to shallow and or narrow waterways and schedules for two operable bridges.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.14	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	There are a couple of areas that Ms. Mann provided to the DCA staff that would be affected by the Central Route, but those don't appear to be reflected on the map. The Mildred Anchorage Area is not noted and neither is Byron Elementary School.	The map discussed at the April 2020 SEC meeting did not include all of the features presented on other DCA maps.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.15	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacomia	The barge depth will need to be compared to the channel depth if you intend to go around Sherman Island.	It is recognized that the proposed barge routes outside of the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel would include several reaches that could cause delays due to shallow and or narrow waterways where navigation would be required to wait until appropriate tide levels and that smaller barges would be required.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
7.16	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacomia	Where does the borrow come from? Referring to the clay to mix with the fines.	Under the current proposal, soils for constructing embankments and other fills would be provided from several locations. On many sites, fine-grained clayey material needed for construction would be excavated at the construction site, including at the intake sites. The RTM would be used to construct the Southern Forebay embankments and the elevated structures at the tunnel shaft sites. Soils purchased from existing commercial businesses also would be used, including clay materials to form the center of the Southern Forebay embankments and structures at the tunnel launch shaft sites prior to generation of RTM.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
7.17	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	There is a lot of subsidence on Bouldin Island and a 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.	Ground improvement would occur at areas on Bouldin Island to strengthen the soils beneath the proposed structures and areas to be filled, including the tunnel shaft site, tunnel segment storage areas, and barge landing.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
7.18	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacomia	When will the biological surveys be completed for Bouldin Island and where will the burrow fill for the tunnel shaft be acquired?	DWR will evaluate biological characteristics of project sites for the selected alternatives as part of the EIR preparation. The proposed tunnel shaft would be constructed from material transported from the tunnel shaft construction site at Glanville Tract.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
7.19	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacomia	Is the team aware that Bouldin Island is -17 feet elevation? The levees on the south side are very fragile.	The subsidence and levee conditions at Bouldin Island have been considered. Ground improvement and levee strengthening on the interior landside of the levees would need to occur prior to construction of a tunnel shaft.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
7.2	4/22/2020	Gil Cosio	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.	The graphic presented at the April 2020 SEC meeting was developed several years ago for another project. As part of the EIR preparation, DWR will identify necessary mitigation and consider methods (and sites) to implement the mitigation needs.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.21	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	DWR sent out guidelines for their participation with the project and it clearly stated how they intend to participate with the Delta. I do not see how that is possible with the current state. I 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.	DWR has acknowledged the need to find creative ways to ensure continued access to public information and participation as it continues important work, and has generated some possible ideas for doing so while also following public health protocols. These ideas are a mix of electronic and non-electronic means, among other strategies. From the blog post: "Public engagement in government-led processes is critical and we need to find ways to enable every member of the community to have access."	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded
7.22	4/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	I am also interested in the fish screen because I read that Clifton Forebay has a nonperforming fish screen getting all the smelt. I am more interested in why that cannot be fixed.	<p>The Delta Conveyance Project does not include any improvements to Clifton Court Forebay or the existing fish facilities in the South Delta. The DCP objective is to improve water supply reliability for the State Water Project. The new intake facilities and conveyance system are physically separated from the existing South Delta facilities for this purpose.</p> <p>The existing SWP (and CVP) fish facilities in the South Delta use louvered screening and fish collection systems that behaviorally separate fish from the diverted flow and draw the fish into large collection tanks. These fish are then routinely transported to fish release sites in the western Delta, well away from the South Delta diversion's hydraulic influence. While these systems are not as efficient as new facilities, DWR continues to maintain and improve the fish collection systems so they perform as intended. All fish losses are monitored and mitigated per existing agreements and permitting requirements with the fish agencies. Fish losses due to high predation rates across Clifton Court Forebay, located just upstream of the SWP fish facility, are probably more significant than the facility fish losses. DWR is currently engaged in significant predator removal programs within the CCF to reduce these potential losses. DWR is investigating long term strategies and solutions in the South Delta to reduce these losses, in collaboration with the fish agencies. DWR operates to reduce diversions in the South Delta, when sensitive species are most vulnerable to losses, in accordance with our Incidental Take Permit for Long-Term Operations. DWR is also evaluating long term operational strategies using the DCP diversions to allow flexible water withdrawals between North and South Delta facilities to reduce overall fish losses in the Delta.</p>	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded



SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.23	4/22/2020	James Cox	<p>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.</p>	See response to above comment.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.24	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Is that from the fourth climate change analysis? I would strongly urge a comparison be done to the report from the fourth climate change analysis because my 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.	The climate change and sea level rise projections were prepared by DWR based upon the recent published analyses completed by the State of California. The climate change projections for river flows include consideration of changes in hydrologic conditions in the upper watersheds of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. Flood protection of project facilities and operations to address climate change and sea level rise is one of the primary goals of the project team. Climate Change and Sea Level Rise assumptions for design and operations analysis of the Delta Conveyance Project are consistent with the projections that were part of California's 4th Climate Change Assessment. Design of the new facilities will be based extreme sea level rise projection for 2100 along with late century 200-year Climate Change hydrology. DWR is also using the latest available dataset of Global Climate Models (GCMs) to develop future hydrology scenarios. We are using most current science and climate change data for conceptual design with a recognition that Climate Change and Sea Level Rise projections are evolving and further analysis using updated data and tools may be necessary for final design and construction. As part of the water resiliency portfolio approach, State and local efforts will be needed to address levee integrity and general Delta inundation with changing climate and sea level rise.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.25	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	The only way in and out of Discovery Bay is on the river that this goes right under, and that is an issue.	New map books will be provided for the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.26	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	The maintenance shaft looks very close to the water treatment plant and sewage plant that serve the residents of Discovery Bay and Byron. That is the only drinking water for as many as 20,000 people.	The proposed Byron Tract Tunnel Maintenance Shaft is located on property to the east of the Discovery Bay community. The water and wastewater facilities that serve Discovery Bay and that are located to the north of State Route 4 are located within the Discovery Bay community. The tunnel shaft construction would include installation of a slurry wall or diaphragm wall around the shaft to isolate the construction site from adjacent groundwater and surface water.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.27	4/22/2020	David Gloski	Is there any gateway to the Delta on the I-5, like a visitor's center? That is an idea of what could be done there.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits and site reuse as part of the proposed project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits including the community's vision for a visitor's center, and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in a visitor's center for the Delta.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.28	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	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.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits and site reuse as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits including the community's vision for a visitor's center and recreational opportunities, and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in a visitor's center for the Delta.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.29	4/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	The entry point for the Delta should be Freeport at the Cosumnes.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits including the community's vision for a visitor's center and recreational opportunities at several locations throughout the Delta, and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in a visitor's center for the Delta.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.3	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	There should be collaboration with the Delta Protection Commission to ensure any visitor center plan isn't a duplicated effort.	The DCA and DWR have been meeting with the Delta Protection Commission, and will continue to meet with this agency as the project progresses.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.31	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	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?	The DCA and DWR have been meeting with the Delta Protection Commission, and will continue to meet with this agency as the project progresses.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.32	4/22/2020	Peter Robertson	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.	As a general rule, any land and/or easements utilized for the Delta Conveyance Project would be acquired by DWR (potentially with the DCA acting as DWR's agent).	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.33	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	It is questionable that the Governor wants DCA to move forward at this time, and a direct order from him is requested.	The DCA team would be happy to work with any interested stakeholder groups who would like presentations of our materials. The DCA will make staff available at mutually suitable times and will follow the latest health and safety guidelines put forth by the state to keep themselves and members of the public safe. In the near future, the DCA can help organize online presentations as needed and move towards in person meetings if/when those are allowed and desired. Materials are always available on our website, printed materials distribution is not guaranteed at this time.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.34	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	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.	Please refer to <a href="https://covid19.ca.gov/img/Executive-Order-N-33-20.pdf">https://covid19.ca.gov/img/Executive-Order-N-33-20.pdf</a> for more information on EXECUTIVE ORDER N-33-20 on the Governor's State of Emergency declaration and Memorandum on Identification of Essential Critical Infrastructure. Please note that Director Nemeth, as the Governor's representative, has directed DWR to continue its work on the Delta Conveyance Project.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
7.35	4/22/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Has the DCA 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.	Due to historic floods within and near Glanville Tract, a ring levee would be constructed around the proposed Twin Cities Consolidation Center and other parts of the tunnel launch shaft site during construction. The ring levee would be removed following removal of the construction equipment.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.36	4/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	Only intakes 2, 3 and 5 are shown. What happened to intakes 1 and 4?	Due to historic floods within and near Glanville Tract, a ring levee would be constructed around the proposed Twin Cities Consolidation Center and other parts of the tunnel launch shaft site during construction. The ring levee would be removed following removal of the construction equipment.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
7.37	4/22/2020	Michael Moran	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?	Potential modification of traffic corridors will be discussed at the May 2020 SEC meeting to obtain further information.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.38	4/22/2020	Sean Wirth	The situation is that either the local residents are affected, or the wildlife species are affected. Anything to reduce the length of the roads would help, and splitting it would be better than nothing.	Potential modification of traffic corridors will be discussed at the May 2020 SEC meeting to obtain further information.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.39	4/22/2020	Sean Wirth	I spoke to the Friends of Stone Lakes and the Stone Lakes managers. The north/south road 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.	The DCA team is still working on the RTM balance to provide adequate soils to tunnel shaft sites, Southern Forebay, and potential mitigation sites to be considered by DWR. The RTM also could be considered for reuse by other entities in the Delta which have not been identified at this time.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.4	4/22/2020	David Gloski	Where is the RTM going generated by the Bouldin Island Launch Shaft?	The DCA team is still working on the RTM balance to provide adequate soils to tunnel shaft sites, Southern Forebay, and potential mitigation sites to be considered by DWR. The RTM also could be considered for reuse by other entities in the Delta which have not been identified at this time.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded
7.41	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	How many Reclamation Districts have signed up to take the RTM?	The DCA team is still working on the RTM balance to determine the volume of RTM that would be available for non-project uses. At this point in time, the DCA team has not contacted reclamation districts to determine the future demand for RTM.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded
7.42	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Perhaps the RTM could be provided to RD's for free.	As currently planned, the surplus soil material could be made available to reclamation districts without charge. However, loading, transporting, logistics, and determination of the suitability of the soil material for the reclamation districts' purposes would be the responsibility of the reclamation districts.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.43	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacomia	The ITR stated the RTM was not reusable?	The analysis of the RTM characteristics was not available to the Independent Technical Review (ITR) that reviewed the Tunnel options. The ITR based their comments on their past experiences on other projects that were not located in the Delta. There will be additional work conducted to demonstrate that the RTM can be reused. DCA engineers are confident that the material is appropriate to use for embankments with proper drying of the material and construction with a clay core in the embankment in the same manner as other levees throughout the Delta.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded
7.44	4/22/2020	James Wallace	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.	The RTM material would be homogenized at the tunnel launch sites and at the construction sites. The embankment material would need to include at least 20 to 30 percent fine material. Based upon current geotechnical information, it appears that the tunnel would be bored in areas that would generate material that would produce appropriate soils. RTM materials that would not meet the embankment design criteria would be placed in a separate location at the RTM storage area.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded
7.45	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	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.	The DCA is aware of the limitations of existing first responder agencies throughout the Delta. Emergency response facilities and crews would be required to be provided by the Delta Conveyance Project in accordance with the requirements of California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) at the tunnel launch shaft sites and near the intake sites. DCA would like to work with the communities to identify methods to help supplement community emergency services.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.46	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	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?	As proposed, the Southern Forebay would include an Emergency Spillway in accordance with the Division of Safety of Dams requirements in case the water levels rise above the freeboard elevation (probably due to extensive rainfall at the Southern Forebay). The water would flow through the bypass into Italian Slough where the water would flow into Old River and the Delta.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.47	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	Would 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?	The Southern Forebay emergency spillway would be designed for flows that would occur when the forebay would be full with excessive rainfall on the forebay water surface with the unlikely occurrence of a malfunction of controls such as failure of fail safe devices, power outages, and/or gate malfunctions that would not reduce flows from the intakes. Although these conditions are highly unlikely to occur, the emergency spillway must be designed to consider these potentially rare events which could release up to 6,000 cubic feet/second into Italian Slough with flows into Old River and other south Delta channels. However, without the emergency spillway to control releases of overflows under this highly unlikely event. The overtopping and loss of the embankment cause flooding of Byron Tract and surrounding areas.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.48	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	The odds of this flooding our properties are becoming more likely.	The Southern Forebay emergency spillway would be designed for flows that would occur when the forebay would be full with excessive rainfall on the forebay water surface with the unlikely occurrence of a malfunction of controls such as failure of fail safe devices, power outages, and/or gate malfunctions that would not reduce flows from the intakes. Although these conditions are highly unlikely to occur, the emergency spillway must be designed to consider these potentially rare events which could release up to 6,000 cubic feet/second into Italian Slough with flows into Old River and other south Delta channels. However, without the emergency spillway to control releases of overflows under this highly unlikely event. The overtopping and loss of the embankment cause flooding of Byron Tract and surrounding areas.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.49	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	What will be the ongoing noise from the operation on the surrounding communities? I would like to see a map in detail of what the houses would look like and where they are in relation to this.	Regarding work in the Southern Complex Area discussed at the April 22 SEC Meeting: Noise should be minimal from the facilities to the nearby homes at most construction sites. DWR will analyze potential for noise effects at sensitive receptors during construction and operations as part of preparation of the EIR.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.5	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Why would the tunnel ever need to be dewatered? What scenario would make that relevant?	The tunnel would need to be dewatered for inspection on a periodic basis. The inspection interval has not been determined. However, inspection once every 10 years could occur. To dewater the tunnel, water would be pumped at the Pumping Plant and discharged into the forebay in a manner similar to normal operations.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.51	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Are the trucks hauling borrow fill are included in the truck traffic graphic?	Most of the RTM and soil material would be moved to the Southern Forebay by rail. Trucks would be used to move this material between tunnel shaft locations and other construction sites. The projected truck trips are being developed and will be discussed further at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.52	4/22/2020	David Gloski	I'm glad to see Italian Slough will be utilized. 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? Asked Carrie if there are plans to look at this as part of the CEQA process.	The Emergency Spillway into Italian Slough would only be used for an extremely rare emergency situation. Currently, there are no plans to discharge flows from the Southern Forebay into Italian Slough or other surface waters. DWR will be analyzing the effects to water quality (including algae) as part of the preparation of the EIR. At that time, they will assess the potential mitigation measures, including an option to use water from the forebay to improve quality in the south Delta.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.53	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	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. Does that mean it would be incorporated into construction at this time or would it be run separately?	<p>The Delta Conveyance Project does not include any improvements to Clifton Court Forebay or the existing fish facilities in the South Delta. The DCP objective is to improve water supply reliability for the State Water Project. The new intake facilities and conveyance system are physically separated from the existing South Delta facilities for this purpose.</p> <p>The existing SWP (and CVP) fish facilities in the South Delta use louvered screening and fish collection systems that behaviorally separate fish from the diverted flow and draw the fish into large collection tanks. These fish are then routinely transported to fish release sites in the western Delta, well away from the South Delta diversion's hydraulic influence. While these systems are not as efficient as new facilities, DWR continues to maintain and improve the fish collection systems so they perform as intended. All fish losses are monitored and mitigated per existing agreements and permitting requirements with the fish agencies. Fish losses due to high predation rates across Clifton Court Forebay, located just upstream of the SWP fish facility, are probably more significant than the facility fish losses. DWR is currently engaged in significant predator removal programs within the CCF to reduce these potential losses. DWR is investigating long term strategies and solutions in the South Delta to reduce these losses, in collaboration with the fish agencies. DWR operates to reduce diversions in the South Delta, when sensitive species are most vulnerable to losses, in accordance with our Incidental Take Permit for Long-Term Operations. DWR is also evaluating long term operational strategies using the DCP diversions to allow flexible water withdrawals between North and South Delta facilities to reduce overall fish losses in the Delta.</p>	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded
7.54	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Air quality: We need to see some strong documentation that shows that we are moving to electric construction equipment etc. to eliminate the diesel emissions. And will air quality impacts require green planting around the community of Byron for air filtration? Indoor air monitors and extra air filtration equipment for area schools?	<p>Unlike the South Delta fish facilities, the new fish screens are placed for the</p> <p>The DCA has identified the current availability of electric equipment, hybrid diesel construction equipment and transit trucks, compressed natural gas trucks and other equipment, Tier 4 construction equipment and transit trucks, Tier 4 locomotives, and hybrid and electric vehicles to move employees and materials between sites. It is anticipated that over the next 15 years as the project is designed and constructed, the availability of electric and hybrid equipment and vehicles will increase including for tugboats. The EIR will analyze potential changes in air quality and identify potential mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse impacts.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.55	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	I am guessing that the truck trips, railroad deliveries etc to this significant construction zone are coming from the Port of Stockton. I believe the area from the Port of Stockton to Clifton Court needs to be treated as an air pollution corridor during construction. Air filtration, green plantings around schools and houses, indoor air monitors, noise barriers for schools need to be targeted around Boggs Trac, Conway Homes, Weston Ranch, and other areas in South Stockton adjacent to this traffic corridor. South Stockton is one of the most tree barren areas in the State, temperatures from climate change in the summer are already 10 degrees higher than in North Stockton, death rates fall 18 years younger in age, and this area experiences the 4th highest rate of asthma in the country. Truck traffic, needed Port expansion, concrete batching, train and barge traffic, will make these conditions all worse. Can mitigation include a major tree planting effort within these communities and funding for local NGOs to hire local workers to do the planting and tree maintenance? We need to transform these communities into green corridors during construction to offset impacts. The goal should be to leave the community better than you found it.	As part of the EIR preparation, DWR will analyze potential changes in air quality due to implementation of the alternatives and identify potential mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse impacts, including public health impacts. The air quality analysis will be conducted for each construction site and within each air basin. Potential air quality considerations will be discussed at future SEC meetings.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.56	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	We have difficulties in the Iron Triangle, center of railroad traffic in South Stockton presently. It is an overly crowded train traffic area, and we have problems with trains idling engines for long periods of time. We need the power of the State of California and the DCA to improve this situation with construction so that idling/air pollution is reduced at that site as well.		Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	For Future Discussion

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.57	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	For the Port of Stockton, if the DCA is going to use electric barges etc., we need to work together to push the Port to being a clean Port. We need the jobs in SJ County, and many fine people are part of Port leadership. They are community oriented, but they do things oddly, like not publish or notify the public about EIRs for Port expansion. If this project comes to pass, community benefits to offset construction impacts should focus on modernizing the Port of Stockton and making it a model, clean Port. I will again address Port concerns with this project when I discuss water quality and HABs in a later point.		Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	For Future Discussion
7.59	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	There are studies of the impact of blowing peat soils on communities of color and lung disease in South Stockton from the mid-20th century. Blowing peat causes lung disease and soils with Chromium 6 are a double threat. I know in a prior meeting Kathryn, you said, that we should assume that you will follow best practices. What would be helpful would be a good description of what containment looks like. Explain it to us -- the plans for that -- so that we can train groups to be active citizen monitors. The project could very well outlive some of us. Let's make sure that Delta residents can watch and know that things are being done right, and can report properly and factually if things go wrong. The more the public knows the better. This has been a big lesson of COVID19. More information alleviates fear because the public can monitor what is happening in a factual way.	Excavated peat soils would be placed in previously excavated holes on the construction site and covered with non-peat soil material present on the construction site, including RTM or topsoil. This method would reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the peat soils and minimize the peat dust from leaving the construction site.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.6	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Neighbors -- There are some longtime farming families living on each side of the proposed South Delta pumping operations. I cannot imagine how any of them could handle living and farming anywhere around that construction zone, even if they are on the opposite side of the proposed construction sites. Please work with care with them. Do right by them. All the air quality comments above apply to them, as they are mostly elderly people, and need protection as well. Also will their water wells for home and farming operations be dewatered? How will you take care of their water needs?	Use of construction methods to reduce dust from leaving the construction site would be implemented at all construction areas. Slurry walls or diaphragm walls would be constructed at the intake, tunnel shaft, pumping plant, and forebay construction sites prior to major excavations to isolate the construction site from the adjacent surface water and groundwater. These methods would protect wells used by homes and farming operations during dewatering activities. Groundwater and surface water monitoring also would occur.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.61	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	<p>The existing South Delta pumping area was built on top of a Yokuts village. Testimony by tribal experts as part of the CWIN case at the SWRCB for WaterFix covered how they return to this area for native plants that are part of cultural practices to this day. I have heard criticism from some of our tribal reps at recent meetings about the consultation process with DWR. While RTD cannot speak for tribes, we have great empathy for their historical losses in California and advocate for protection of their cultural practices and protection of the natural world on their behalf. If this project advances, please do not just disregard these concerns. Are there ways for these native plants to be moved, replanted and protected? Is there a way to honor their history and culture near new facilities? I don't think such offers make up for the losses endured -- in a way my white person suggestion feels like offering a Disneyland version, or whitewashing, of nature in place of real nature. However, somehow, something needs to happen to recognize the true history, the loss, and reconciliation/inclusion of California tribes if this project moves forward so they can gain strength spiritually, culturally, and economically in California. What would water reparations look like for the water rights to the Delta that they were stripped of by the genocide? This is between you and the tribes, but how this is handled can either show real generosity of spirit from the water contractors and the State of California, or not. Again, we believe that the most impacted parties must somehow see benefits. We see tribes as the most impacted parties historically.</p>	<p>DWR is engaging with tribes through consultation under AB 52 and DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy. To initiate this process, DWR reached out through letters and emails to 121 tribes throughout the study area. DWR has reached out to all tribes that responded. Due to the COVID-19 public health situation, some tribes want to delay discussions regarding this project. DWR has met virtually with interested tribes, and communicated with remaining tribes that they will be available to meet when the tribe is ready. DWR will work with these tribes to identify potential effects to tribal cultural resources and consider potential mitigation measures.</p>	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded



SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.62	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	How much total electricity will be used for operations at the new South Delta Pumping Facilities? Current pumping requires roughly 15% of the state's electricity (somewhere around there, I would have to dig for the exact number). Are we looking at solar operations to reduce energy use? One of our critiques of WaterFix and other state plans is that energy/greenhouse mitigation is too often based on buying credits elsewhere in the world. This means we live with construction, water, and air pollution impacts without receiving the benefits of mitigation. If electricity consumption is going to remain the same or increase from new pumping operations, can mitigation in energy consumption be directed toward the Delta environmental justice communities? For instance, how many low income Stockton, Iselton, Antioch, North Delta residents can be provided with solar panels/systems to mitigate a set percentage of decrease in energy consumption? Or can struggling cities and towns, and school districts be the beneficiary of provided solar systems as well to offset increases or lack of reduction in energy use. We would really like to see a switch where community benefits mitigate pollution and climate change impacts related to creation of the project within the Delta first. The project is Delta-centric; make the offsets into community benefits; and make them Delta-centric. The people who live with the impacts should receive the lion's share of benefits.		Carrie Buckman		For Future Discussion

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.63	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Carrie, you said that you would apply the 4th Climate Change analysis to flood protection analysis of the new South Delta facilities. Our concern is not just sea level rise, but storm surge, along with SJ River inundation. This is one of our primary concerns regarding Delta management with or without the tunnel. French Camp slough and the SJ River is the site of the greatest potential for overtopping, and area adjacent to the large Conway Homes public housing community, but everything downstream from that point is at risk, including new Delta pumping facilities. I am glad to hear that you are using sea level rise data for the year 2100. Phil had told me 200-year Army Corps standards at a prior meeting without mentioning this additional standard. Comparing it to DWR's own analysis is essential. Share the answer with us. And please, please, please update design to match flood analysis with climate change modeling up until the time construction begins. You need to be constant consumers of climate change literature and adjust levee protection accordingly. You cannot rely on data from 2010. It seems to me to be a very expensive project for roughly a 50 year life-span. While we may not support the project as the best solution for water management with climate change, we also don't want it to fail if it goes forward. Failure with climate change is not an option. Failure will result in deaths and catastrophic economic loss in our region and for water supply for others. Our sincere critique here is for you all to be nimble and to get it right.	DWR is using the future projections of San Joaquin River inflow (and 10.2 feet of sea level rise) as part of the modeling effort to identify flood levels that must be considered within the new facilities design. Please see earlier comment response regarding the 4th Climate Change Analysis.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.64	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	HABs -- I am writing these comments while watching the CA Water Boards' Region V workshop on HABs. Restore the Delta is pursuing funding to become a HABs testing and tracking site with an emphasis on citizen science conducted by area youth. Our goal is to provide lots of data so that we and the Water Boards can understand how HABs are proliferating and work toward elimination of causes. I am particularly concerned about how South Delta Facility construction could increase HABs proliferation? We have seen increased HABs incidents related to barrier installation during the drought around Bradford Island. What are plans for HABs mitigation during South Delta Facility construction? Are floating wetlands a possibility to absorb nutrient loads released during dredging and construction in surrounding rivers and sloughs?	DWR will analyze changes in water quality due to implementation of the alternatives in the EIR, including construction-related water quality concerns.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.65	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Opportunities for restoring Mormon Slough with flows off of the Stockton East diverting canal -- similar to the Truckee Creek in Reno. Such flows could help to recirculate water into the Stockton waterfront and reduce HABs. The restoration of Mormon Slough would be a new source of water and riparian restoration. It could also work as an urban renewal program for South Stockton, providing new recreation opportunities, tree planting, and urban walkways. (A San Antonio/Reno river walkway with pocket parks to honor the cultural history of the Delta).	DWR will be analyzing the effects to water quality (including HABs) as part of the preparation of the EIR. At that time, they will assess the potential mitigation measures, including opportunities at Mormon Slough.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded
7.66	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Increased aeration systems installed by the Port of Stockton, State, and local government entities around the Stockton waterfront and near marinas across the South Delta. We also believe that we need in addition to a pipe for the Stockton drinking water plant, some small pipes of water to get freshwater into the Stockton waterfront to prevent HABs.	DWR will be analyzing the effects to water quality and water supply as part of the preparation of the EIR. At that time, they will assess the potential mitigation measures.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.67	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	An aggressive state effort to reduce nitrate loads by the Port, upstream dischargers, and local industry so as to reduce HABs proliferation.	DWR will be analyzing the effects to water quality as part of the preparation of the EIR. At that time, they will assess the potential mitigation measures.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.68	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Fish screens. I asked my question about the installation of new fish screens for exiting pumps that will be used maybe half the time with the new tunnel facility. Carrie, DWR maintains it is a separate project. This is not right. If we are rebuilding the South Delta facility, let's fix all of its elements. Not doing so would be akin to remodeling a new home and failing to replace the failing electrical system because it is a "separate" project. Frankly, we have given up on the idea at RTD that beneficiaries will ever pay for screen replacement on existing pumps. We would support state financing of such a repair and would work to bring the public along to supporting that idea. In a post-Covid world, it would be a waste of a good opportunity to do the job the right way and reduce the kill of endangered fish.	<p>The Delta conveyance project does not include any improvements to Clifton Court Forebay or the existing fish facilities in the South Delta. The DCP objective is to improve water supply reliability for the State Water Project. The new intake facilities and conveyance system are physically separated from the existing South Delta facilities for this purpose.</p> <p>The existing SWP (and CVP) fish facilities in the South Delta use louvered screening and fish collection systems that behaviorally separate fish from the diverted flow and draw the fish into large collection tanks. These fish are then routinely transported to fish release sites in the western Delta, well away from the South Delta diversion's hydraulic influence. While these systems are not as efficient as new facilities, DWR continues to maintain and improve the fish collection systems so they perform as intended. All fish losses are monitored and mitigated per existing agreements and permitting requirements with the fish agencies. Fish losses due to high predation rates across Clifton Court Forebay, located just upstream of the SWP fish facility, are probably more significant than the facility fish losses. DWR is currently engaged in significant predator removal programs within the CCF to reduce these potential losses. DWR is investigating long term strategies and solutions in the South Delta to reduce these losses, in collaboration with the fish agencies. DWR operates to reduce diversions in the South Delta, when sensitive species are most vulnerable to losses, in accordance with our Incidental Take Permit for Long-Term Operations. DWR is also evaluating long term operational strategies using the DCP diversions to allow flexible water withdraws between North and South Delta facilities to reduce overall fish losses in the Delta.</p> <p>Unlike the South Delta fish facilities, the new fish screens proposed for the</p>	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.69	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	<p>Restore the Delta seeks to create a citizen science program that will move youth from some of our more challenged communities into becoming water scientists, engineers, historians, advocates etc via HABs monitoring and testing. Other groups we work with are developing citizen science and employment opportunities around climate change mitigation and air quality monitoring and mitigation. We want to see workforce development for all the tunnel activity between the Port of Stockton and Clifton Court Forebay to include green jobs for environmental justice communities for mitigation, not just construction. While temporary construction jobs are helpful, they are temporary and do not negate poor environmental outcomes that exist presently on the ground. We would like to see such a strategy around all points of construction for the tunnel -- pulling residents from Isleton, Walnut Grove and Antioch to share in job development opportunities near their communities. Again, to fully offset construction impacts from 23 years of tunnel construction, the goal should be to leave challenged communities better off than you found them. That would build equity into the State Water Project.</p>	<p>The DCA is interested in methods to include local residents in the project implementation. Additionally, DWR is working on outreach related to ideas about Environmental Justice concepts to incorporate in the EIR, and these ideas will be helpful for that effort.</p>	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.7	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	<p>Yesterday, we asked several times what was the deadline we had to meet, and a process outline had been provided at one of the recent DCA meetings also covering a timing outline.</p> <p>Kern County Water Agency, however, is using a different outline which I have attached. Kern also reported that, “The DCA delivered its “footprint” for engineering to DWR on April 1, 2020. The “footprint” for engineering serves as the starting point for the environmental analysis necessary for the EIR.”</p> <p>So what does it mean that we are still offering input. What is the footprint if it is predetermined? Isn't that what we are working on? What does our work on siting really mean? And how does the SEC fold into this timeline?</p> <p>While I would prefer an answer relatively soon, can you also please explain this at next month's meeting? Committee members should be aware of where the process is really at.</p>	<p>Thank you for your follow up on the schedule. I was hoping we would get to talk about it on Wednesday, but we didn't have a chance to focus on this topic. I've tried to provide more detailed information about the schedule here.</p> <p>As we've discussed during SEC meetings, DWR was directed by the Governor to start the planning and environmental review process for a proposal for a single tunnel Delta conveyance project with an overall schedule goal of completing the environmental review within 2-3 years. DCA is working under DWR's direction pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act Agreement (JEPA). Based on this direction, the DCA is developing “Engineering Project Reports” that document the preliminary design work on the alternatives to support DWR's environmental review. In parallel to the development of this information, the DCA organized the SEC to get input regarding specific design and construction activities from Delta stakeholders. During January's SEC meeting, Kathryn Mallon indicated that drafts of the Engineering Project Reports would be delivered to DWR in July. As a part of this, the DCA and DWR planned a two-month period for review and revision of the drafts of the reports, with the final reports originally expected in September. Based on the delay in scoping, we will be delayed in providing the DCA with additional alternatives to work on. I am hoping that we will still be able to have the final product in September, but the draft deadline in July will likely slip.</p> <p>Consistent with the schedule outlined at the November SEC meeting, in early April, the DCA gave DWR initial engineering information on the proposed project to help begin its review. This information is consistent with the material that the DCA has been sharing with the SEC. At the same time the SEC is reviewing this information, DWR's engineering and</p>	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.71	5/8/2020	Jim Cox	<p>At the last stakeholders committee meeting the southern facilities were discussed Many questions were asked regarding Clifton Ct. facility and changes to be made there. The answer was far from sufficient. We were told that Clifton Ct. would be a separate project. Why a separate project? As the fishing representative on the committee I find that answer totally unacceptable. To the fisherman of the delta this sounds just like what we have heard before. Twenty five years ago water contractors committed to installing "state of the art screens" on Clifton Ct...it never happened. Those same water contractors did get the additional water they wanted!</p> <p>There is not a single wildlife professional that does not agree that Clifton Ct. is the worst "hot spot" in the delta for fish mortality. The annual fish loss totals in the millions. With the loss of those spawning fish to the fishery the future losses go into the billions.</p> <p>The Delta Improvement act of 2009 called for the co-equal goals of water reliability, and delta habitat restoration. Chapter 2, section 85020, line c, (c) Restore the Delta ecosystem, including its fisheries and wildlife, as the heart of a healthy estuary and wetland ecosystem.</p> <p>To the fisherman of the delta this is the critical part of this act. Yet we have heard nothing about habitat improvement. When we were told this is a separate project, I ask by whom. Is this a DWR project? Or is this being done by some one else, and if so</p>	DWR's project objectives for the Delta Conveyance Project include adding operational flexibility to the State Water Project to improve operations for aquatic species, but unlike past efforts (like the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan), they do not include a specific objective to restore habitat. DWR has many other efforts (such as EcoRestore) that are focused on habitat restoration. In addition, as a part of the DCP impact assessment, DWR expects that habitat restoration will likely be proposed to mitigate potential impacts to certain biological resources.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded
7.72	2/13/2020	James Sarmiento	Requesting GIS Shapefiles for the Drive Shaft Siting Study.	The drive shaft siting studies are still being finalized. The final GIS files can be provided.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.73	5/12/2020	Douglas Hsia	Re Glanville Tract Launch Shaft: I would like to share with you one of my constituent coming up with the idea of using Dierssen Rd as the haul road plus added facilities to minimize disruption to the existing road. The difference between his and DCA's plan is the freeway interchange. Having the interchange connected from Dierssen Rd would cause less disruption to the Twin Cities Road. The constituent's family has a long farming history in the Delta.	The potential for haul roads with and without new interchanges is being considered for Hood-Franklin Road, Dierssen Road, Lambert Road, and Twin Cities Road. The selection of haul roads will be discussed in more detail at the May 2020 SEC.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.01	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	Intake 2 should be eliminated due to logistics; Intake 5 could affect/take Hemley properties. Can't offer a preference since all would impact friends and neighbors. The intakes are more than a left river bank intrusion. They encroach into the river and effect flood flows which would likely require west bank improvements - maybe even moving the levee right bank levee westward means moving River Road in Yolo County. Levee improvements will be required up and down stream of each intake - which probably means some significant barge traffic. Intake 5, at the north end of Randall Island, may encroach into the abandoned river channel along Highway 160 which created Randall Island- not sure if this is a geotechnical issue, but it might be. Because the intakes would be located within the National Heritage Area and if there are lights located on or around the intakes, I recommend that all project lighting conform to the 2018 International Dark Sky Park Program Guidelines; this should be incorporated into all design elements and specifications.	Artificial outdoor lighting at all sites would be limited to basic safety and security requirements, and shielded to direct light only downwards towards objects requiring illumination to minimize halo and spillover effects outside of the property boundaries. The lights would be downcast, cut-off type fixtures with non-glare finishes, and controlled by photocells. Lights would provide good color with natural light qualities with minimum intensity with adequate strength for security, safety, and personnel access. The lights would comply with the Illuminating Engineering Society industry standards for light source and luminaire measurements and testing methods and the 2018 International Dark Sky Park Program Guidelines.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.02	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	Existing east-west surface routes from 1-5 to the intakes are significantly impaired. All three roads shown on Page 1 are primarily constructed on levees and all are near or adjacent to designated wildlife areas. These levee roads were never intended to carry the type or numbers of trucks that will be used during the project. Additionally, all three roads are "commuter" routes for Delta workers and are impacted by redirected traffic from 1-5 - Google maps have made it worse. Linear project features, such as roads, always pose special problems and in the Delta road construction, maintenance and use problems are usually exacerbated by poor ground conditions, high groundwater, flooding, slow moving farm equipment, uncontrolled intersections, sight-limited vertical curves on bridges, agricultural operations (particularly during grape harvest when truck traffic is very heavy at night into the early morning), slough crossings, wetlands and variable speed limits - which are often ignored.	The DCA is aware of the limitations of the existing Delta roads, and is analyzing multiple routes with a range of modifications to move materials and people to and from the construction sites. The range of routes currently being considered will be discussed in more detail at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.03	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	<p>I endorse the concept of pooled bus service, be it electric or diesel. The parking location for employees should be at the designated project staging areas - not new parking lots. I don't think food service trucks at the job sites are necessary. There are many mine and construction sites where construction personnel are shuttled to the work site and bring their food - it's a lunch-pail approach. Set up food concessionaires in the parking lot at the beginning of each shift. I think that DCA should advise SEC that even though employee traffic will try to be minimized there will still be significant traffic on the roads from project superintendents, specialty contractors, state inspectors, and emergency vehicles and I am sure interested professionals and vendors who will want to visit the site. It may be that project employees represent the smallest number of daily round trips.</p>	<p>As currently planned, the project would utilize park-and-ride lots at Consolidation Centers developed for the Delta Conveyance Project to consolidate vehicles delivering materials and people to smaller construction sites. Details related to the Consolidation Centers are still being developed; however, use of these areas for centralized food trucks have been considered. It is recognized that in addition to construction material deliveries and employees, the traffic would also include vehicles for regulatory agency and utility company staff. Access to the construction for non-construction visitors (e.g., university classes) would be regulated by the construction managers who could schedule these visits during non-peak traffic times.</p>	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.04	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	<p>Under "Condition of Existing Levees", is this category intended to identify areas of potential inundation? I ask because large areas in the Delta will be inundated during wet winters without suffering any levee breach. Under "Future Development", please also consider designated "Special Planning Areas" which may scattered throughout the project area, i.e., Courtland Special Planning Area. Under "Existing Water Supply Wells" please consider the effects of the drawdown (extent of drawdown curve) on the extensive dewatering at all shafts. It is likely that drawdown caused by dewatering will extend a significant distance from the shafts and may impact existing wells. Additionally it is likely, given the geology and history of subsidence in the Valley, that dewatering the shafts (and the intakes) will cause subsidence outside of the project area. I recommend that DCA establish a series of monitoring wells around the shafts which could be used to determine the extent of the drawdown curve and when accurately surveyed, would provide references for potential subsidence.</p>	<p>The assessment of potential tunnel shaft locations considered the relative condition of the existing levees that protect the interior land as a factor related to the potential for deep flooding, not for ponding of water or poor drainage.</p> <p>"Special Planning Areas" appear to be located in or near Courtland, Locke, and Walnut Grove within Sacramento County which are areas not considered in the shaft siting studies based upon the corridor locations.</p> <p>Existing water supply wells were considered as an existing feature. Prior to construction of the intakes, tunnel shafts, pumping plant, and Southern Forebay, slurry walls or diaphragm walls would be constructed around each facility to isolate the construction site from adjacent groundwater and surface water. Groundwater and surface water monitoring programs would be implemented to identify any water elevation changes due to the Delta Conveyance Project.</p>	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.05	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	<p>It is not clear if DCA proposes rail spurs to each launch site or just a new siding near Lambert Road which would be served by surface transportation. Rail spurs would be very difficult since the only appropriate existing 1-5 undercrossing is at Lambert Road and constructing a sustainable spur system through the Delta would be extremely difficult and expensive to maintain. A rail siding near Lambert and Franklin Roads would probably be at least 2-miles long, require at least one at grade road crossing and would probably be part of a larger staging area. It is likely that surface disturbance would exceed 300 to 400 acres. Although I agree with rail transport, I am slow to endorse significant surface disturbance which is likely to become a permanent feature.</p>	<p>As currently planned, the Rail-Served Materials Depot would be located parallel to Franklin Boulevard between Twin Cities Road and a location north of Dierssen Road. The rail siding area would be part of the Consolidation Center which would also include RTM and tunnel segment storage. These facilities would be removed following construction. RTM would be moved from the tunnel launch shaft on Glanville Tract (to the west of Interstate 5) to the Consolidation Center with a conveyor belt.