

October 30, 2020

Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority
Stakeholder Engagement Committee Members

Subject: ***Materials for the November 5, 2020 Regular Committee Meeting***

Members of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee:

The thirteenth regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Stakeholder Engagement Committee is scheduled for a remote video conference on **Thursday, November 5, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.**

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

<https://webinar.ringcentral.com/j/1480658465>

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

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

- **Meeting Agenda**
- **Meeting Minutes**- September 23, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting

All files presented during the meeting will also be available at dcdca.org by the Monday following the meeting.

Regards,

Sarah Palmer, DCA Board Member
Stakeholder Engagement Committee Chair

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



DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, November 5, 2020, 3:00 p.m.

Remote – Conference Access Information:

Phone Number: 1 (650) 242-4929 **Access Code:** 148 065 8465

Electronic Meeting Link:

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

<https://webinar.ringcentral.com/j/1480658465>

The purpose of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee is to create a forum for Delta stakeholders to provide input and feedback on technical/engineering issues related to the DCA’s current activities. Please note, this meeting is **not** part of the Department of Water Resources' California Environmental Quality Act public outreach process related to a potential Delta Conveyance project and therefore comments made in this meeting will not be recorded or tracked for those purposes. All items are information only.

In compliance with state and county health orders, the meeting will be held electronically only through the listed meeting link and telephone number. Assistance will be provided to those requiring accommodations for disabilities in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; requests for accommodations can be made by contacting staff at (888) 853-8486 or info@dcdca.org. Members of the public may speak regarding items on the agenda when recognized by the Chair. Speakers are limited to three minutes each; however, the Chair may limit this time at her discretion. Please note that Item 4 is a single discussion item; subparts are listed for clarity. **Persons wishing to provide public comments remotely on Agenda Items must complete the online public comment form at <https://tinyurl.com/dcapubliccomment-SEC> by 4:00 pm.** The public may also provide written public comment by email to publiccomment@dcdca.org. All written comments received prior to the conclusion of the meeting will be included in the written record for the meeting but will not be read during the meeting. Additional information will be provided at the commencement of the meeting.

1. WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL/HOUSEKEEPING

3. MINUTES REVIEW: September 23, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting

4. WORKSHOP: STAFF PRESENTATION & COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

- 4a. DCA Responds to Deferred SEC Questions
- 4b. Bethany Alternative Logistics & Traffic
- 4c. DWR Updates
- 4d. SEC Questions or Comments on September 23rd Meeting Presentation
- 4e. Public Comment on Item 4

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS & NEXT MEETING

6. NON-AGENDIZED SEC QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

7. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS

This is the time and place for members of the public to address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee’s jurisdiction but that are not on the agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes each; however, the Chair may limit this time when reasonable based on the circumstances. To provide public comment, complete the online public comment form at <https://tinyurl.com/dcapubliccomment-SEC> by 4:00 pm with their name, phone number or other identifier. As these items have not been agendized, the Committee is not legally able to discuss these items at this meeting unless a recognized exception applies.

8. ADJOURNMENT

* * * * *

Next scheduled meeting: December 9, 2020 Regular Stakeholder Engagement Committee Meeting at 3:00p.m.



Memo

Contact: Valerie Martinez, SEC Facilitator

Date: November 5, 2020 SEC Meeting

Item No. 3

Subject: Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes from SEC Meeting 12 (September 23, 2020) are attached for your review. Please send any edits to hannahflanagan@dcdca.org by **noon Wednesday, November 4, 2020**. Since the SEC is not a voting group, this process will facilitate the review process and allow us to efficiently address the minutes at the meeting.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, September 23rd, 2020

3:00 PM

(Paragraph numbers coincide with agenda item numbers)

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

1. WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Stakeholder Engagement Committee (SEC) was called to order via RingCentral video conference at 3:00 pm.

Director Palmer welcomed the SEC and meeting guests and thanked all for their participation. The meeting is being held via phone and video conference pursuant to Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20 in response to the COVID-19 State of Emergency.

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

2. ROLL CALL/HOUSEKEEPING

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

Member Mike Hardesty and tribal representative alternate Chairman Jesus Tarango were not in attendance.

DCA Board Members in attendance were Director Sarah Palmer (Chair) and Barbara Keegan (Vice Chair). In addition, DCA and DWR staff members in attendance were Kathryn Mallon,

Valerie Martinez, Joshua Nelson, Graham Bradner, Nazli Parvizi, Claudia Rodriguez, Jasmine Runquist, Genevieve Taylor and Carrie Buckman.

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

Ms. Palmer stated that this meeting has a change of platform within RingCentral which places the SEC members in a different virtual meeting room than attendees. The SEC discussion and public comment processes remain the same. Attendees will remain muted with no video option unless they are speaking during public comment. The DCA will unmute the speaker however the speaker will have the option to turn on their video. The SEC members have full control of their video and audio. The chat function will not be used in this meeting even though it can be seen.

Ms. Palmer reviewed housekeeping items. Members of the public can request to speak during the public comment period by submitting the online form at <https://tinyurl.com/dcapubliccomment-SEC>. Written comments will be added to the record but not read during the meeting. DCA will work to ensure everyone is heard and receives the information needed.

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

Ms. Palmer announced that there is a new member, Chief David Welch from the Courtland Fire Department. A new directory has been circulated and will include his contact information. Also, applications are being taken for a new SEC representative for Hood.

3. MINUTES REVIEW: September 23rd, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting

There were no comments or changes to the minutes.

4. WORKSHOP: STAFF PRESENTATION & COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

a. DWR Updates & Environmental Justice Survey Overview

Ms. Buckman provided an environmental review update.

The CEQA process is currently at the “Scoping Summary Report” phase, which has been completed, along with the NOP and scoping meetings. The next step is the Agency Outreach Plan. DWR has already begun reaching out to some agencies and made some progress with Step 2 of the process, which includes formulating and defining alternatives.

With CEQA, DWR is still working to collect information needed for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) by identifying existing conditions and developing methods to analyze potential impacts.

With NEPA, the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is now accepting scoping comments for their Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Comments are due to USACE by October 20th.

In regard to soil investigations, field work under the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been scheduled to start in late September/early October on public property or with willing landowners. The process will start with site clearances at those sites with biological, cultural, and drilling representatives to ensure the site will work for the investigation. Private landowners are also being contacted for use of their properties. These landowners have received phone calls and information in the mail in hopes of obtaining a temporary entry permit. This permit includes a set of procedures for accessing the property, noticing requirements, information regarding the types of work and timelines for the work. It also includes compensation for the use of their property to conduct these investigations.

DWR is also starting to develop a framework for community benefits discussions with the SEC to start in December. They are looking at goals and processes that will not only be shared within DWR, but also other agencies before it goes public at the SEC meetings. The conversations regarding these topics will be introduced in December, to move more steadily in 2021.

Regarding DCA’s delivery schedule, information for the East and Central corridors was received by DWR in August to help start work on the environmental process and the Project Engineering Report will be submitted in December. As the Bethany corridor is a more recent effort, the information for the environmental process is planned to be received by December and the Project Engineering Report submitted to DWR by April 2021.

Ms. Buckman introduced the Survey of Delta Environmental Justice Communities that DWR will be sending out. The first reason for this survey is to learn about the places and resources that are important to people. A robust understanding of these baseline values will improve the CEQA analysis of disproportionate impacts to Disadvantaged Communities in the Delta. Additionally, DWR wants to identify potential project-related impacts and benefits for the Delta’s diverse communities. The goal is to identify ways in which the project may affect these places and resources and consider options to reduce these impacts or benefit Disadvantaged Communities in the Delta.

Ms. Buckman introduced Genevieve Taylor to further the presentation on the survey. Ms. Taylor is with Ag Innovations, an independent facilitator that has been assisting DWR with developing the survey. The survey is working on community input with a specific focus on environmental justice and Disadvantaged Communities. With regard to Disadvantaged Communities, they are looking at historically burdened, underrepresented, low-income, and

otherwise vulnerable populations. The survey should, however, be filled out by anyone who lives, works, or plays in the Delta. Although the goal is for everyone to participate, the questions are not designed to focus on unique tribal concerns and interests. It is not a formal part of DWR's tribal consultation process. DWR would appreciate tribal participation and efforts from tribal representatives to reach out to their communities about the survey but it is not geared towards tribal concerns.

The survey is on MetroQuest, which allows it to be easy and interactive. The intent is to collect data and provide education, while being quick and engaging. Robust marketing is being used to encourage broad participation, including social media and postcards to be mindful of the bandwidth issues in the Delta. There will be strategies to work with community organizations to provide information and get it out to everyone.

After the "Welcome" page on the survey, there is a section entitled "What's Important to You?" where one will drag a wide range of topics into a list to show top priorities. These topics include Historic & Cultural Protection, Healthy Natural Environment, and Internet Access, among others. Assuming that the list is not all-encompassing, there is an option to suggest another priority.

Next is the "Places That Matter to You" page where participants will drag and drop at least three map markers to show the places that are special to them. Each marker will ask for some more information regarding the type of location that it is. Options include historic or cultural site, fishing, gathering spots, outdoor activities, business or service, and other. The goal with this page is to lay out these locations and understand how they are used.

The next page is "Delta Community Needs" to identify nuance of participants' experiences in the Delta. Community members provided some help about how to frame questions and DWR is hoping to get additional feedback about what works and what does not. This page also includes economic wellbeing, experience in nature, and voice, where participants can discuss their experience with other projects.

The survey is expected to be in the field from September 29th to November 30th. It is planned to be available in English, Spanish, Chinese, and Tagalog (the top 4 spoken languages of the residents in the 5-county Delta region). With these languages, 95% of the population should be able to submit their surveys. Marketing will include e-blasts, social media, flyers, and an extensive phone bank. Postcards will also be sent to approximately 13,000 people that have been identified carefully based on low income and bandwidth limitations.

The website that will be used is YourDeltaYourVoice.org and QR codes will also be used. For any questions, please contact Heather@AgInnovations.org.

Ms. Martinez clarified that the survey is one of many different outreach tools being used for the project. It is not meant to replace any aspect of outreach, including tribal consultation.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla asked if information about surface water was included in the survey?

Ms. Taylor said that information is in the survey under the "Your Experience in Nature" portion.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla commented that most of the Filipino community takes pride in also speaking English, but other Cambodian languages are not included in the survey. They do a lot of fishing in the Delta. Why is only Tagalog included?

Ms. Taylor said Tagalog was chosen because the Census listed 6% of the population speaking Tagalog only. There is quite a concentration in Solano County. The plan is to learn and observe as much as possible from the first round to see what's needed at this time. If there is a desire for something else, it will be added. This is just the first of several surveys.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla suggested working with Apsara to do the translations, which would result in thousands more responses.

Ms. Taylor said the team will be working with Apsara.

Mr. Wallace said in CEQA, there is no such thing as environmental justice resource. Environmental Justice is applied differently in CEQA because it's supposed to assess the physical effects of a project on a community. It would be helpful to clarify exactly how CEQA addresses environmental justice. Will the data from the survey will be shared with USACE preparing the NEPA document? NEPA does have an environmental justice category that is very specific about the data that will need to be used and how to identify low income communities/communities at risk. Background information would be helpful. Mr. Wallace mentioned that another survey has been circulating in the Delta about water usage and it has been resisted by large portions of the population because it seemed to be invasive and a duplicate of the Census. Unless the survey is presented in a way that makes people feel comfortable, there might be some resistance to providing responses.

Ms. Buckman said while two separate documents are being prepared for the EIR and the EIS, DWR's document is including all CEQA and NEPA requirements, even though USACE is preparing a separate EIS to satisfy NEPA requirements. As the project proponent, DWR knows that USACE will be incorporating a lot of DWR's information by reference as the basis of their document and if there are any other subsequent NEPA compliance efforts needed, the team would like to have them available. The plan is to structure the environmental justice analysis similar to the requirements of NEPA. More in-depth detail can be provided at an upcoming meeting if there is interest.

Ms. Taylor said the team has been thinking about how the survey would be received. Another distraction could be the election. The strategy is to work with community organizations that have trusted relationships and give them plenty of information so they can speak to it. The marketing has been made to be engaging and the language made to be inviting to assure the public how information is being used and why. The hope is that folks have several points of contact. For example, mail, Facebook, or around the community to make it worthwhile to be involved.

Ms. Martinez asked if it would be helpful for the SEC members to push the survey out to their communities.

Ms. Taylor said SEC members sharing the survey link would be helpful to show that it is a worthwhile endeavor. The intent is to be useful in different ways.

Mr. Hsia asked if the survey will be pushed out to Elk Grove.