</p>	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.06	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	<p>Throughout the history of through-Delta conveyance projects - BDCP, WaterFix - the project proponents have tried to sell Delta farmers, reclamation districts, water agencies and communities on the benefits of the RTM. I wish DWR/DCA would quit insulting us and just call it what it is - muck, tunnel spoils, waste material. OK, having said that, my guess is that material extracted from the shafts and the tunnel will have limited value as an economically viable reusable material. If the material is to be used in the construction of the intermediate and/or southern forebays, it will have to meet spec for a 30-foot (+/-) high earthen structure, containing more than 5 AF, and is subject to California Division of Dam Safety design and construction standards. As confident as DCA appears to be in the quality of the material I doubt that they would say with certainty that they could design and build qualified structures with what they know now. I find it hard to understand how DCA, or DWR, can assess the viability of a homogenized waste material as being a structurally acceptable construction material. Likewise, assessing the engineering qualities of variable geologic material deposited through a 30-mile estuary deposit tunnel horizon seems overly optimistic. I recommend a serious inferential analysis to determine an alternative use or off-site destination for the tunnel material and as a favor to all of us drop the term RTM and call it what it is.</p>	<p>The embankments at the Southern Forebay would be constructed in the same manner as other Delta levees with a clay core. The clay material would not be planned to be RTM, but would be excavated from onsite deposits or purchased from existing commercial local quarries. The RTM which is anticipated to consist of sands, silts, and clays and would be placed on the waterside and landside of the forebay embankments. Additional analyses will be conducted as new geotechnical information becomes available.</p>	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.07	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	I would like a discussion regarding the shaft site dewatering. The dewatering process will create a significant amount of water that may have to be pumped into temporary detention facilities before it is discharged into the appropriate waterway. I'd like to know what pumping rate DCA anticipates, this would help inform what other construction-related infrastructure will be needed at each shaft site. I'd also like a discussion about current NOPES water quality requirements and where the discharged water is likely to flow given such low surface water channel gradients.	Water storage tanks would be located at the intake, tunnel shaft, pumping plant, and Southern Forebay sites to reuse most of the dewatering flows for dust control and concrete, slurry, or grout production at the construction site. This would require on-site water treatment facilities to treat the dewatering flows prior to conveyance into the storage tanks. Flows that cannot be stored for reuse due to dewatering flow production schedules would need to be discharged to adjacent waterways. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit would be required for all discharges and would regulate flows and water quality. It is anticipated that some level of water treatment would be required, including sediment removal.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.08	2/26/2020	David Gloski	I would defer to the locals. However I would like one more thing considered. I believe one of the intake areas should be left as a park/picnic/marina/education center. With that in mind for the end, would one site be better than the other? Would it be better to be close to Hood for Hood to benefit for weekend vendors or held with other business?	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits and site reuse as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in the Delta.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.09	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Would these busses keep workers from engaging with Hood businesses? Is that good or bad?	At this time, the potential for effect of workers on local businesses in Hood has not been identified at this time. In previous studies, local Delta businesses provided comments that additional business from construction workers could be beneficial. However, if the additional business resulted in loss of existing patrons due to traffic and business congestion, the effects may not be beneficial especially after the construction activities. Changes in local and regional economics due to implementation of the alternatives will be analyzed in the EIR.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.10	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Highly recommend developing a way to leverage the river and use these facilities in a recreational way later.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits and site reuse as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in the Delta.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.11	2/26/2020	David Gloski	The final site needs to be part of a park/recreational area. Consider benefits to people and wildlife at the end.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community collateral/benefits as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community collateral and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in the Delta.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.12	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Make sure you have the flow studies to explain operations in low flow years. Minimize weekend tie-ups of the river. Build structures to accommodate good uses at the end.	DWR will be developing the operational patterns, including during low flow years, as part of the EIR.  The DCA continues to look for opportunities for co-benefit on all structures and is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits as part of the project which will be discussed with the communities.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.13	2/26/2020	David Gloski	<p>I question whether you want construction considerations to be more than twice as important as 2 of the other three categories and nearly twice as important for the third! If the four categories are of equal importance, your ranking system is flawed.</p> <p>I believe a high-level environmental complexity grade should be added. DWR does CEQA but DCA cannot just make believe environmental doesn't exist in site ranking.</p> <p>Should Geotech have aquifer effects in the ranking?</p>	<p>"Each sub-category should be considered as a separate factor. The four broad categories used in the tunnel shaft siting were generalized groupings, and are not intended to be equally represented in the siting study. At this stage of project, construction considerations are extremely important as they relate the constructability and viability of various sites.</p> <p>Consideration of environmental impacts is addressed through the CEQA process, whereas, the DCA shaft siting studies are focused on the engineering considerations. Shaft locations will be re-evaluated based on input from the CEQA review as part of an iterative process during preparation of the EIR, if needed.</p> <p>Geotechnical considerations are based on publically-available Delta-wide datasets. Aquifer impacts would be site-specific and should be considered using site-specific data collected during monitoring programs. Prior to construction of the tunnel shafts, slurry walls or diaphragm walls would be constructed around the shafts to isolate the construction from the surface water and groundwater.</p>	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.14	2/26/2020	David Gloski	<p>For East Corridor Launch Site B, this is near Highway 4. Need to not impede Hwy 4 during commute times. Stick with rail along Highway 4 as barges and bridges could be a problem. Also, with Discovery Bay boating, the sloughs in that area are already congested with boats. Do the intake sites have launch sites with them? You said tables will be updated with refined #'s. Please date tables so we can track them. I think the public question on funding risk is important. What if this project stopped midway?</p>	<p>The proposed barge landing to serve the tunnel launch shaft Lower Roberts Island would be located along the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel. Therefore, barges could access the barge landing without affecting the State Route 4 bridge. Due to shallow or narrow reaches along the Sacramento River between Rio Vista and Walnut Grove, barge landings would not be included for intake construction.</p>	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.15	2/26/2020	David Gloski	<p>Could be valuable to Reclamation Districts. Consider an RTM bank to allow Delta Agencies to access low cost RTM for levee work.</p>	<p>The DCA would like to work with the reclamation districts to establish an approach to provide RTM for future levee work.</p>	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.16	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Do the segments change in shape depending on tunnel diameter? How are underground corners handled with the segments?	Each segment ring would be tapered. Segment pieces that would form the ring would be rotated into various configurations to form a curve in the tunnel.	John Caulfield	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.17	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Tribal recommendation take precedence because the Delta contains the remains of their ancestors and is a place of spiritual significance. California tribes are connected for cultural & economic reasons to healthy salmon runs, which will do worse with any of the three intakes. In regard to protection of communities, Delta engineers can make the best land/levee assessment as to the viability of placing intakes on these sites & the increased flood threat to communities. In addition, economic productivity of each site for the region should also be evaluated in any final decision. We see site 5 as the least objectionable (following the recommendation of the tribes); however, we see destroying seven generation farms equally tragic to the destruction of spiritual places of importance to California tribes.	The DCA considered potential interferences with existing development, including farms, in the identification of intake locations. As discussed at the December 2019 and January 2020 SEC meetings, Intakes 2, 3, and 5 would impact fewer existing developments.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.18	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	It is our understanding that where or how to build a road in the Delta will require Army Corps of Engineer permits for wetlands. In addition, landowners may not be willing to sell. Our recommendation would be to pick the closest route to the chosen intake, ensure that permits will be approved, and work with neighbors first before starting eminent domain processes to see if a satisfactory route can be established for the majority of parties. As we said intake #5 is the least objectionable, then the process would be about running the most direct route to that intake site. Our question: would the DCA be better buying out farms for the corridor and intake site and making people financially whole for the loss of businesses, homes, future revenues, etc. and figuring out a way to honor their legacy in the Delta so that their families are remembered? Making people live through 15 plus years of construction impacts while impeding farming causing revenue losses, and taking away pieces of land feels cruel. We believe impacted farms will fail. The community will see each day of work as an assault on their lives, and the tension between parties and the possibility of conflict will be extreme. Perhaps it is better for offers of a buyout that will let people rebuild their lives well? We don't know the answer to that question, and would not engage in such a conversation with community members. It is not our place; it would be presumptuous. Such discussion would need to happen between the DCA and landowners.	DWR (and potentially the DCA as DWR's agent) will negotiate with landowners regarding land acquisition activities at a future time in the project implementation process. The DCA will continue to work with potentially affected landowners to minimize impacts and respect the Delta. DWR will analyze potential construction-related impacts due to implementation of the alternatives as part of preparation of the EIR.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.19	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Whether electric buses are used or not with a "park and ride" scenario, the DCA will have to bring food, medical, emergency, and other employee services to these sites because: 1) Employees won't be able to get in and out fast enough with a car or bus for a normal meal (even fast food); 2) Construction hazards, regular farming traffic etc., will require on site emergency services. It is not an either/or. It is both to mitigate construction traffic levels (on top of farm traffic) AND to protect workers and to reduce pollution.	The DCA has considered methods to provide food trucks to consolidation centers or construction sites to reduce employee vehicle trips. The DCA is aware of the limitations of the Delta roadways, and emergency response facilities and crews would be required to be provided by the Delta Conveyance Project in accordance with the requirements of California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) at the tunnel launch shaft sites and near the intake sites. Methods to reduce traffic congestion due to the project will be discussed in detail at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.20	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	The barge landing would make the most sense in Hood as it was a barge site until the railroad came into the area. However, having been up and down the Sacramento River during droughts on a pleasure boat, be advised that we hit sandbars regularly. Surveys for water depth need to be completed and enough water will need to be coming down the Sac River during dry months and dry years for barging to work.	Due to shallow or narrow reaches along the Sacramento River between Rio Vista and Walnut Grove, barge landings would not be included for intake construction. Smaller deliveries of riprap or other materials to complete the levee modifications could be transported on small barges. However, the use of barges for these facilities would not require a barge landing.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.21	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	We need to learn about the alternative to sheet piling. Regardless of noise reduction efforts/ buffers etc., Greater Sandhill Cranes would be driven out of the area and would further decline in number with such extreme noise. So we look forward to learning about what construction noise would be like using new construction techniques. We want to know about real time reporting for water quality testing during the process. We also want to know how construction will be operated when an endangered species makes itself present. Incorporating as many wildlife corridors and bike/kayaking/wildlife viewing opportunities as possible into completed design throughout the project could enhance public access while protecting species.	<p>The DCA is continuing to evaluate methods to reduce the need for pile driving at the intake sites, and will provide information to the SEC when these analyses continue.</p> <p>Water quality monitoring would be conducted in the Sacramento River upstream and downstream of the construction locations as is generally required for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for construction projects.</p> <p>The National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife will issue permits to DWR for the operations of the facilities which will include specific actions related to protection of threatened and endangered species regulated by each of these agencies.</p>	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.22	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	<p>As with the intakes, we maintain that consultation should take place with California Indian Tribes regarding the cultural, spiritual significance of each site first before asking for input from general members of the SEC to pick a site. After such consultation, it would then make the most sense to consult with Delta levee engineers to understand floodplain/levee needs and to gain further understanding of soils (in addition to recommendations made by geologists) to ensure best public and worker safety outcomes. After that an evaluation should be made of impacts to protected species, and then an economic evaluation should be made as to which site would result in the greatest reduction of revenue for a county or loss of jobs. In other words, we see community ranking following this rubric.</p> <p>To that end, the rubric for picking sites by the DCA is an adequate ranking system but does not answer the questions listed in what we describe as a community rubric. We do see an effort being made to reduce pollution by choosing sites that could be managed with barges or trains, which incidentally may also lower construction costs, but to pick the correct parcel thoughtfully and correctly these other impact questions need to be answered. Taking these other items into account, we believe could also reduced construction costs by reducing needs for mitigation during construction.</p>	The DCA studies to select intake and shaft sites were focused on engineering considerations, including geotechnical conditions based upon available information and information provided by local reclamation districts. DWR will analyze potential changes due to implementation of the alternatives in the EIR, including potential changes to biological resoures and economic resources. DWR also will conduct Tribal Consultations. As the EIR progresses, it is possible that shaft locations may be re-evaluated and modified.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.23	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	<p>In order to construct train spurs, we believe the same type of permitting will be required as for the construction of new roads. Yes, trains are a good method for transporting materials in order to reduce pollution, but as with roads, evaluation of wetlands needs to be completed, as well as species impacts, and possibility of land acquisition from farmers. Can this be completed in time for construction. Also, the Iron Triangle in Stockton is one of the most impacted train transfer points in the west. Can it handle addition train traffic from the Port of Stockton. Waiting to talk with the Port and train authorities will add years to the project driving up costs and delays.</p> <p>Barging is a possible solution, but see earlier question. Water depth surveys would need to be completed to ensure feasibility of sites. We could not possibly determine best sites without that data.</p> <p>Last, there needs to be a full comparison of pollution estimates from trucks vs. trains vs. barges – with an understanding of what will be electric and what won’t. Our greatest concern is that the combination of increased barge, train and truck traffic around the Port of Stockton could make a very fragile community an environmental wasteland. If pollution impacts cannot be mitigated, we believe communities around the Port will need indoor air filtration systems for schools, and perhaps homes on Rough and Ready Island.</p>	The DCA is currently evaluating a coordinated effort between roads, rails, and barges to deliver materials to the construction sites. As discussed at previous SEC meetings, each of these transit modes would have constraints and opportunities and would need to be implemented in a combination of activities. DWR will analyze changes in local and regional air quality due to implementation of the alternatives and develop mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse impacts as part of the EIR preparation.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.24	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	<p>We strongly disagree with the assertion that RTM will be usable. The supplemental engineering report warns the DCA to not count using the materials The Delta is filled with legacy Mercury which will methylize when it comes into contact with water filled with nitrates from agriculture – particularly on the San Joaquin side of the Delta which receives ag discharge from upstream. How can such soil be used for levee reinforcement or at an expanded forebay at Clifton Court? The State Water Resources Control Board has strict standards regarding levee materials, dredging and spoils in the Delta.