Ms. Taylor said yes, the goal is to reach anyone that is somehow connected to the Delta. Zip codes are also included in the survey. That demographic information will be very important in determining where folks are at and what that means.

Ms. Hsia mentioned that there is a large Chinese population in Elk Grove.

Ms. Taylor said it would be great to make sure that the survey makes its way there.

Ms. Tayaba asked how the survey would work for tribal groups.

Ms. Taylor said the team would love to have tribal groups participate. However, because sensitive information would be included, that information might be better provided through the formal tribal consultation process. There is a question under the maps about historical and cultural resources that is identified as confidential. The team will go through the answers and anything that could be confidential will be flagged.

Ms. Buckman said to add in on the DWR's perspective, it will be ensured that everything is kept confidential and addressed in a complex way that the tribes are looking for. This is a good way to collect information quickly, but this is not the only way information will be collected from tribes.

Ms. Tayaba said tribes would definitely like to participate.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla said that in the North Delta, 52 percent of people who live there speak a language other than English as their first language. There is a poverty rate in communities of color between 13 and 18 percent. We commend DWR for getting this work done and going above and beyond the requirements of CEQA because the only people who brought folks from the environmental justice communities of the North Delta during the Water Hearing at the Water Board during the last round of WaterFix was Restore the Delta. Water Board acknowledged and understood that there is a human right to water consideration that goes with this project. It's outstanding of DWR to do this survey and it's some of the best action they've taken as a group. There is a systemic history of racial isolation of communities of color and landowners from the Delta. With all that is happening today across the country with equity, access to resources, and public health there is a moral obligation to do more. More means more information to do what is best by the entire community.

Ms. Swenson said she commends the efforts to try to receive more input from a more diverse group in the Delta. The limitations with COVID are understandable. There is a greater response to paper surveys. It is old-fashioned but the Delta is old-fashioned. Requests will probably be made for the survey to be in paper form and potentially to be placed in post offices. Is it possible to get this format? The QR codes are great but might not work out for everyone. Be mindful of the audience. The Census is still done by hand.

Ms. Taylor responded that the team will definitely take that into consideration. It's been surprising what bandwidth looks like in the Delta and the team truly believe this will be a good

way, but if people need support in filling out the survey, there will be a hotline to help. Please keep in touch with the team if people are requesting paper surveys and requests like placing it in the post office.

Ms. Martinez said the survey is made for the computer and also cell phones.

Ms. Taylor said the survey is designed for cell phones as well and it has been tested with older cell phones to ensure that everyone can use it effectively.

Mr. Cox said the survey is a great idea and it's good to see fishing included in the topics. The Delta Protection Commission would be helpful to get the survey out as well.

b. Bethany Alternative Siting

Mr. Bradner began the presentation on facility siting analysis for the Bethany Alternative.

All of the alternatives have intakes in the northern part of the project area. The Eastern Tunnel Corridor and the Central Tunnel Corridor proceed south, connecting with the Southern Forebay. The Bethany Alternative heads much further south on the eastern side of Clifton Court Forebay, connecting into Bethany Reservoir. The presentation focuses mostly on areas south of Lower Roberts because everything else is similar to the other alignments that have been presented to the SEC. There will also be focus on Twin Cities because the different approach to RTM management affects the launch site.

The Bethany Alternative deviates at the Lower Roberts Launch Shaft. The Bethany Reservoir is up in the foothills at an elevation of about 245 to 250 feet. For reference, a lot of other areas in the Delta are at a -10 to -15-foot elevation. This is a different approach to getting water into the State Water Project. The Bethany Alternative eliminates the Southern Forebay and the tunnel connections down to the State Water Project. A pumping plant will still be used to not only lift water out of the tunnel but also deliver it directly to Bethany Reservoir with this alternative.

Mr. Bradner presented an overview of the configuration for the Bethany Reservoir system. The water comes in from the tunnel and up through the shaft to the pumping plant. The shaft will be multi-purpose as it can also flow up into the surge basin if necessary. The water will go up through a wet well into the pumping plant that will be responsible for pushing the water up the hill through pipelines into the Reservoir. There will be surge tanks associated with the pipeline to address any abrupt shutdowns.

In terms of the system components, everything will begin at the Lower Roberts Launch Shaft and there will be two maintenance shafts along the tunnel alignment to the pumping plant. There are two maintenance shafts because the distance is about 15 miles. The pumping plant will lift the tunnel flow up to the Reservoir and the surge basin will be adjacent to the pumping plant to release water during a surge event. From the pumping plant, there will be four parallel pipelines to convey water to the Reservoir, with associating surge tanks. Lastly, there will be a discharge structure into Bethany Reservoir.

Mr. Bradner pointed out the constraints with the site. The presentation image showed the pumping plant at the southern end of the project, south of Clifton Court Forebay. The image also pointed out the Banks approach canal on the left and the federal approach canal on the right. There are several high-power utilities and gas lines that zig zag along the site. There are many conservation preserves and easements that cover the front end of Bethany Reservoir, which are constraints when looking at the different siting options. Something to note is that the Mountain House School and the community of Mountain House are nearby. Another consideration with this area is that the topography starts to change; it is mostly flat by Jones Pumping Plant, but once the foothills are reached, it starts to climb. The steeper grade is another element that will need to be dealt with.

He outlined the other pumping plant sites considered. There were a total of 10, including several along the outer rim of the Reservoir for a cavern style pumping plant. A few more locations were partly down the hillside and two other locations were down at the lower elevation by Byron Highway. The main comparison criteria used included system operations and flexibility considerations, construction considerations, geotechnical considerations, property and land use, and environmental setting.

A comparison of all the Pumping Plant options was presented, showing option 3 being eliminated prior to the siting evaluation based available information. The color coding used on the chart are green for favorable, yellow for neutral, and orange for negative. An importance factor was also applied in a separate column. As a result of this analysis, site 10 scored the highest ranking and is therefore the preferred site for the pumping plant and the associated surge basin. Site 10 is relatively close to the federal pumping plant. This site avoids impacts to the conservation easements and there is excellent access from Byron Highway and Interstate 580 and to existing power. The pumping plant configuration would be similar to many existing DWR facilities, pumping from the base of the hill. There is adequate space in this area and at a low ground elevation to minimize the height of the surge relief basin and avoid dam safety regulations, but not an excessively deep excavation.

A total of six routes were considered for the pipeline alignment (A-F). Route E was eliminated from further study, similar to the previously discussed Site 3. The pipeline corridor extends from the pumping plant to Bethany Reservoir. Four 15-foot diameter parallel steel pipelines are required (at 6,000 cfs). The pipelines would be constructed with cut and cover methods, with some areas requiring tunneling depending on obstacles such as topography and other features that exist in the area. There are many narrow valleys and high peaks that need to be dealt with in finding the appropriate route. The presentation image also shows the conservation easements.

The same approach for comparison was used as the pumping plant. Both the color coding and importance level systems were used in determining the preferred route. Based on the analysis, the recommended alignment in Route F. This alignment results in the shortest overall length and discharges at a location in the Reservoir that provides adequate mixing of the water to limit stagnation. It also avoids embankment dams that stretch along the northeastern end of the Reservoir. It maintains adequate distance from sensitive receptors that were looked at in the siting analysis. The route minimizes conflict with existing surface structures and conservation easements. It does require two tunneled sections—one under the federal aqueducts and another under the conservation easement along the southern perimeter of Bethany Reservoir.

Mr. Bradner discussed the tunnel alignment and the shaft siting analysis. The presentation image showed colored squares that represent sites that were selected and evaluated based on the criteria shown on the left side of the presentation, including that the total route is about 15 miles and a maintenance shaft would be needed every 4-6 miles. Two potential maintenance shafts will be needed along the route, with a minimum 10-acre site each. Additional desirable criteria for the shaft sites are that they be along existing roads, more than a half mile away from existing schools, conservation land, refuges, preserves, etc., and that they be more than a quarter mile away from existing homes. None of the locations presented conflict with any of the criteria. Based on all this analysis, an Upper Jones Tract Maintenance Shaft and a Union Island Maintenance Shaft were sited. The image shows straight line rough tunnel alignments, but more work needs to be done for the exact tunnel alignments. The Upper Jones Shaft is right along Bacon Island Rd. and Union Island is right off Bonetti Rd. Clifton Court Forebay is shown for reference.

In summary, the Launch/Reception Shaft would be at Lower Roberts Island, two maintenance shafts, one at Upper Jones Tract and another at Union Island, the Reception Shaft would be just south of Byron Highway at the Bethany Pumping plant and Surge Basin, with a pipeline route of four parallel pipelines directly into Bethany Reservoir.

Ms. Mann said it looks like it would be a great cost savings not having to dig another forebay. Was that part of the plan?

Mr. Bradner said it's unknown at this point how the cost will end up turning out, but the cost of pumping plant and the pipeline will still be pretty significant.

Ms. Mann said it appears that there are no additional fish screens. Is that correct?

Mr. Bradner said correct, there would be no connection to any water bodies, except at the intakes.

Ms. Mallon explained that there were no additional fish screens on the Eastern or Central alignment, once the water is screened at the Sacramento River it stays isolated on that route.

Mr. Bradner added that the Eastern or Central corridor options would discharge into the Banks Channel, but it was downstream of the fish facility at Clifton Court.

Ms. Mallon said when Ms. Buckman did the presentation where she explained why she was requesting the DCA study this, it met all of the goals and objectives of the project and it had a perceived reduction of impact. The elimination of the Southern Forebay, the tunneling, and the hydraulic structures along the aqueduct results in a substantial reduction of the footprint of this alternative. This is why it was added in the analysis.

Ms. Mann said to clarify, there are three different alternative sites to present to the governor, correct?

Ms. Mallon said Ms. Buckman has asked the DCA to evaluate the three alternatives in detailed engineering documents, which is why it's being reviewed with the SEC.

Ms. Buckman said in addition to these alignments, there may be additional operational components that DWR would analyze in the EIR. It's undetermined at this point what the final number of alternatives will be.

Ms. Mann asked if the SEC is also looking at alternatives as far as intakes. Is there flexibility for the intakes?

Ms. Buckman said the intakes are set where they are, and there were no good alternatives for those.

Ms. Mann said the amount of electricity that is required to pump water over the Tehachapis to Southern California is a great amount. What about this pump station? What kind of magnitude of electricity? It's a big deal, especially with all the fires.

Ms. Mallon said there are no differences in power requirements between the different alignments; all water needs to get pumped up to Bethany Reservoir. In the last alternative, the reliance was on the Banks Pumping Station, but obviously this will not be needed with the use of Bethany. This will run independent of the Clifton Court Aqueduct and Banks facilities.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla asked what are the levee heights for the maintenance shafts for Lower Roberts Island down to Bethany Reservoir.

Mr. Bradner said the pads themselves are generally going to be constructed to elevations similar to the surrounding levees. It will vary based on individual site configuration. In general, from Lower Roberts down to Bethany, those are probably going to be about 15-20 feet tall, as the areas are at lower elevation.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla mentioned that in a recent presentation for new modeling for flooding inundation for the Delta that takes into account sea level rise, storm surge, and storm events running down the San Joaquin River, it seems that this entire alignment is placed at the most vulnerable part of the Delta. Tremendous flooding is being forecasted mid-century to 100 years at Lower Roberts Island past Clifton Court Forebay heading towards the Reservoir. In particular, Site 10 will be a flood site. There might be some homework to do along those lines. Right now, the Jones pumping plant is used at almost 100% capacity during pumping season, and it was discussed at the last meeting that a storage facility for water would be unnecessary because it would always be in operation. Can Jones handle this alternative? It was mentioned that with pumping to get water up there, energy use would need to be increased regardless of which direction it came from. In light of trying to decrease energy use, can there be a solar alternative?

Mr. Bradner said the presentation mentioned was referring to work that the Delta Stewardship Council is presenting. He said he has not seen it yet but looks forward to seeing it when it is released publicly. When looking at different locations for the potential pumping plant and surge basin, elevations played a key role. At the site being shown for Bethany, elevation ranges from about 40-50 which is pretty far above the flood plain. In DCA's analysis, they coordinated with DWR to figure out a 200-year flood elevation of 20.8 feet that incorporates future sea level rise and changing climate conditions. The pumping plant site is higher than that. With the

maintenance shafts and launch shaft, the shaft structure would be built up to 200-year flood protection, with those changing environmental conditions, originating up at the intakes at the Sacramento River. It's higher than many of the numbers down in the Delta. Those shafts are being built to the highest elevation to ensure there's no flooding or inundation inside the tunnel, or if there were to be some sort of malfunction or incident where the inside of the tunnel was flooded, it wouldn't flood out.