</p> <p>Moreover, as RTM is transported, how will the spoils be kept from becoming airborne? Prior testing under WaterFix indicated Chromium 6 and arsenic present in soil samples.</p> <p>We simply must see the alternative data that indicates that the RTM is safe, and how much of it the DCA believes is reusable. And for the portions that are not reusable, the engineering report suggested dumping the spoils in quarries. Our question is what quarries? Where? And what will the impacts be on those groundwater systems? We simply cannot recommend dumping polluted soil somewhere else without adequate, transparent data as to content and volume.</p>	<p>Potential reuse of RTM was evaluated by collecting soil samples from within an approximate tunnel horizon and including various additives typical of tunneling operations. These samples were then laboratory tested for geotechnical properties and environmental constituents. Based on the testing performed to date, the RTM appears to meet the geotechnical specifications for embankment fill surrounding a clay core within the embankment. Environmental testing found that metal concentrations were generally consistent with background naturally occurring levels in surface soils and would not mobilize into adjacent soil or water bodies, including the Southern Forebay.</p> <p>The DCA intends to continue evaluations of potential reuse of RTM and will perform additional sampling, testing, and evaluation in the future to confirm appropriate applications. Material reuse or disposal will be in compliance with all State and federal standards.</p> <p>Transport of the RTM or any other soil material would be conducted in a manner to avoid dust issues, including the use of covered rail cars or trucks</p>	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.25	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The northern most intake is problematic given its proximity to the sandhill crane roost sites in north Stone Lakes. This roosting site is the most constrained by development in our region and as such the most problematic if it is abandoned due the construction of the intakes.	DWR will evaluate changes in aquatic and terrestrial resources due to construction and operations of the intakes in the EIR. As this analysis continues, it is possible that the intake locations or plans could be modified.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.26	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	All of the proposed haul roads look like they will be very impactful to terrestrial species, particularly roosting and foraging sandhill cranes. All roads within the jurisdictional boundary of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge should be avoided. The haul road choices are indicative of how destructive and disruptive this project will be for terrestrial species.	Due to the location of the intakes along the Sacramento River between the confluences of the American River and Sutter Slough, it is difficult to access these sites without traveling along Hood-Franklin, Lambert, or Twin Cities Roads. The DCA is considering methods to minimize traffic congestion on these roads and will discuss roadway modifications at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.27	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	A continuous ripirian zone is an extremely important goal, and it would appear to be very achievable.	The DCA would be interested in exploring improvements to the riparian corridor along the Sacramento River near the intakes.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.28	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	We should revisit the placement of the intakes utilizing the same input process that is being used for the launch site placement. The current placement for the intakes work for the engineering side of things, but they are disastrous for aquatic and terrestrial species.	DWR will evaluate changes in aquatic and terrestrial resources due to construction and operations of the intakes in the EIR. As this analysis continues, it is possible that the intake locations or plans could be modified.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.29	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The most important criteria to include would be diversity and density of terrestrial species with a focus on listed species, but not to the exclusion of other species. However, it would be a mistake to simply add a couple of new criteria items to the engineering rubric currently being utilized to identify "acceptable" siting locations. Doing so would likely result in an outcome similar to the intake locations, where the engineering was the primary driver for the selection of placements that worked well mechanically, but were/are extremely destructive to both aquatic and terrestrial species. We recommend that a far more comprehensive approach be utilized for siting the launching shafts and their extensive infrastructure, one that exhibits sensitivity to the important issues and concerns represented by the stakeholders in the SEC. So, beyond comments and suggestions about how to integrate terrestrial species concerns into the decision process, we will also be discussing more broadly how the decision process should work.	The DCA shaft siting studies did consider properties that are owned by agencies and entities to protect habitat, including Cosumnes River Preserve. DWR will evaluate changes in aquatic and terrestrial resources on all types of lands due to construction and operations of the intakes in the EIR. As the EIR analysis continues, it is possible that the intake locations or plans could be modified.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.30	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The approach utilized in the launching shaft selection process presented to the stakeholders at the last meeting represents a reasonable foundation for a framework that could be robust enough to incorporate addition of criteria addressing stakeholder concerns. But, it would be a potentially large mistake to just add a bunch of new criteria suggested by stakeholders, weight them, and then generate a new map. With all of the new criteria, the underlying decision process of balancing all of the additional factors becomes extremely complicated, and a single new map that attempts to incorporate all of the new criteria into one depiction representing more refined siting possibilities would seem to be nothing short of magic to all but the most informed GIS experts and modelers. Therefore, we recommend that a series of additional maps be generated for informational and illustrative purposes. The first series of maps would depict siting possibilities based on the ten to fifteen mile spacing between launching shafts coupled with the criteria specific to one stakeholder category, excluding engineering concerns. This would provide an understanding of shaft placements in the absence of the engineering concerns. The second series of maps would depict the stakeholder category considered along with engineering concerns. The third would be a single map depicting the engineering concerns along with all of the stakeholder category concerns. This approach would allow a non-expert modeler to see the compromises and tradeoffs that were made in a visual format and would allow each stakeholder to see how their concerns fit into the larger decision-making process.	The DCA shaft siting studies were limited to engineering considerations, access routes, avoidance of lands owned by agencies and entities for the protection of habitat, existing development, and existing infrastructure. Information provided by the SEC was used to modify factors related to existing development and land uses. The EIR will evaluate potential changes to the physical, biological, and human environment due to implementation of the alternatives. As the EIR analysis continues, it is possible that the shaft locations could be modified.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.31	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	A program like ESRI GIS hotspot analysis should be used to identify hotspots and then a decision making tool, like MARXAN, should be used to run a huge number of permutations to expose possible efficiencies - this should be done for all three classes of additional maps that we are suggesting. The stakeholders should be provided all information used for weighting criteria, the decision-making software utilized, and what specific data/GIS layers were used. (see his multi-page response for more info)	The GIS was actually used to identify different types of land uses, understand access routes, and determine distances between shaft locations. The comparison of the options was conducted in an Excel-based tool. The results of the shaft siting studies will be compiled in the Engineering Project Report in a manner that will help understand how the different factors were analyzed with the associated weighting criteria.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.32	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacomia	The external conveyance of water from the Delta instead of through the estuary, will destroy native species habitat, Delta farms and communities and the cultural heritage therein, as well as surrounding natural resources. Thus, the three proposed sites, as components of the external conveyance project, are unacceptable because they will result in unnecessary destruction to the Delta estuary and surrounding areas.	DWR is responsible for development of the overall Delta Conveyance concept and development of the operational plan. The DCA is preparing engineering information related to construction of the facility options. The EIR will evaluate potential changes in the Delta estuarine conditions, Delta habitat, Delta farms and communities, and cultural resources related to implementation of the alternatives. That information will be considered by the DCA during finalization of engineering plans.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.33	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacomia	Impacts of trucking would be substantially destructive to the farms, private properties and wildlife habitat of the sites. More research and actual data concerning this issue is needed before decisions governing trucking on this scale can be considered.	Potential truck routes and road modifications will be discussed in more detail at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.34	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacomia	Because trucks moving material, equipment, etc. will create the greatest impact, it is doubtful that carpooling employees to and from the site will effectively mitigate this.	The construction traffic plans involves both movement of materials and employees. Almost 200 employees could be present at some construction sites, such as the intakes. Therefore, carpooling would be necessary to reduce traffic on access roads and because adequate space for parking would require larger construction sites.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.35	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacomia	Barge traffic of this frequency and magnitude will substantially clog and pollute the Sacramento River rendering it unsafe for other craft and the species existing there.	Barge traffic would be focused on moving goods and materials either to Bouldin Island under the Central Corridor option or Lower Roberts Island under the Eastern Corridor option. Access to Bouldin Island from the Port of West Sacramento, Port of Antioch, or ports on San Francisco or San Pablo bays would use portions of the lower Sacramento River. Access to Bouldin Island from the Port of Stockton or access to Lower Roberts Island from any of these ports would use the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel/San Joaquin River.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.36	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacomia	Layout needs to be entirely redesigned to accommodate through-Delta estuary conveyance, eliminating the need for grading of the final site. This will preserve, intact, the existing wildlife corridor and habitat as well as the cultural heritage and Delta communities. The most viable way to convey water with the least destructive effects is through the estuary. There is ample data to this effect, supported by independent scientific studies previously completed.	This comment is suggesting an alternative to the Proposed Project that DWR identified in the Notice of Preparation. DWR is considering alternatives to the Proposed Project as part of the development of the EIR, and will identify a range of reasonable alternatives that meet the project objectives and could reduce the significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project. The DCA will then design facilities related to these alternatives. Alternative concepts should be submitted to DWR through the CEQA process.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.37	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacomia	The actual effects of boring such large launch shafts in largely unknown soils to the depths proposed is not supported by sufficient study and data. More research and data is needed in order to address this question.	Additional geotechnical investigations are planned for the next several years to further understand conditions along the tunnel alignment and at the tunnel shaft locations. Engineering design criteria would be modified as the geotechnical conditions became more fully understood.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.38	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	<p>Preferred: CE5 2+ miles from Courtland, 1+mile from Hood, 1+ mile from Stone Lakes NWR (National Wildlife Refuge). Most flexible access. All vehicles can be divided onto different roads or redirected to most nimbly dilute/reduce impacts and address local conditions. Possible to avoid Hood altogether.</p> <p>Least Preferred: CE2 Though distant from Hood (positive), single access minimizes flexibility to address impacts. Closest to Stone Lakes NWR, requires all traffic to run along edge of NWR. Requires access/routing through edge of Hood. Place second access road.</p> <p>Middle: CE3 Less impactful on Stone Lakes and shorter route than CE2, shares negative traits of CE2. Place second access road.</p>	The DCA appreciates this information and will include it in the ongoing analysis.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.39	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Establish truck routes as far away as possible from Stone Lakes NWR & off levee.	The DCA access routes were developed to minimize the use of levee roads and avoid land use changes to refuges, preserves, and conservation areas.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.40	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	This is a great opportunity to provide, model and support green transportation, as well as local food and service providers. CE5 provides most flexibility to divide and dilute local impacts. Provide communities (and/or post) work, bus and service vehicle schedules. If electric bus charging stations are located at staging areas, work to convert to public use to meet state charging station goals. If electric bus charging stations are located at staging areas, work to convert to public use to meet state charging station goals.	Electric charging stations, possibly powered by solar panels, would be considered for the consolidation centers where materials and people would be transferred to hybrid or electric vehicles for consolidated transport to the construction sites.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.41	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	I favor a barge option on-site of intake construction. Since in-river alterations are already happening, this minimizes the footprint. I do not favor using one in Hood as it would require truck traffic in the town, something to avoid.	<p>Due to shallow or narrow reaches along the Sacramento River between Rio Vista and Walnut Grove, barge landings would not be included for intake construction. Smaller deliveries of riprap or other materials to complete the levee modifications could be transported on small barges. However, the use of barges for these facilities would not require a barge landing.</p> <p>There are no active railroads near the intake sites. The DCA considered re-activating the abandoned railroad adjacent to the intake sites. However in a recent study to reactivate this railroad, the California Parks and Recreation Department decided to cancel further evaluations due to potential impacts on habitat and communities. Use of the rail-served materials depot near Interstate 5 and Twin Cities Road would be used to consolidate materials and employees into transit vehicles to reduce traffic on north Delta roads.</p>	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.42	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wildlife friendly landscaping (butterfly gardening, planting trees of varying maturities/sizes/purposes).</li> <li>- Portable mature trees (&amp; other plants) in planters brought to site and moved as appropriate during project. Planted sequentially as project components are completed.</li> <li>- Rooftop planting/living roof</li> <li>- Minimize hardscapes</li> <li>- Bat, bird boxes</li> <li>- Restore function of riparian corridor lost to construction on nearby lowland to mimic corridor.</li> </ul> <p>Though not wildlife related, consider art on tall structures</p>	As DCA continues to develop the facility plans, these ideas could be included in the final landscape design plans for constructed facilities.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.43	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	<p>Overall, I like the exhibition of the siting methodology. It shows nothing is perfect, but prioritization of factors can produce clarity and preferred site/s. Can DCA confirm comprehensive consideration of significant (state recognized and other) sites of Native Peoples? Such sites may be assumed to be included in the matrix within the cultural feature grouping including houses, cemeteries, etc. I realize it is not a best practice to draw attention to such sites, even (especially?) in a project document. Though the state has listings of archeological sites, they are not public (State Historic Preservation Office- SHPO) and these, among other culturally significant sites in the Delta are thought by some to be under reported.</p>	DWR is conducting the Tribal Consultation activities and will evaluate potential changes to cultural and historical resources due to implementation of the alternatives as part of the EIR.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.44	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	<p>Central Alignment- not preferred</p> <p>Launch Site A Consider keeping site north of Twin Cities Road to keep significant buffer for Delta Meadows State Park. Coordinate with State Parks re park-sponsored canoe trips in the Meadows.</p> <p>Launch Site B The traffic on, and condition of, Highway 12 makes me question its capacity to accommodate added project traffic. Access to the San Joaquin River on the west side of Bouldin makes barging attractive, but that river reach is a funnel point for boating traffic from Bethel Island and Frank's Tract (and elsewhere). CA State Dept of Parks and Recreation is currently working with citizens and other stakeholders in a process very similar to the DCA SEC called Franks Tract Futures. Though the FTF project may be a good fill (RTM) candidate, adding barge traffic to that area, even if the barge station is on Little Potato Slough, requires coordination with FTF for effectiveness and to address public perception concerns.</p> <p>Southern Forebay- no comment Eastern Alignment- preferred (Please note spelling: Rindge Tract) Launch Site A Keep footprint as far south as possible minimizing impact on Cosumnes River Preserve</p>	These comments will be added to the considerations in the ongoing development of the Central and Eastern corridors.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.45	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Barges- schedule as in-river conditions- tides, fisheries, recreation, flow permit. Publicize barge schedules (as possible).	Barge operations would be subject to changes in river conditions, tides, wind, and recreational and commercial navigation traffic. Barge traffic along the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel and Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel would operate in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Port of West Sacramento and Port of Stockton, respectively. In addition, the barges and the associated tugboats would operate in accordance with requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard and the Division of Boating and Waterways of the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Notifications would be provided to the U.S. Coast Guard and local marinas.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.46	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Jersey Island, Franks Tract Futures, ACOE proposal for Big Break wetland creation, MWD islands	Future use of RTM and other excavated soil materials for habitat restoration will be considered as the project concepts are developed by DCA and analyzed in the EIR.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.47	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	<p>Assess existing traffic, seasonal, event &amp; other patterns (car counters?). Divide traffic, employee parking into multiple access points to minimize impact on each road. Assign vendors/ contractors/ service vehicles which road which day to minimize impacts. Cut additional road(s) as necessary to accommodate targeted traffic &amp; ensure at least 2 access routes.</p> <p>Provide Delta and project interpretation at all facilities and in between (wayside), incorporate controversy. Ensure adequate parking.</p> <p>Work with Delta Protection Commission to assist their ongoing efforts of signage, Heritage Area.</p> <p>Art/murals on facilities ala West Sacramento and Oakley water tanks.</p> <p>Possible to remove roads post-project as appropriate?</p> <p>For worksites near Delta attractions leave (or build) project picnic, parking, lighting, infrastructure- work with local communities for best converted facility use</p> <p>Turn employee lots to park &amp; ride, interpretive stops</p> <p>Project roads gated &amp; staffed to control/minimize traffic</p>	<p>DCA was scheduled to conduct traffic counts. However, with the implementation of "shelter in place," it was decided to delay traffic counts. At this time, DCA is analyzing traffic patterns using existing information and will discuss this information at the May 2020 SEC meeting. The DCA did create a calendar of recurring events to be considered related to community traffic conditions. During construction, cooperative meetings with the communities could be implemented to reduce construction activities during weekend events, including Friday night activities.</p> <p>The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community collateral/benefits as part of the project. When the DCA is compiles this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community collateral including the community's vision , and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in the Delta. The DCA and DWR has been and will continue to coordinate with the Delta Protection Commission.</p> <p>Many of facilities at the construction sites, including barge landings, would be removed following construction and the site would be restored, potentially for community uses or habitat.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
8.01	5/21/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Concerned about the topics that arise in the SEC meetings as being narrow and limited where they can't explore at a greater compacity and would like more open Q&A discussions.	We are happy to work with the Stakeholder Engagement Committee to create space for more reflection and more time for Questions/Answers if that is something the Stakeholder Engagement Committee feels is missing.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded
8.02	5/21/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Biggest concern is the potential loss of permanent crops such as orchards and vineyards and the way this will affect the agricultural economy.	We will be working with Stakeholder Engagement Committee Member Liebig to reach out to the agricultural community to further discuss issues around reuse of agricultural land.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.03	5/21/2020	Karen Mann	Emphasized that the Central Corridor route is not a preferred option. It was noted that the Independent Technical Review (ITR) team hired by the DCA said that the Central Corridor was not feasible and that there are no benefits to the East Contra Costa County. This route will affect the wells, the Sandhill cranes, and will go through the a heavily used recreation area and the National Heritage area.	<p>The December ITR stated that compared to the Eastern Corridor, the Central Corridor more impractical due to limited accessibility of the tunnel shaft sites using existing roads.</p> <p>The Shaft Siting Analyses presented at the February 12 and February 26, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings indicated that potential tunnel shaft sites along the Central Corridor were determined to have a higher potential for conflicts with wells and Greater Sandhill Cranes habitat than the Eastern Corridor. Water-based recreational opportunities presented at the February 26, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting indicated similar occurrences along the Central and Eastern corridors. This information was only at a screening level; DWR will complete an assessment of potential impacts within the Environmental Impact Report.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.04	5/21/2020	Karen Mann	Concerned about the layout of the Byron maintenance shaft being within only 1000 feet of residences.	The currently proposed Byron Tract Tunnel Maintenance Shaft would be over 4,100 feet (0.75 miles) from the eastern boundary of Discovery Bay development. The tunnel crosses under State Route 4 at approximately 120 feet below the ground surface and about 750 feet from the southeastern corner of Discovery Bay development.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.05	5/27/2020	Angelica Whaley	As part of the CEQA process, is a current traffic study being conducted using data that is more recent than 2018?	We used data from Caltrans' Freeway Performance Monitoring System (PeMS). PeMS has imbedded loops that continuously collect information that helps their traffic management center react to different instances on the road, so that is quite recent. For other places, we have updated the traffic counts done in previous years to current (pre-COVID) volumes using the growth projections from Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) and San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG). We did anticipate there would be some growth, and again used the regional traffic models to forecast this growth. We noted some anomalies, such as some of the traffic before the recession was actually higher than more recently. But in any case we are using the best available data. The 2018 data considered by our analysis was based on data published in the 2019 report, which is the most recent SJCOG congested management program's Monitoring and Performance Report.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.06	5/27/2020	Angelica Whaley	Has there been an analysis of the agricultural traffic separate from day to day traffic along the Delta?	The original plan was to do traffic counts for certain locations at 4 different times during the year in order to get the seasonal differences. It's not currently advisable given current traffic patterns. If it changes, I recommend doing that. We do have information for the Caltrans facilities from their embedded loops that are continuously collecting information. We can compare data from different months to get some information on seasonality.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.07	5/27/2020	Angelica Whaley	Grape harvesting trucks take up the whole road.	The original plan was to do traffic counts for certain locations at 4 different times during the year in order to get the seasonal differences. It's not currently advisable given current traffic patterns. If this changes, I recommend doing that. We do have information for the Caltrans facilities from their embedded loops that are continuously collecting information. We can compare data from different months to get some information on seasonality.	Neil Paynter	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.08	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	Clarify the statement “DWR is not subject to local regulations.” 6-ft shoulder going through Stones Lake is worrisome because it will take up valuable habitat with big trucks. Since new census surveys were just filled out, does this mean you will be using old census information? Caltrans isn’t the best model about how to approach traffic in the Delta as they can share inaccuracies with road closures and signage. They are not the best model for signage or communication.	<p>DWR is a state agency, so as a general rule it is not subject to local regulation.</p> <p>Regarding Stone Lake and the bike lane, it is just one of three alternative paths to get between Interstate 5 and the potential haul roads to the intakes, including 1) Hood-Franklin Rd, 2) Lambert Road, and 3) Twin Cities Road. All three routes have low volumes of traffic compared to their capacities and so could accommodate project traffic while maintaining the target LOS. The choice of route(s) can be made using non-traffic criteria, or a combination of routes could be used.</p> <p>The U.S. Census is done once every 10 years; however, the American Community Survey is completed more frequently and was used in the current analysis.</p> <p>We did not base our approach on Caltrans' methodology, although they use a very similar methodology for forecasting because it is industry best practice. We also did not take our traffic standards from Caltrans, though again there are similarities in standard traffic engineering practice. We did use data from Caltrans. Caltrans has imbedded loops that continuously collect information that helps their traffic management center react to different instances on the road. That information is available and that is the information received from Caltrans.</p>	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.09	5/27/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	Concern with data from 2018 because traffic has increased extremely each year. Is there 2019 data that you can access from Caltrans?	We used data from Caltrans' Freeway Performance Monitoring System (PeMS). PeMS has imbedded loops that continuously collect information that helps their traffic management center react to different instances on the road, so that is quite recent. For other places, we have updated the traffic counts done in previous years to current (pre-COVID) volumes using the growth projections from SACOG and SJCOG. We did anticipate there would be some growth, and again used the regional traffic models to forecast this growth. We noted some anomalies, such as some of the traffic before the recession was actually higher than more recently. But in any case we are using the best available data. The 2018 data considered by our analysis was based on data published in the 2019 report, which is the most recent SJCOG congested management program's Monitoring and Performance Report.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.1	5/27/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Regardless of COVID, agricultural traffic will be the same with the same capacity and you should be able to do those studies calculated appropriately because there is no impact to agriculture right now and work is at the same speed. This is important because there is concern about grade trucks which can be looked at easily. Caltrans can be difficult to work with.	Based on the prior WaterFix project, we anticipate that seasonality may be an area of interest. We therefore planned to count the same locations at different times of the year to learn more about that. Hopefully when traffic patterns more closely reflect normal conditions, we can do that. We do have information for the Caltrans facilities from their embedded loops that are continuously collecting information. We can compare data from different months to get some information on seasonality.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.11	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	Noticed that San Joaquin County and Sacramento County data were used. Why wasn't Eastern Contra Costa County data used? They have good data to look at for Highway 4. Contra Costa County is going to be adversely affected significantly, we are in the DNF category on your charts.	We did look at a number of other studies with data from other counties; for example, a study on improvements to Byron Highway. But for the purposes of this presentation we wanted to focus on San Joaquin and Sacramento counties. In doing so we found that the situations in the north, middle, and south areas are all quite different. The south area, which is the focus of this question, definitely has existing traffic conditions that are challenging and that accounted for in the analysis.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.12	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	On Highway 4 there are 3 bridges between Stockton and Discovery Bay and a proposed maintenance shaft Semi trucks take two lanes to get on bridge because it is narrow. How do you work around old bridges with no shoulder and how are you going to go about historical bridges?	<p>At this time, it is anticipated that most construction material would be transported from Interstate 5 in a westward direction, and, depending on the alignment selected, may not need to cross some of the State Route 4 bridges.</p> <p>On State Route 12, the Central Alignment would include trucks from Interstate 5 over the Little Potato Slough Bridge. We are considering the best approach for that location.</p>	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.13	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	On Byron Highway there is agricultural and school traffic.	Byron Highway is heavily congested and has a LOS F in the peak commute periods and LOS E in the mid-day off-peak period. These high traffic patterns would interfere with the transport of construction materials to and from the Southern Forebay Complex. We are looking at different strategies to minimize or eliminate project travel on that road, including direct rail access, to reduce the volume of construction trucks during some periods of the project, including during the beginning of the project when fill material would be moved from the south portion of the Southern Forebay complex to the northern portion of the Southern Forebay. These truck traffic could not be moved by rail; however, these trucks could be moved at night or by conveyor belts or bridges over Byron Highway.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.14	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	On the Highway 4 route, how about access for emergency equipment since lanes are old and narrow? There's been existing issues with blocked traffic.	We did not base our approach on Caltrans' methodology, although they use a very similar methodology for forecasting because it is industry best practice. We also did not take our traffic standards from Caltrans, though again there are similarities in standard traffic engineering practice. We did use data from Caltrans. Caltrans has imbedded loops that continuously collect information that helps their traffic management center react to different instances on the road. That information is available and that is the information received from Caltrans.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.15	5/27/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Is there an actual quantity of truck traffic that has been proposed?	The powerpoint file provided for the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting included histograms showing the currently proposed truck volumes to separate construction sites by month.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.16	5/27/2020	Jim Wallace	Althought CEQA doesn't require projects to use level of service, surely that can't be the ONLY factor?	Per SB 743, upon the adoption of the revised CEQA guidelines, which occurred in December 2018, automobile delay (like LOS) can no longer be used for determining impacts under CEQA. Agencies must use some other metric that matches the three goals in SB 743, namely reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. Most state agencies have chosen to use vehicle miles of travel (VMT). Level of service is not going away, since it can still be used for general plan conformity and impact fees, but it will not be used for CEQA. We used LOS for this planning study because we know that it represents local traffic conditions which are important to both Delta communities and to the project. DWR has indicated that it is planning to include LOS information within the Environmental Impact Report to provide additional information, but it will not be the basis for determining significance.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.17	5/27/2020	Douglas Hsia	2 weeks ago, provided suggestion to widen Diersson Road; is this under your consideration?	After the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting, we adjusted shaft locations to avoid any improvements at the Dierssen Road overpass at Interstate 5.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.18	5/27/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	It's important that Contra Costa County data is included in this information.	Contra Costa County information was included in the analysis presented at the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting. The powerpoint file presented at the meeting included information for Contra Costa County related to State Route 4 and Byron Highway, and focused on southwestern Sacramento County and western San Joaquin County where most of the construction traffic would occur.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.19	5/27/2020	Sean Wirth	What is the possibility of moving the proposed haul road to the intakes? What if we shifted it closer to the Sacramento River than the eastern levee?	<p>The proposed haul road along the western toe of the railroad embankment would be located so that vehicles could enter and leave the intake sites from the east side.</p> <p>We currently propose avoiding access to the intake sites from the west along State Route 160 to avoid construction traffic in the town of Hood and extensive truck traffic on State Route 160 which appears to be unsuitable for large volumes of truck traffic.</p>	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.2	5/27/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	On the graphic of truck trips, are estimates included for trucks hauling fill?	The graphics in the powerpoint file presented in the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting showed that the trucks for different materials using a color code, including blue color for the trucks hauling fill material.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.21	5/27/2020	Jim Wallace	If you improve the intersection of I-5 and Hood Franklin does that involve Federal Highways Administration? What do the communities think? Running trucks through Hood on the Sacramento River is a good idea, keeping it out of Hood is the best way to go, just a haul route, so without knowing how many trips that is, might have a more difficult time when trying to determine how that impacts wildlife.	After the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting, we determined that there would not be a need for an improvement of the intersection of Hood-Franklin Road and Interstate 5. As currently proposed, employees accessing Intakes 2 and 3 would exit Hood-Franklin Road to the east of the community of Hood onto a haul road that would be parallel to State Route 160.	