Ms. Mallon added that the Sacramento River hydraulic connection is driving the height of the shaft. It's higher than the flood level or the climate change level.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla said the team really needs to look at flood inundation on the San Joaquin River side because that's the biggest flood threat, not the Sacramento River. The Delta Stewardship Council is using sea level rise forecasts from the Oceanic Administration and is middle of the road in their forecasting. Keep in mind flood threat and an accelerated threat that would flip the switch.

Mr. Bradner said he would like to see what the DSC is producing. Jones Pumping Plant which is the federal Pumping Plant, only gets involved if the federal agencies are participating in the project, in which case they would receive a 1500 cfs diversion into their approach canal that would then be lifted into their system.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked does this project's pumping plant replace that completely?

Mr. Bradner said this pumping plant does not even involve it; it's parallel.

Mr. Wirth asked who owns the easements. Were they set out to protect particular species? Why shouldn't we assume that the downslope habitats aren't as important as those in the easements?

Ms. Buckman said those are easements that are associated with different projects. Generally, DWR and DFW hold a number of easements. The reason they are being avoided is because it is a requirement of the easements. When the easement was created, it prohibits any construction activity on them. As part of the EIR, it will be looked at if there is the potential to affect other resources on other parts of the alignment and if there is the need to mitigate, but it's a requirement that those areas are avoided. The easement next to Bethany is held by DWR and DFW for California red legged frog, California tiger salamander, San Joaquin kit fox, and burrowing owl. It was in response to the South Bay Aqueduct Improvement Project.

Ms. Swenson said it seems dismal to have the construction activity so close to schools and homes. It doesn't seem like a preferred alternative because it's still close range. How do you analyze which is best? Are you looking from a position of land use? One view is being preferred over another because if it was coming from a community aspect, it wouldn't be so close to schools. What is the main driver in determining facility routes? Why is something so expensive being built for water to go into an aqueduct that is leaking, not covered, and loses water to evaporation? It doesn't seem like the best use of water. Not being used beneficially with tax dollars.

Ms. Mallon said the question will be recorded with a response in writing in the Q&A to clarify some misinformation in that question.

Mr. Bradner said the main driver for siting this is an engineering analysis to site the facility to lay out a concept project that will then be analyzed through the environmental process. This is not the finished project; there will be more evaluations done.

Ms. Mallon said in terms of the proximity to schools, a slide was also shown about all the constraints in the area. DCA had proposed for construction close to school to only be done in the summer. The work that is in close proximity to schools can be isolated to only do in the summer months. Since this is a pipeline, the work would continue to move along as it gets done.

Ms. Swenson asked if residents will be put up in hotels during the construction if it is close to their homes?

Ms. Mallon said if there was a direct impact that would warrant it, it would be part of a fund for that.

Ms. Martinez added that community is a big factor in the EIR and a determining factor in the siting for this project.

Ms. Mallon agreed and said the team is trying to avoid houses where possible and optimize given the constraints.

Mr. Moran said in previous presentations, there have been mockups of what facilities might look like in the landscape. Will this pipeline be buried?

Mr. Bradner said it's cut and cover, so it would be buried.

Mr. Moran asked for more clarification in writing on any scenario where both Bethany and Banks will be operating at the same time, keeping in mind flood control, high flows, etc.

Ms. Mallon said the DCA is not part of the operational scenario, that will be developed by DWR down the line. This won't be able to be answered in the SEC questions.

Dr. Lytle asked how much water Banks and Bethany are capable of pumping. Has there been any preliminary analysis on seismic vulnerability in that area? When another pumping station is placed so close to the state and federal pumping stations, if there is a seismic vulnerability area right there, all the conveyance facilities will be sabotaged. Please look at this closely.

Mr. Bradner said Banks is a little over 10,000 cfs and Bethany would be designed to discharge whatever the current flow capacity is. It could range between 3,000 and 6,000 cfs. The additional 1,500 cfs for a 7,500 cfs project would be delivered to the Central Valley project, before it got to Bethany. The maximum of the discharge to Bethany Reservoir would be 6,000 cfs, even for alternatives with capacity of up to 7,500 cfs.

Mr. Hsia asked about the present condition of Bethany Reservoir. Will it require much improvement?

Mr. Bradner said some conversations with folks at DWR about those conditions have begun. There are no impending critical issues and it will be inspected regularly by DWR.

c. RTM Management Plan Updates

Mr. Bradner provided information on the RTM Management Plan specific to the Bethany Alternative. RTM is only generated at tunnel launch shaft sites, in this case at the two locations, Twin Cities and Lower Roberts. Slightly more would be produced at Lower Roberts, with 6.6 million cubic yards being generated at Twin Cities and 7.5 million cubic yards at Lower Roberts. There is no Southern Forebay on the Bethany Alternative, so there is no need to transport RTM from Twin Cities to the Southern Facility Site. Borrow material would be needed for the launch shafts, so the RTM would be used to restore the topography of those borrow areas. For size reference of a million cubic yards, it's equivalent to 600 acres at a foot deep, or 60 acres 10 feet deep, or 300 Olympic sized swimming pools.

The first option for RTM Management associated with the Bethany alternative is to stockpile on-site. The second option is off-site disposal; hauling it off from where it's generated to somewhere else with another use. It can often times be used for mining and quarries operations.

The first stockpile, the Twin Cities Stockpile, would need to allow space on-site for natural drying. It's essentially the same site boundary as the Central and Eastern alignments, but without rail. With no need of rail, there is also no need to relocate Franklin Blvd. A range of heights were looked at for the stockpile, ranging from 15-25 ft. A stockpile with a height of 15 ft would have a footprint of 222 acres, 20 ft would be 167 acres, and 25 ft would be 133 acres. A photo render was shown from Dierssen Rd. to give an idea of what the site would look like from I-5. The image shows the launch shaft on the left with the extension and the wall with 200-year flood elevation. It goes up about 20 ft above the existing grade. The stockpile is shown in the background, with Franklin Blvd. behind it. Another render was shown from Franklin Blvd, showing the intersection at Twin Cities. The 25-ft height and the 15-ft height renders were shown. The team has reviewed many options but are thinking a 15-ft stockpile would be better, although it would consume more acreage.

The second stockpile, the Lower Roberts, is at a lower elevation of -10 ft. The levee by the Stockton River is shown with an elevation of 14 ft. On the right of the image presented, there is a dredge stockpile area that is used periodically. A 15-ft. height is similar to the existing dredge stockpile height. Same as Twin Cities, different site dimensions were looked at for different heights. At 15 ft, the site would be 265 acres, at 20 ft., it would be 199 acres, and at 25 ft., it would be 159 acres. The team thinks a 15-ft. area would make the most sense and be less visible. A photo render was shown from on top of the levee with Windmill Cove to the left, looking over the Port of Stockton. The 15 ft. stockpile was shown and other facilities were still seen in the background behind it.

Mr. Bradner reviewed Option 2, off-site disposal. It's a much smaller site required, and the material would only be held on-site long enough to be tested before being hauled off. There

would be no on-site drying because that would expand the site footprint. The material would be hauled wet to look at the benefits of a much smaller site. The options for hauling methods are road and rail. Disposal options include potential quarry reclamations and landfills.

The Twin Cities site would only need to be 175 acres for off-site hauling. It would still require the perimeter ring levee to protect the interior of the site. There would still be the borrow area for construction of shaft pads and wet containment cells for holding and testing. There is a significant difference in the construction size as the drying area is not needed.

The Lower Roberts site reduces from 370 acres to 130 acres. The shaft pad area would still be needed, and the tunnel liner segments would be adjacent. The area in the center is where the RTM would sit for testing and where it would get loaded for off-hauling. An additional area on the right of the construction area is tentative and would be used as a borrow area for pad construction.

The options for off-site material transport are road and rail. Trucks could haul about 13 cy averaging about 3,600 truck trips a week (round trip). If tunnel boring is moving faster, it could be up to 7,200 truck trips a week (round trip). Rail would hold about 1,200 cy per trip for a 20 rail-car load, averaging about 21 trips a week, with a max of 42 trips per week.

With a little less than half of the material at Twin Cities and a little more than half at Lower Roberts, the team is looking at restoring the topography of the borrow areas and then the total number of trips required to haul off the material. Twin Cities would be a total of about 449,000 truck trips and 5,000 rail trips. Lower Roberts would be a total of about 536,000 truck trips and 6,000 rail trips.

In determining where to haul the RTM to, several quarries are nearby seeking restoration. There is the Vernalis site with the quarries of several companies, 53 miles from Twin Cities and 33 miles from Lower Roberts. There is Lone and the Sacramento Landfill and Gravel Mines. Other options are the Telchert Rock Plant in Tracy, the Mossdale Brown Sand Dredge Pit in Lathrop, and CalMat in Pleasanton. All of these locations would require a transfer and delivery would need to be done by truck because there are no provisions that could handle a delivery by rail.

There are several sites with adequate capacity. The Vernalis site is estimated to need about 33 million cubic yards needed for restoration, Lone is about 22 million cubic yards, and the Sacramento Florin Perkins Landfill is a complex site with many different features. There is room there, but it would require a lot of coordination to determine specifics. The recommendation from the team is the Vernalis site. It is along the I-5 corridor, so it has good access. The area is rural which is good for off-peak hauling. It has conservative hauling distances allowing for better future options.

Truck hauling to Vernalis would require about 1,800 trips per week from Twin Cities, totaling about 449,000 trips. The roundtrip total is about 106 miles, totaling about 47.6 million miles. Lower Roberts would also be about 1,800 trips per week, but with slightly more material, it would total about 536,000 trips. The roundtrip total would be about 66 miles, totaling about 35.4 million miles.

In comparison of the two options, stockpiling or off-site disposal, one of the key benefits of stockpiling is a substantial reduction in truck traffic and associated air emissions and greenhouse gas emissions as it eliminates nearly 83 million trucking miles. The material would be available for Delta Area Reclamation District levee maintenance and other local beneficial uses; the current estimate of levee repair needs is nearly 13 million cubic yards. It would also give time for the industry to advance to electrified hauling vehicle technology as commercial vehicles will likely be available over the next decade. The negatives of this option include the aesthetic issue of on-site stockpiled material and significant land requirements for drying and stockpiling, which is about 580 extra acres.

The main advantage of Option 2, off-site disposal, is substantially less construction and permanent area required at Twin Cities and Lower Robert Island sites. However, it adds significant truck traffic and associated air emissions and greenhouse gas emissions along the I-5 corridor and near the Port of Stockton. The material would also not be available for local beneficial uses. The DCA is recommending Option 1.

Ms. Swenson asked regarding the Twin Cities site, what was the rationale for choosing it? This landowner is lacking information about his property. There is concern about the direct correlation between the Reserve and its relationship to that parcel. It seems like decisions are being made off of satellite imagery. A lot of work is being done out there to expand crane territories and to restore vernal pools. What's the significance with that? The locations that DWR is selecting are concerning. One million truck trips is concerning. The justification seems disingenuous with the aesthetic issues. That is why it shouldn't be stockpiled on land.

Mr. Bradner said Twin Cities was chosen after an extensive siting study. That site has engineering and logistical advantages that made it most ideal. As this is an engineering analysis and study, environmental and community impacts will be evaluated as part of CEQA.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla Option 1 includes aesthetic issues due to stockpiling and takes significant land from landowners. Option 2 alleviates the problems of Option 1 but leaves communities of color with increased air quality issues. If it's looking like there will be improvements in vehicles and equipment in the next 10 years, there could be a push for that to happen at the Port in an accelerated fashion so that Option 1 could be skipped, going straight to Option 2 without overly burdening the communities in Option 2. Neither option is what is best for doing things fairly in the Delta. The presentation says the material isn't available for local uses but aren't there quarries near enough on the perimeter where material could be stored for levee upgrades?

Mr. Bradner said the team has discussed this. There are some limits as to what the CEQA process can assume. It's one thing to say it will be available for others to get but the Reclamation District taking that material would be a separate CEQA process. If electrified vehicles can be combined with Option 2, the discussion would be different.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said equity is about trying to do what's best for everyone at the same time.

Ms. Martinez reminded that things would change moving forward as technology changes.

Ms. Mallon said if electric trucks existed today, discussion might be different. Nearby rail would be helpful. We know the Reclamation Districts need this material and it's hard to find. There is rail by Lower Roberts and a barge landing could be built. There are some advantages at Lower Roberts. Twin Cities requires a lot of truck vehicles. Because electric isn't yet guaranteed, it adds to air emissions at this point in time. I'm fairly confident there will be access to electric vehicles at the time, especially with the announcement from the Governor.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said this is such a massive project, do you have any leverage to push these things like electric vehicles in the industry?

Ms. Mallon said it's not so much leverage as it is buying power. If they're available on the market and we mandate them and create the demand for them, that helps move the market. If High-Speed Rail, the City of LA, and others join in, we'll get some leverage there. The team is thinking similarly.