Neil Paynter	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.22	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	Why are you not including traffic info for Yolo County, all connected so all traffic affects everywhere? The idea of driving those trucks through those preserves and the town of Hood is bad. I don't agree that there is no capacity issue on these roads; all it takes is one incident for it to last hours before you can pass. Twin Cities is rocky and bumpy and that should be a capacity limiter. Impacting the slough with trucks is bad and would like to see data that no damage will happen to the Slough and Stone Lakes Reserve.	<p>None of the routes currently planned for the project use any of the local roads through Yolo County (some project traffic will use the Yolo portions of I-80 and I-5).</p> <p>None of the three routes between Interstate 5 and the intake locations would go through the community of Hood. The primary construction route would be along a haul road located to the west of the abandoned railroad embankment.</p> <p>As described in May 2020 Stakeholders Engagement Committee meeting, several roads would be widened to provide two 12-foot wide lanes with 4 to 6-foot wide shoulders which would provide adequate space in case a vehicle breaks down. We are proposing to make improvements to Twin Cities Road.</p>	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.23	5/27/2020	Sean Wirth	It would be better if truck traffic flushed wildlife into safe area in west than to an unsafe area.	The proposed haul road would be located to the west of the toe of the abandoned railroad embankment which would include the eastern edges of the three intake sites.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.24	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	I love the idea of widening Highway 12, long needed, big issue at various times of the day, not safe to drive on, leave it better than you found it.	As currently proposed, State Route 12 would be widened from Interstate 5 to the construction site.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.25	5/27/2020	Sean Wirth	Widening should take into consideration the fact that traffic will not change; that is a problem.	The Delta Conveyance Project would consider the increased traffic patterns due to construction in addition to traffic that would occur without the Delta Conveyance Project. For State Route 12, the portion of the roadway between Interstate 5 and the construction site is proposed to be widened to accomodate the construction traffic, but not other traffic patterns that would occur without the project.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.26	5/27/2020	David Gloski	Widening Route 12 would be great and would save lives and improve safety.	Under Central Corridor, State Route 12 would be widened from Interstate 5 to the construction site to accomodate the construction traffic to a new Bouldin Island offramp/onramp.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.27	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	We were told that the water board agreed that the Bouldin Island wouldn't work, and sending toxic fumes to a place where people live full time might not be the best move.	The State Water Resources Control Board did not come to any findings for the WaterFix Project before the application for change in point of diversion of the existing water rights was withdrawn. It is recognized that concerns were raised by opponents of the project, including concerns about air quality emissions during construction of a tunnel launch shaft site on Bouldin Island. The EIR for this project will evaluate air quality emissions due to implementation of the project.	Carrie Buckaman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.28	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	In order for a truck to get onto the bridge, because of the S-curve the traffic coming the opposite way would have to stop to let the truck on. It takes both lanes for the vehicle to be able to get on the bridge.	The analysis we presented at the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting was high level analysis using LOS based on the number of lanes. For the number of lanes on State Route 4 , our computer model shows LOS D. The EIR analyses and future engineering analyses would consider more details, including constraining curves.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.29	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	Contra Costa County fire marshal was concerned because at the Discovery Bay Bridge, there are no emergency services from that bridge east, so no firefighters, etc. if there was an issue. If there's anything happening on Highway 4, it can take 8-10 hours to clear the vehicles. That road is a levee road which means that the 2 lane road is higher than the rest of the island; one side has ponds and the other side is agriculture so the turnouts would only be on the south sides of the road.	The DCA is considering the potential effects of vehicle break downs on traffic and construction operations. Therefore, we are considering a design standard of 12-foot wide lanes with 4-foot wide shoulders for routes that would carry a lot of construction trucks. We are also considering providing occasional turn-outs if road widening would not be feasible. We are also considering relocation of some tunnel shafts, including shafts that would be accessed from State Route 4.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.3	5/27/2020	David Gloski	I think Highway 4 traffic is event driven, it's always an issue. Wondering why rail wouldn't work?	As stated during the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting, we are not proposing to direct significant construction truck traffic to the Southern Forebay complex along State Route 4, and instead extend rail lines to the Southern Forebay complex.	Neil Paynter	6/24/2020	Responded
8.31	5/27/2020	Philip Merlo	Most of the prevailing winds along Highway 4 are going into Stockton which is a city of low income people. Are any studies concerning CO2 emissions being conducted considering a vast majority of those emissions will be affecting a community with one of the highest rates of asthma? Civil rights issue since perks will be going to white people but the problems will be affecting people of color. Any reliance on rail that reduces truck traffic is appreciated.	As part of the EIR, DWR will be conducting air quality analyses as well as human health risk assessments related to construction vehicles and equipment. The EIR also will include analyses of Environmental Justice impacts to determine if the impacts would be disproportionately high and adverse on minority and low-income populations. Additionally, water from the proposed Delta Conveyance Project would be used by 27 million Californians, including minority and low-income communities.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.32	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	How is it that you are able to continue your work during a time when all other agencies are cutting their budgets? What is the truck traffic on the port of Stockton and what economic groups will be the most impacted? Make sure the voices of those who have lesser than us and will have to do more than us will be heard.	The environmental and permitting efforts for the Delta Conveyance Project are funded by the agencies that may receive water from the project. As part of the EIR, DWR will be conducting traffic and economic analyses related to construction vehicles and equipment. The EIR also will include analyses of Environmental Justice impacts to determine if the impacts would be disproportionately high and adverse on minority and low-income populations.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.33	5/27/2020	Jim Cox	Reiterate that Karen was saying about bridges on Highway 4. I have a pickup and when trucks are going across the Highway, you're making it essentially a one lane Highway so it takes time for trucks to get over bridges and therefore traffic backs up.	We are considering relocation of several tunnel shafts located along State Route 4 to reduce construction traffic along this road. If relocation is not advisable, the DCA can consider alternatives.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.34	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	The traffic data is incorrect because the traffic near Elk Grove is insane no matter which direction. It worries me when you say you will not affect traffic because the data is wrong. The other idea the people of Stockton will not notice is ingenuine. I know their traffic is already bad so increasing it would be terrible. Your modeling isn't aligning with the people who live there, get accurate representations for the Twin Cities connection.	<p>The graph presented at the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting showed the anticipated traffic volumes on Interstate 5 between the community of Elk Grove and Hood-Franklin Road. In that roadway section, the volumes would be within the capacity of the freeway. There are times when traffic congestion would occur due to traffic issues outside of this freeway section and not due to capacity problems in this section of freeway.</p> <p>For the section of Interstate 5 within the Stockton area, we showed in graphs at the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting that there is recurrent congestion in this area. But we also showed that the construction traffic would be a small proportion of the daily variation in traffic. For example, in the southbound direction the construction traffic would be only about 10 percent of the variation that occurs in daily peak hours.</p>	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.35	5/27/2020	Jim Cox	Why improvements on Clifton Court weren't being included in this, the answer in the answer packet wasn't one. The damage being done at Clifton Court has been happening for years. Nothing has changed since 1995. I feel that this subject needs to be approached, this is the worst part of the Delta but if you're operating the same, you're still killing fish and all the problems with the current project. You're dodging the most critical part of the project. There wouldn't be a hotspot if they're wasn't flow in Clifton Court, and even cutting back down limits the problem. You're dodging the biggest concerns in this project, part of the act that created this said to restore the habitats of the Delta.	Modifications to Clifton Court or the Skinner Fish Facility are not part of the Delta Conveyance Project. DWR reached out separately to interested parties to help improve understanding of the issue.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.36	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	I keep waiting to hear what the benefits are for those who live near the Delta. I contacted part of my stakeholders (people in bus and gov) the fire chief of eastern Contra Costa County voiced his concern about increased traffic or heavy equipment of any projects. He has never been contacted for this project. The manager of Discovery Bay was taken by surprise by the location and approximation of the shaft and tunnel (600 ft within homes). Where this tunnel is planned, our only source for water is right there (400 ft away) our only waste treatment plant is on Highway 4 which will be above the tunnel. The municipalities need to be aware.	This DCA has discussed this comment with DWR, especially its emergency response team. Based on those discussions, the DCA and DWR anticipate additional outreach efforts in the near future.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded
8.37	5/27/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	In my review of the presentation looking at the Southern Bay Embankment design, there was a measure of the external slope, one being 6 ft of free board and another being 28 ft. How was that number derived and whether or not I can get the info on how that's being estimated?	The flood elevation of 20.8 ft near the Southern Forebay was determined using DSM2 Bay-Delta model simulations performed for the conceptual engineering design. The 200-year hydrographs (CVHS Scaled Events) from Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) 2017 update representing late century climate change hydrology were used for boundary flows at Sacramento River, Yolo Bypass, San Joaquin River and East-side streams. The analysis assumed projected sea level rise of 10.2 ft at Martinez for the year 2100 (State of California, Sea-Level Rise Guidance, 2018 Update). Only flows within the channels at DSM2 boundary locations were considered in this analysis. This analysis assumed no levee overtopping or breaches within the DSM2 Bay-Delta domain and represents a conservative projection of water surface levels in the Delta under the projected climate change and sea level rise conditions. Climate change and sea level rise projections are evolving and further analysis using the latest data and modeling tools will be conducted to refine flood protection elevations for final design and construction.	Graham Bradner	6/24/2020	Follow Up

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.38	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	On 4/22, I asked what the ongoing noise would be. Phil answered noise should be minimal, but nothing can be minimal from 400-600 ft. The other thing I would like to encourage is that Susie has been very active and is knowledgeable in that area. I hope the DWR will take a genuine swipe at discovering what personal toll will have on her and her family. Karen: the domestic wells are close to the 150 ft down tunnel. What are you going to do about them?	The currently proposed Byron Tract Tunnel Maintenance Shaft would be over 4,100 feet (0.75 miles) from the eastern boundary of Discovery Bay development. The tunnel crosses under State Route 4 at approximately 120 feet below the ground surface and about 750 feet from the southeastern corner of Discovery Bay development.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.39	5/27/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	Given the issues with east Highway 4, I think that you should plan to build a safety center before Discovery Bay that includes more than tow trucks; ambulance and emergency personnel will be needed. Poor served area so you will need safety to go along with this project.	We are considering relocation of several tunnel shafts located along State Route 4 to reduce construction traffic along this road. If relocation is not advisable, the DCA can consider alternatives.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.4	5/27/2020	Jim Cox	How about the tours of the fishing manufacturing?	We can plan a visit to the ISI facility in Freeport that manufacturers cylindrical tee fish screens. This will be discussed in more detail at the June SEC meeting.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded
8.41	5/27/2020	Jim Wallace	Map 13 is wrong, it says Sacramento River but it should say Slough.	Map reference has subsequently been corrected.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.42	5/27/2020	Melissa Tayaba	Where are cultural resources in all of this? The AB52 meeting hasn't happened yet, we have concerns but we haven't had communication with them at this time. There are concerns about fish, pollution, restoration, birds. Some of those topics I feel like I can't bring to this setting here but all the maps that you're showing us, there are sites there. They're not being accounted for. We keep asking for alternatives but still we have those big questions. How will you protect sites and cultural resources.... before COVID, we were looking into the screens. Do you have any kind of statistics from the north and about screens and how they affected the fish and do you have the science of the vibrations on the fish?	DWR is responsible for tribal consultations under AB 52, and has reached out to all tribes with initial communications and updates. However, DWR understands that the tribes may not be staffing their offices during the COVID-19 operations. Additional updates will be provided to the tribes as alternatives are developed.  The DCA can provide flash drives to the tribes with meeting presented at the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.43	5/27/2020	Sean Wirth	I've continued to do outreach and have talked to Kathryn. The major concern is the largest impact environmentally of areas that were set aside for the environment. It's concerning to see that level of impact on areas that we should completely avoid. We're going to need to return to get new aspects on what we can do for these species that we need to protect.	DWR will identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures during development of the EIR.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.44	5/27/2020	Douglas Hsia	How many more meetings do we have ahead of us?	We would like to have the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings continue as an ongoing process. We are planning for one meeting each month during the next year. Between June and September, we will be discussing siting and engineering items. In September, we can revisit the purpose and structure of the meetings.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded
8.45	5/27/2020	Douglas Hsia	Is the DCA Board meeting monthly? Will the 4 SEC presenters happen every month?	The DCA Board of Directors meeting happens on the third Thursday of every month. The idea was for the Stakeholder Engagement Committee members to present to the Board of Directors. Depending upon what the Committee members desire, the presentation can continue to be 1 to 4 people. Due to the need for compliance with the Brown Act, Committee members cannot meet with a quorum of the other SEC members for their thoughts or opinions for this report to the Board of Directors.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded

**SEC Member  
Question/Comment Tracking Log  
Updated 06.24.2020**

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.46	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The northern stretch of both corridors is the same and so those comments are combined. The proposed haul roads for intakes 2 and 3 bisect lands in the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge and would be very destructive and disruptive to the wildlife that use and travel between the two sides that the road bisects. Sandhill Cranes use that area extensively in the fall and winter months. The hauling should be done on the River Road to the west to avoid the construction and use of such damaging new haul roads in the refuge. The intakes, which are drivers for the haul roads, but also have hugely damaging effects on the Refuge, should be moved to an area that has less negative effects to the Refuge, which is one of the most important regional conservation efforts in the Sacramento area.	<p>The proposed haul road would be located along the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment so that vehicles can enter and leave the intake sites from the east side of the construction sites. It should be recognized that the intake construction sites extend towards the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment.</p> <p>We currently do not want to access the intake sites from the west near the river side to try to stay out of the community of Hood, and to avoid using State Route 160 which may not be suitable for large volumes of truck traffic. The haul roads would also be sited west of the toe of the abandoned railroad embankment in order to be outside of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge to take advantage of the embankment and tree barrier to serve as a buffer from the wildlife refuge on the east.</p>	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.47	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The proposed Hood Franklin interchange improvement would be growth inducing and the storage facility depicted southeast of that interchange would be disruptive to Refuge lands to the north and lands within the jurisdictional boundary of the Refuge to the south. The inducement of development east of I-5 would impact critical foraging habitat for sandhill crane and other migratory waterfowl. The road widening and bridge improvements on Hood Franklin Road would be disruptive to the Blue Heron Trails facility and would further isolate wildlife attempting terrestrial movement to the north and south in the Refuge. The use of the river or the River Road (160) would avoid these additional disruptions and impacts to the Refuge.	We have modified the roadway access plans to avoid using Hood-Franklin Road for major construction vehicles that would access Intakes 2 and 3.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.48	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	For the proposed Lambert maintenance shaft, the new interchange on Lambert Road would be growth inducing and potentially lead to increased urbanization to the east which would have demonstrable negative cumulative effects on local wildlife. The road widening of Lambert would be disruptive to wildlife and further isolate wildlife attempting terrestrial movement to the north and south in the Refuge, as well as wildlife attempting to utilize habitats nearby the road. The haul roads to the north and to the south of Lambert Road would also be disruptive to wildlife. Use of River Road (160) or the river to move material to the intake sites would lessen these impacts on the Refuge. The location of the Lambert maintenance shaft and the new haul road that would access it would also have substantial negative effects on wildlife from the Refuge.	We have modified the roadway access plans to avoid the need for a new interchange at Lambert Road and Interstate 5. Lambert Road and the bridge are not proposed to be widened over Snodgrass Slough and the embankment with the abandoned railroad alignment within the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. Materials must be moved from Interstate 5 to the intake locations, and DCA believes that Lambert Road currently represents the best overall choice to be used as a single corridor to the intake haul road which would be located to the west of the abandoned railroad embankment. State Route 160 may not be suitable for this amount of construction traffic and the traffic would go through the community of Hood.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.49	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	For the intakes 3 and 5 configuration, the widening of Lambert road and the new interchange was just mentioned. The new haul roads associated with this configuration would disrupt and isolate wildlife in the Refuge.	We have modified the roadway access plans to avoid the need for a new interchange at Lambert Road and Interstate 5. Lambert Road and the bridge are not proposed to be widened over Snodgrass Slough and the embankment with the abandoned railroad alignment within the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. Materials must be moved from Interstate 5 to the intake locations, and DCA believes that Lambert Road currently represents the best overall choice to be used as a single corridor to the intake haul road which would be located to the west of the abandoned railroad embankment. State Route 160 may not be suitable for this amount of construction traffic and the traffic would go through the community of Hood.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.5	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	<p>The conclusion is that for both corridor options presented in the Map Books, the negative terrestrial effects on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge would be severe unless the River Road and the Sacramento River were used for access and for hauling material to and from the intake sites.</p>	<p>The proposed haul road would be located along the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment so that vehicles can enter and leave the intake sites from the east side of the construction sites. It should be recognized that the intake construction sites extend towards the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment.</p> <p>We currently do not wish to access the intake sites from the west near the river side to try to stay out of the community of Hood, and to avoid using State Route 160 which may not be suitable for large volumes of truck traffic. The proposed haul roads would also be sited west of the toe of the abandoned railroad embankment in order to be outside of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge to take advantage of the embankment and tree barrier to serve as a buffer from the wildlife refuge on the east.</p> <p>It may not be feasible to move large volumes of equipment, construction materials, and employees on barges along the Sacramento River. The Sacramento River between Rio Vista and the intake locations includes several relatively shallow areas, including one area between Rio Vista and Walnut Grove where barges could only move during high tides. There are also four moveable bridges between the intakes and Rio Vista which would affect traffic on the river road.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.51	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	A corridor that is further west of the current Central Corridor should be considered to avoid these substantial adverse effects to the Refuge.	<p>We have modified the roadway plans to eliminate major construction traffic on Hood-Franklin Road between Interstate 5 and the community Hood. We have also moved the proposed tunnel launch shaft site from the site on the western side of Interstate 5 to the Twin Cities Complex on the eastern side of Interstate 5. These changes to reduce the need for road modifications to Hood-Franklin and portions of Lambert Roads.</p> <p>The proposed haul road would be located along the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment so that vehicles can enter and leave the intake sites from the east side of the construction sites. It should be recognized that the intake construction sites extend towards the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment.</p> <p>We currently do not wish to access the intake sites from the west near the river side to try to stay out of the community of Hood, and to avoid using State Route 160 which may not be suitable for large volumes of truck traffic. The haul roads would also be sited west of the toe of the abandoned railroad embankment in order to be outside of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge to take advantage of the embankment and tree barrier to serve as a buffer from the wildlife refuge on the east.</p>	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.52	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Both corridors are squarely within the Pacific flyway and enormous numbers of waterfowl and other migratory birds use the areas being contemplated for both alignments. As well, many non-migratory listed species utilize the areas being contemplated for both alignments. It is important to keep this in mind in any discussion of the two corridors under consideration.	The EIR will analyze the potential impacts of the corridor options on terrestrial species.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded



## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.53	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	<p>For the Glanville Tract launch site, the shaft, conveyor belt and new roads are within the boundary of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. And here again, the Refuge would take the brunt of the negative effects of the tunnel infrastructure. It is important to note that a long standing conservation goal has been to provide connection for the Stone Lakes Refuge's Sandhill Crane population with that of the Cosumnes River Preserve, and parts further south. This was an important component of the crane conservation measures included in the BDCP to address impacts from the tunnels, and for the CA Waterfix iteration of the project as well.</p> <p>The strategy was to provide suitable permanent roosting complexes appropriately spaced along the spine of the Stone Lakes Refuge to allow cranes access to the foraging habitat within a 2 mile proximity of those sites such that when completed the southern established roosting sites would overlap with those of the Cosumnes Preserve and provide continuity and connection. The presence of the launch shaft and its substantial infrastructure would make this important goal difficult to impossible to accomplish. As well, there would be serious effects to Swainson's hawks and other listed birds from the placement of this shaft and its infrastructure.</p>	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.54	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Restoring the entire Glanville Tract site to Sandhill Crane roosting and foraging sites, as well as foraging for Swainson's hawks, and supplementing with substantial additional foraging acreage nearby, might help offset the substantial effects to those species from the enormity of the construction planned there.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.55	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The Glanville Tract storage and support site are not within the Stone Lakes National Refuge boundary, but they are extremely close to the conserved lands of the Cosumnes River Preserve and the multi year plan of construction would result in negative effects to wildlife in both the Refuge and the Preserve for more than a decade.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project on terrestrial resources. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.56	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The interchange work at Twin Cities and the road widening would both be growth inducing and have detrimental effects to wildlife, and further isolate and disrupt them.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources and the potential for growth inducement as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.57	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	It has been extremely disappointing to see that our most important regional conservation efforts and successes are being squandered for a project that is so regionally damaging to the environment.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources and the potential for growth inducement as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.58	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	A corridor that is further west should be considered to avoid these substantial adverse effects to the Refuge.	<p>As described in the January 22, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting, intake sites would be located downstream of the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Wastewater Treatment Plant outfall to minimize effects to the Sacramento Regional Water Authority Freeport intake. The intakes also would be located north of the confluence of the Sacramento River and Sutter Slough to minimize effects to some Delta fisheries.</p> <p>The proposed haul road would be located along the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment so that vehicles can enter and leave the intake sites from the east side of the construction sites. It should be recognized that the intake construction sites extend towards the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment.</p> <p>We do not wish to access the intake sites from the west near the river side to try to stay out of the community of Hood, and to avoid using State Route 160 which may not be suitable for large volumes of truck traffic. The haul roads would also be sited west of the toe of the abandoned railroad embankment in order to be outside of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge to take advantage of the embankment and tree barrier to serve as a buffer from the wildlife refuge on the east.</p> <p>It also may not be feasible to move large volumes of equipment, construction materials, and employees on barges along the Sacramento River. The Sacramento River between Rio Vista and the intake locations includes several relatively shallow areas, including one area between Rio Vista and Walnut Grove where barges could only move during high tides. There are also four moveable bridges between the intakes and Rio Vista which would affect traffic on the river road.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.59	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	New Hope Tract Maintenance Shaft: This is a high use area for Sandhill Cranes and migrating waterfowl, and local listed species. The shaft and the road improvements would effect wildlife and further isolate them. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.6	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Staten Island Maintenance Shaft: Staten Island is ground zero in terms of regional Sandhill Crane population. More cranes and migratory waterfowl use this Island than any other area in our region. I provided coordinates and a description for a maintenance shaft location that should have the least effect on the Island's wildlife, but that statement needs to be tempered with the acknowledgment that any effect on the most important regional resource for Sandhill Cranes and other waterfowl is too much. The suggested location for the maintenance shaft was 38 degrees 10" 59" N by 121 degrees 30'31"W, as near the road as possible, adjacent to Luc's house. This is an already disturbed area and, if near the road and power line, the facility would help keep cranes flying over that spot elevated over the line, perhaps reducing risk of collisions.	The DCA moved the proposed Staten Island tunnel maintenance shaft to the suggested location.	Graham Bradner	6/24/2020	Responded
8.61	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Bouldin Island Launch Shaft: This is another important location for foraging and roosting Sandhill Cranes, as well as many other listed species. It is close to Staten Island and an important component of the available conservation for the Sandhill Crane. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) claimed that it purchased this island, along with three other Delta Islands, for the co-equal goals of a "restored Delta and a reliable water supply for California." If the incredibly damaging shaft is not located here, does that mean that MWD would only be planning for restoration for this site? This is an important point to understand in trying to determine which corridor would have less detrimental effects to terrestrial wildlife. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.62	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Mandeville Maintenance Shaft: This shaft and its new haul roads and bridges would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.63	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Bacon Island Reception Shaft: This shaft and its new haul roads and bridge would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.64	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Byron Tract Maintenance Shaft: This shaft and its new haul roads would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects.	The proposed tunnel shaft location on Byron Tract north of State Route 4 has been eliminated.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.65	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Southern Forebay Facilities: This huge expansion of the forebay facilities would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility. Given the amount of space depicted between the elements of the facility, there should be ample opportunity to maximize native plantings.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.66	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	New Hope Tract Maintenance Shaft: This more easterly location is preferable because of the reduction in road improvements, but it is unclear how access to the shaft would be attained. The one described road goes straight to the alignment and then stops with no indication of how it would proceed either north or west. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	<p>The proposed access road to the New Hope Tract tunnel maintenance shaft on the Central Corridor would extend to the west from West Lauffer Road.</p> <p>The proposed access road to the New Hope Tract tunnel maintenance shaft on the Eastern Corridor would extend to the west from Blossom Road, generally along a farm road.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.67	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Brack Tract Mainenance Shaft: This shaft is very close to both the north and the south units of the Woodbridge Ecological Reserve, which is second only to Staten Island in terms of Sandhill Crane density. This is also an incredibly popular area for crane viewing, with the south unit parking lot overflowing with visitors on the weekend. The shaft appears to be within one mile of both the north and the south unit roosting areas, making the shaft placement situated in an area an overlap for foraging cranes from both of those roosting areas. The shaft needs to be moved north outside of at least that one mile foraging diameter, and two miles outside would be better.	<p>The proposed tunnel shaft has been moved to Canal Ranch Tract.</p> <p>The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.68	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Terminus Tract Reception Shaft: The needed roadwork and level of disturbing effects to terrestrial wildlife is reduced for this shaft compared to its central corridor counterpart. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.69	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Kind Island Maintenance Shaft: The needed roadwork and level of disturbing effects to terrestrial wildlife is reduced for this shaft compared to its central corridor counterpart. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

## SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.7	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Lower Roberts Island Launch Shaft: local listed species here may be pushed over the brink by the added pressures of the construction and operation of this shaft, which could increase the chance for permanent abandonment of the area by some of those species. This shaft and its new haul roads and bridge and barge landing would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	<p>The proposed barge landing was deleted from the Lower Roberts Island tunnel launch shaft site.</p> <p>The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.71	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Lower Jones Mainenance Shaft: The needed roadwork and level of disturbing effects to terrestrial wildlife is reduced for this shaft compared to its central corridor counterpart. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.72	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Victoria Island Maintenance Shaft: The needed roadwork and level of disturbing effects to terrestrial wildlife is reduced for this shaft compared to its central corridor counterpart. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The proposed Victoria Island tunnel maintenance shaft has been deleted.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.73	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	If the Bract Track Maintenance Shaft could be moved further north so that it is more than one mile from both the southern and northern units of the Woodbridge Ecological Reserve, the eastern corridor would appear to have less negative effects on terrestrial wildlife. Much more still needs to be done to reduce effects on wildlife in the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge.	<p>The proposed tunnel shaft has been moved to Canal Ranch Tract.</p> <p>The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.</p>	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded



SEC Member

Question/Comment Tracking Log

Updated 06.24.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.74	5/30/2020	Karen Mann	Please make sure the traffic people are aware and monitor the number of deaths/year on Hwy 4 (San Joaquin County AND Contra Costa County area) – then check Byron Highway.	The DCA shares the community's emphasis on safety regarding State Route 4. We are evaluating potential adjustments to tunnel shaft locations based on Stakeholder Engagement Committee feedback as well as our own observations to minimize construction traffic on the two State Route 4 bridges.	Kathryn Mallon	6/24/2020	Responded