Ms. Buckman said this has been explored because that's the idea of the team as well, but at this point in time, they didn't think the vehicles would be available to count on that plan. They will continue to think of ways to push that technology.

Mr. Moran said Twin Cities is a big crane habitat. Are there any studies on the physical impacts of putting that much soil on top of the existing land that can impact the Consumnes area?

Mr. Bradner said more work will need to be done with site specific data. Right now, there isn't a lot of that. What is available has been studied and ground conditions are better there. It's further out of the Delta so the ground is more consolidated. More work will be needed in the future.

Ms. Martinez said this is a plan for the moment and will continue to be adjusted.

Mr. Bradner said even with the post-construction land restoration work that was went through, there is quite a bit of site-specific data needed to gather to restore the conditions and return them back to productive use.

Mr. Robertson asked for the percentage on contaminated RTM that can't be used.

Mr. Bradner said there are limitations on site specific data on the tunnel alignment because the project is needed first, then data can be collected along that alignment. Based on what is known, there is no reason to anticipate any significant levels of contamination. In the soil balance work, we did assume 5% would be unsuitable for whatever reason. That's built into the Central and Eastern analyses. It can be the same thing for Bethany.

Ms. Mallon said that environmental data will be available when the Geotech program is finished later this year. That sampling is part of the program.

Ms. Giacoma said she is concerned about the area around Twin Cities; they have flooding issues currently. If stockpiles of RTM are added, it will severely impact their situation that is already a problem. Not just the obvious risk of flooding to the people but that flow also goes to the preserve. If there is a flood there that is exacerbated by the RTM, it will flow to the preserves.

Mr. Bradner said the area does flood periodically. The floods are within the perimeter of the levee system which are within the Reclamation District. Unfortunately, the eastern side of the Reclamation District is the railroad embankment that also serves as a form of flood protection for the district, although not intended. More work will be required to determine impacts, but the goal is to avoid that. To reiterate, the location being discussed for the stockpile is within the Reclamation District, not the floodplain itself. Flooding is common within that area. The team is taking that into account to assess the impacts.

Dr. Lytle said this is troubling because there have been lots of questions regarding RTM from the beginning of this process. The whole concept about whether or not Reclamation Districts can use this material because its stockpile is unknown at this time. It's difficult to think about what is essentially tunnel waste to be used by Reclamation Districts for levee improvements when it's unknown if it's a usable product. It's important that when this begins being proposed, there must be a good siting plan. There are lots of questions about the management of a substantial amount of materials. There's a lot of work. The options 1 and 2 are too contrasting and need compromise and blending. It can be taken to offsite disposal areas, it can be stockpiled at the Port, which has been done for years. The numbers for truck trips are huge.

Mr. Bradner said in terms of the stockpiling, the plan is to hold in containment and test for contaminants. Once cleared, it goes into the drying process or hauling it off. In terms of finished stockpile, it would be seeded with erosion control. We wouldn't plant it with deep contaminants. More testing of the material will be done to answer any remaining questions. All work has shown that it is suitable material and meets the geotechnical properties. The focus will be on organic based conditioners. Good work is being done, but yes, there is a lot associated with all the options due to the volume.

Dr. Lytle said when looking at the initial analysis on the usability of the material, long term chemistry of the weathering of that material with years of environmental exposure and how that might affect the material and the water that goes through it is not being considered.

Mr. Bradner said those are still questions that will be answered. Long term potential weathering and such will be evaluated. More material will be tested.

Ms. Martinez reminded that the discussion regarding usability of RTM has taken place several times in past meetings and while the team understands this is an area of concern, the focus should remain on engineering.

Mr. Wirth floodplain is active and floods every 7-10 years. It's a major conservation area for several species including Sand Hill Cranes. When it floods, the cranes head east. They don't like to go far from their usual lands. The area south of Elk Grove is being consumed quickly by urbanization. The argument could be made that it's worth exploring having an upland forage area created with the tunnel muck if it was possible based on the chemistry and long-term viability. Having more available long term could potentially be very useful. It would need to be done on someone's land willingly. There is an increasing shortage of upland forage for cranes by Elk Grove. Climate change is here and with sea level rise as well, it will become more common.

Ms. Mallon said in terms of the use of this material in the Reclamation District for levees, if the team didn't feel comfortable with using this material for construction of levees, they wouldn't have used it to build the embankments. That issue has been addressed, but with upcoming work, those conclusions will be reconfirmed. There has been no exploration of the use of the material for any sort of habitat construction done yet.

Mr. Wirth added that it would also need to be able to support agriculture so that the cranes can forage. A viable food source is a potential option.

d. SEC Questions or Comments on August 26th Meeting Presentation

Ms. Swenson said when discussing with a community member, they reminded her that during the BDCP WaterFix there was an Appendix 3F that needs to be revisited because it talked about the direct impacts of the locations of the intakes and there's no reason not to use information that has already been gathered. She is concerned that Delta land knowledge is not being used. The focus is a lot on fish and biological, which are also very important, but we also need to include land-use expertise here in the Delta to fully understand the physical effects. It's clear maps and plots are being looked at but that BDCP knowledge is needed for integrated decisions.

Ms. Martinez said there have been a lot of discussions about using past information wherever possible so that is being done.

Mr. Hsia said regarding Intakes 2 and 5, his constituencies mentioned that near the south of maintenance area 9, according to their study the levee condition is very bad there and they are wondering if any levee improvements could be done.

Mr. Bradner said a Delta-wide evaluation was done about vulnerability. That was based on a variety of factors, including geometry. Many of the Sacramento River levees are overbuilt and taller than necessary. Many of them are also built from sand and have a variety of problems. In terms of what the project would accomplish, the team looked at the vulnerabilities of the levees that could affect various elements of the project and then identified the appropriate response. The team looked at structural repairs and nonstructural repairs. For the most part, nonstructural are the best approach. Emergency response, flood risk training, and anything else that can be used to reduce risk was examined, ensuring there are enough provisions onsite in the event of something. In situations like Bouldin and Lower Roberts, repairs to existing levees were included.

Mr. Moran said regarding recreation facilities and mutual benefits, would Davis-Dolwig considerations be utilized? To clarify what Ms. Mallon said, the RTM was at least preliminarily evaluated for use of reclamation and not for habitat use, correct?

Ms. Mallon said a thorough analysis was done to ensure it could be used as structural fill. The material is clays and silts from 150 feet under the ground, it's not organic like at the surface. An additive would be needed for some type of growth. It's a relatively inorganic material to begin with.

Mr. Bradner said the team looked at both agricultural and habitat uses post-construction but didn't see anything about the property of the material that would prevent it from being used for habitat purposes. It would just need additives like Ms. Mallon said to get the growth started. There's nothing about it that would prevent growth.

Mr. Moran asked if the RTM analysis includes physical subsidence reversal and putting topsoil?

Mr. Bradner said the post-construction restoration work encapsulates all of that. It was covered as a module two sessions ago.

Ms. Buckman regarding Davis-Dolwig, we will follow up. It is being worked on and a team member is leading the effort working with Parks and Recreation, as well.

e. Public Comment on Item 4

Sherry Norris said it seems that the survey is not really geared towards the tribes. She works with the California Indian Environmental Alliance with the State Water Alliance and the California Department of Health with fish concerns. Since questions regarding fish will be included, is there an opportunity to assist in reviewing surveys to include items that have been done over the years? When the results come out, is there an opportunity for the final draft to be commented on by the public to see how the results are being looked at?

Ms. Martinez said that this is a DWR survey. This will be an opportunity for discussion after the fact to see how information will be translated or reviewed.

Ms. Norris said that when you look at the results and tease out what they mean to interpret the results. We have seen results interpreted and pieces missing. If there could be an opportunity for groups to see how these results are being interpreted, it could make the survey more accurate. We know that DWR and the Water Board have done surveys before, but I don't think they have done any about fish, and those of us that have worked at the Water Board have. She recommends some cross referencing with the making and interpretation of the survey.

Osha Meserve represents Local Agencies of the North Delta. The discussion today regarding sea level rise is going back to the presentation in July with the preliminary rejection about the alternatives not meeting climate resiliency objectives of DWR. There were questions today from the SEC members about sea level rise for the Bethany Alternative, but the answers were unknown. It is disingenuous and untrue about what the DCA and the DWR are looking into since the alternatives don't have sea level rise criteria. When DWR and DCA are giving updates, the SEC process is described as being a great place that reduce and address impacts on the environment and the community. But when the restraints of this process aren't disclosed that this process is constrained to technical engineering issues and is not a part of the DWR and CEQA process. It's important that SEC output and inputs constraints need to be noted. This is giving a false impression because of the failure to disclose constraints. Tunnel muck shouldn't be on top of the best farmland in the world.

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

a. SEC Tour Updates

Ms. Parvizi informed that the new DCA website is live and the tours are located there under the August SEC meeting page. The information on the T-screen tours will also be posted.

b. Future SEC Meeting Topics

Ms. Mallon said that the team went through all SEC questions that have been asked since the start of the whole process that received the response that it would be covered in a future meeting. The majority of them have already been covered in other meetings but a couple of them have not been and will be addressed at the next meeting. This includes Mr. Wirth's questions about the power corridors being considered.

Ms. Keegan asked Ms. Mallon if she could list those topics.

Ms. Mallon said there was a request for a list of renders, operation space, truck traffic, existing train traffic and idling in South Stockton, and power corridors. There will be 1-3 slides on each topic to close out the Q&A log.

Ms. Martinez noted that agenda item 8 would be addressed at this point in the meeting.

Ms. Parvizi discussed the meeting schedule for the rest of the year. With a once a month schedule, the SEC has had their meeting every fourth Wednesday. However, given the holidays in November and December, DCA is proposing the November meeting take place the first week of the month and cancelling the October meeting, otherwise there would only be a week between the two meetings. The December meeting would take place the second week instead of the fourth.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla suggested making an exception to the usual Wednesday meeting for November and moving it to Thursday, in light of the election.

Ms. Parvizi mentioned that the following Wednesday is also an option, but it is Veterans' Day. Wednesdays are the days that all members are available, but a Thursday could be done depending on everyone's schedules.

Ms. Swenson asked if November 18th is a holiday.

Ms. Parvizi said no, but it is nearing Thanksgiving.

Ms. Martinez asked if a November 18th meeting would give the team enough time with engineering to be ready for the December meeting.

Ms. Mallon said yes, they could be ready in those three weeks. Depending on what works for everyone, moving the meeting to a Tuesday or Thursday would be fine, in order to have it earlier in the month.

Ms. Parvizi said she will send out a Doodle survey to the SEC with some of the proposed dates for the next meeting and decide on a majority rules basis.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla asked although the SEC can't talk about operations or water quality enforcement, could there be opportunities in design and construction for creating solutions for water recirculation for HABS?

Ms. Buckman said that falls under the community benefits discussion, but it'd be good to explore and discuss.

Ms. Mallon asked what specifically Ms. Buckman meant.

Ms. Buckman said the possibility that when talking about community benefits that projects that could address or improve conditions related to HABS could be looked at.

Ms. Swenson asked if December 2020 will be the end of the meetings?

Ms. Mallon said no, the Bethany alternative will run probably through March and then Ms. Buckman mentioned using the SEC after for a community benefits framework. Possibly until June of 2021.

c. SEC Report to DCA Board

Ms. Martinez said what's been working lately is for any interested folks to email Ms. Parvizi and she sends them the materials they need for a reasonable presentation. If anyone would like to volunteer now, they can, otherwise it can be organized offline.

Ms. Parvizi said there have been no volunteers the past two meetings so any interested members can reach out to her.

6. NON-AGENDIZED SEC QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

Ms. Parvizi reminded that the application will be going out in the next day or so to join the SEC in representation of the Hood community. An email will be sent out to all members for them to forward as necessary.

Ms. Martinez noted that there were no public comments for item 5.

Ms. Mann said considering the proximity of the Bethany alternative to the community of Mountain House, DCA may want to consider adding an SEC representative of the Mountain House community.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS

This is the time and place for members of the public to address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction but that are not on the agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes each; however, the Chair may limit this time when reasonable based on the circumstances. To provide public comment, complete the online public comment form at <https://tinyurl.com/dcapubliccomment-SEC> by 4:00 pm with their name, phone number or other identifier. As these items have not been agendized, the Committee is not legally able to discuss these items at this meeting unless a recognized exception applies.

There were no public comments.

8. NEXT MEETING

Ms. Martinez said the team will be sending out the updated date for the next meeting to the SEC after each member fills out the survey regarding a date that works with their schedule.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Palmer adjourned at 5:59 pm.

APPENDIX: WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT