

June 18, 2021

Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority
Stakeholder Engagement Committee Members

Subject: ***Materials for the June 23, 2021 Regular Committee Meeting***

Members of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee:

The fourteenth regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Stakeholder Engagement Committee is scheduled for a remote video conference on **Wednesday, June 23, 2021 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**- April 28, 2021 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

Wednesday, June 23, 2021, 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 Executive Order N-08-21, 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 Items 4 and 5 are single discussion items; 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**
- 3. MINUTES REVIEW: April 28, 2021 Regular SEC Meeting**
- 4. UPDATES & COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**
 - 4a. DCA Review and Updates
 - 4b. DWR CEQA Status Update
 - 4c. SEC Questions or Comments on April 28th Meeting Presentation
 - 4d. Public Comment on Item 4
- 5. PRESENTATIONS & COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**
 - 5a. Design Change Updates
 - 5b. Ongoing Outreach Efforts
 - 5c. Community Benefits Program Update
 - 5d. Public Comment on Item 5
- 6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS & NEXT MEETING**
 - 6a. Community Benefits Framework
 - 6b. Engineering Updates
 - 6c. Subsurface Investigations Updates
- 7. NON-AGENDIZED SEC QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS**

8. 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.

9. ADJOURNMENT

* * * * *

Next scheduled meeting: Regular Stakeholder Engagement Committee Meeting: September 22, 2021 at 3:00p.m.



STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

Memo

Contact: Valerie Martinez, SEC Facilitator

Date: June 23, 2021 SEC Meeting

Item No. 3

Subject: Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes from SEC Meeting 16 (April 28, 2021) are attached for your review. Please send any edits to hannahflanagan@dcdca.org by **noon Tuesday, June 22, 2021**. Since the SEC is not a voting group, this process will facilitate the review process and allow us to efficiently address the minutes at the meeting.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 28th, 2021

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 3:01 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 Anna Swenson, Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla, Cecille Giacomina, Douglas Hsia, Gia Moreno, Isabella Gonzalez-Potter, James Cox, Lindsey Liebig, Karen Mann, Peter Robertson, Vice Chairwoman Malissa Tayaba, Mike Hardesty, and tribal representative alternate Chairman Jesus Tarango. Ex-officio members Gilbert Cosio and Michael Moran were also in attendance.

Members Angelica Whaley, David Gloski, David Welch, Dr. Mel Lytle and Philip Merlo 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 Valerie Martinez,

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

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

Ms. Palmer 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 and not have a 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 emailing publiccomment@dcdca.org. Written comments will be added to the record but not read during the meeting. Patience is appreciated, as this is the first teleconference for the SEC. DCA will work to ensure everyone is heard and receives the information needed.

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

Ms. Palmer noted that this meeting pertains to engineering topics only and discussion can only contain topics in the DCDA purview.

3. MINUTES REVIEW:

There were no comments at this time.

4. Item 4

4a. DCA Review and Updates

DWR Director Karla Nemeth acknowledged all the hard work that's been underway. Ms. Nemeth spoke candidly, she's not under any illusion that people will feel differently about this project overall but believes the info the SEC is providing in the feedback will help DCA find ways through designing and engineering to avoid or minimize effects on local communities represented here. Mr. Bradner hopes for continued engagement and again, there is no need to

agree with a project in any way. She said she believes people of good conscience can have disagreements and can find ways to work together. One of the ways DCA is hoping to deepen work with the SEC is through the Community Benefits Program. Ms. Nemeth acknowledged how important this input has been for the Department of Water Resources.

Ms. Nemeth said that previous DCA Executive Director Kathryn Mallon has moved on to other opportunities and she welcomed Graham Bradner who has agreed to take the interim position for the DCA. There is a lot of work that the DWR needs to do relative to permitting for this project. Ms. Nemeth said that Ms. Mallon was really candid with the SEC on the nature of this project's effects on this community. Ms. Mallon is part of the reason why DWR has gotten the valuable feedback that it has thus far. Ms. Nemeth thanked SEC members and DCA staff for the intense time, commitment, and effort. Ms. Nemeth hopes the SEC will continue in that same spirit.

Ms. Keegan acknowledged the work done since the first meeting on November 13, 2019. Although it has been only 16 months, it feels like 3 years of work. Ms. Keegan thanked everyone. She stated the general purpose for the meeting is the technical and engineering feedback and that this would provide a forum for Delta stakeholders to really communicate with the technical and engineering teams relative to the issues associated with the DCA activities. Also, DCA staff has been able to discuss measures to offset effects, thanks to an incredible amount of input from the SEC, which has been extremely valuable.

Ms. Keegan mentioned moving into a new phase, having passed the formal process in terms of evaluating the technical issues, the siting (what goes where), why things must happen in a certain way. Yet there are still opportunities to ensure that all residents have a good understanding of the DCA and continue to gather input to ensure that the proposed project considers the community as part of the design and construction process. CEQA has very formal environmental processes and DWR will be the lead on that. The difference is to continue with this as a space where community members have the opportunity to talk directly with engineers, with technical people, with leadership, ask technical questions and gain important information.

Since the DCA is subject to the Brown Act and these are Brown Act meetings, it's not only going to be impactful, it's going to be transparent communication that is open to all the community to participate in. Ms. Keegan thanked those who have participated, knowing it's been a great sacrifice of time, energy, and effort, but is appreciated.

Mr. Bradner gave a brief presentation and introduction of himself. He received his Bachelors and Masters degrees from Clemson University with 20 years of engineering experience, including 16 years at GEI in Sacramento. He specialized in water supply infrastructure and flood risk reduction projects in Northern California. Mr. Bradner is a California registered engineering geologist and hydrogeologist experienced in various technical, governance, and management roles. Mr. Bradner has over two years on the Delta Conveyance Program serving as Levee/Forebay technical lead and Deputy to the Engineering Design Manager. Mr. Bradner will continue to provide input to the engineering team.

Mr. Bradner brought attention to the DCA guiding principles. To continue to operate in a collaborative manner that brings multiple voices and perspectives, communicate the work the

DCA is doing in a transparent way and be sure to make use of constructive feedback received, deliver top quality work consistent with a world class project and organization, be creative and innovative in thinking about resolving challenges and opportunities, while demonstrating that collaboration and communication is part of engaging the community. It is clear that the project reflects community input.

Mr. Bradner presented the Anticipated DCA Planning Phase Schedule to help SEC members visualize the focus of the DCA draft for the Eastern and Central corridors including the Bethany Reservoir Alternative which is key for DWR to form an Environmental Assessment Process. The Geotechnical program was launched and later the SEC was formed.

Mr. Bradner summarized the SEC collaboration feedback that has been incorporated. SEC input does not indicate in any way that the SEC has been supportive of the project, but if there were to be a project, what would be concerns of the Delta communities, where there are opportunities to take input and determine how to reduce the effects. Some comprehensive examples of feedback would begin with construction effects and facility siting.

Mr. Bradner reviewed the next phase in the Anticipated DCA Planning Phase Schedule for the next couple of years. The focus will be to maintain the core engineering staff to answer questions from the environmental team process making requests for modifications to the documents or concepts design; keeping an eye on the incoming geotechnical data to confirm the assumptions that were used in the conceptual design preparation; to continue community engagement; to provide support to DWR with permit preparation and hearings. A rough estimate at this point will have the DCA potentially beginning some early engineer work on a preferred alternative somewhere between 2023-2024. This estimate is contingent on obtaining necessary permits and approvals and DWR moving forward with a proposed project.

4b. DWR CEQA Status Update

Ms. Buckman provided an update on the project schedule. DWR is preparing a public of the Environmental Impact Report/Statement (EIR/EIS) under CEQA to be released May 2022. The Corps is simultaneously working on an EIS under NEPA. It will be a separate document, but they are coordinating for the document review periods to overlap. DWR may provide a longer review period for the CEQA document than the Corps. The Final Environmental Document is anticipated for release in late 2023. The technical work for the biological analysis has begun for the biological assessment.

Ms. Buckman provided environmental planning updates. Technical studies and impact analyses are still underway with results pending. With NEPA, the United States Army Corps of Engineers is proceeding to develop an EIS. Soil investigations began in March and are posted every week with a two-week look-ahead. The schedule is not exact due to local and environmental conditions, but the estimate is updated weekly. Meetings for the Community Benefits Program Framework have begun with the first of three workshops in April and two more in May coming up on May 6th and 25th.

4c. SEC Questions or Comments on February 24th Meeting Presentation

Mr. Cosio did not agree with the term “collaboration” as presented in Mr. Bradner’s presentation. Instead, Mr. Cosio thinks of it more as a compromise.

Ms. Moreno agreed with Mr. Cosio and recalls the team bringing up that there are opportunities to talk to engineers but many times the responses are that they can’t be answered at that time. She doesn’t believe that this is a collaboration. Questions that are asked often times get dismissed. She has asked numerous questions about Hood with regard to engineering and access roads but has been told that she was wrong.

Ms. Martinez acknowledged that Ms. Moreno raised a concern about questions that haven't been answered. The team can recirculate the question and answer matrix for the committee to review and see if questions have been answered or still need to be addressed because some might've been missed.

Mr. Hsia recalled at the last meeting that he asked Chris Martin at DWR about the stakeholder equity ratio and Mr. Martin said it was beyond the scope of the SEC discussions. Mr. Hsia thinks it was disappointing that an important analysis was unable to be discussed. Ms. Martinez said this will be added to the question and answer matrix. It may be beyond the teams’ scope, but this item should definitely be revisited.

Ms. Barrigan-Parilla said on Ms. Buckman’s presentation, there will be the completion of hydro modeling of the project for impacts for 2040/2070 done by the end of June. Will that information be shared with the committee? That has been a main concern. The Bureau of Reclamation has expressed preliminary interest in the tunnel and now there’s a 7500 cfs alternative that’s being considered. Does that change design impacts, numbers that were provided, cubic yards of dirt that will be removed? When will the SEC be updated on the new modeling?

Ms. Buckman replied that in the NOP, the team has identified a range of potential capacities for the alternative. Ms. Buckman has asked the DCA to review various options of 3000, 4500, 6000, and 7500 cfs versions of the Eastern and Central alignments. As the DCA has been doing that, the work the team has done has included those four capacities for the three alignments. The 3000, 4500, and 6000 only include State Water Project participation. For the 7500 option, a connection to a CVP facility is included. Thus far, the Bureau of Reclamation has not indicated interest in participating in the project, but they are included in one alternative because of the historical record for California WaterFix. They could potentially be interested. Some people might want to see the effect of an alternative. It is not a proposed project at the moment because they have not shown interest, but the EIR will provide an analysis for this alternative to see the comparison of benefits and adverse effects.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said there must be a breakdown somewhere in the system because the contractors under Kern County Water Agency are saying a preliminary request has been made. There is talk and confusion about if there is a bigger tunnel coming with Reclamation involved.

Ms. Buckman will follow up on that, but any request for participation will come through DWR. No request has been received. For the modeling, the team is working on hydraulic operations simulations. DWR is planning technical meetings to share basic information and the dates will

be scheduled soon. Hydrologic/hydraulic modeling will not be included in the SEC meeting because this is tied to CEQA. The team is looking at a 2040-time frame and a qualitative 2070.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked if the SEC won't be receiving the presentation, can the team keep the committee updated with the timing of those meetings?

Ms. Buckman said yes, this team is hoping people will participate. DWR will make sure all of the meeting notifications come to this committee as well.

Ms. Swenson is in agreement with Mr. Cosio that this process has not been collaborative in a way that the SEC is supporting the project or think it is a good thing or good infrastructure. As Governor Newsom said, DCA should fix the existing infrastructure. Most changes going to be made aren't tangible. There are already bad traffic issues currently. How would farmers make it through conditions that come with this project? At a Delta Stewardship Council meeting, it came across like DCA had everything figured out which is kind of disingenuous. This is not in the name of community.

Ms. Martinez reiterated the mantra that participation in this discussion in no way shows support for the project. It indicates dedications to communities in the event that this project is built. This is a difficult process, so the team thanks them for their participation.

Ms. Palmer noted that everyone should be particular of the vocabulary used because it is not collaborative, it's a participation.

4d. Public Comment on Item 4

There were no comments.

5. Item 5

5a. Design Changes

Mr. Ryan presented design changes that will illustrate the process that will continue with the DCO as they evaluate the project. To begin, there are changes to the Southern Forebay and Bethany Complexes power supply, though the slides only include the Southern Forebay. The original plan had two power sources, one from the WAPA at the bottom of the graphic and the other from PG&E at the top. To note, there are currently no agreements in place, but these are potential power sources to hook up to the system. The colors on the diagram show the corridors. There are very few pieces of underground sections, mostly on-site. There is also a piece of the corridor coming from the south of overhead power from WAPA that was parallel to existing power and a smaller piece from PG&E. The golden color is new power corridors of above-ground towers.

Because the two power providers are in the same area, there are balancing issues with being able to provide that redundant power. Due to the size of the loads, reliability becomes an issue. With new infrastructure being less by going with the WAPA system, the conceptual designs now only receive power from WAPA. This removes about seven miles from the corridor coming

down from Brentwood. That removes almost all of the urban and rural residential footprint of that power facility which helps reduce some of those impacts.

The corridor that came down from Brentwood would have followed down the green line on the graphic by the Southern Complex facility and extended down to Bethany, which is by the WAPA facility. Using WAPA eliminates the stretch from Brentwood to Bethany as well.

The next change is the road up to Bethany Reservoir for the Bethany Discharge Structure which is shown in the yellow area at the top of the presentation graphic. The goal of the original alignment was to follow existing roads to minimize impacts in the area. At the time, to try to minimize that footprint, the road would've had to have been widened because it would need to carry significant construction traffic and it's currently a narrow farm road. Also, because of the grades, a large road cut would have been necessary up in the hillside which would have been visible from a fair distance.

Mr. Ryan said the DCO's EIR team looked at the impacts of the project facilities and defined impacts on an alkali wetland which is a sensitive wetland area that are more rare than other types in California. In this type of situation, the goal would be to avoid impacts to the wetlands, so some alternatives were explored. As a result, a new road alignment was identified. This new road alignment is not on an existing road, but it takes advantage of the topography so that it's essentially the same length of originally proposed road. The road cut is much smaller, so visual impacts should also be less. There is also less dirt to move to stockpiles. It also completely removes the road footprint the wetlands area.

There was another similar change that came as a result of the same process. Another alkali wetlands area is by the Southern Forebay with an access road and some rail going right through it. The original configuration was to minimize rail and the impacts that go along with that. The new alignment, in order to avoid the wetland, has the railroad rerouted and the road adjusted. There is still a very slight footprint as the roads can't be moved any more and are right on the edge of the wetlands. Some parts of the Southern Forebay site had to be moved around but it did not affect the functionality.

All these changes illustrate what kind of the things the DCO brings to DCA's attention, similar in a way to some of the things brought up in discussion from the SEC. Even still, there are some other items from the DCO being worked on that may or may not result in further changes.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked for clarification on what WAPA is.

Mr. Ryan said the Western Area Power Authority.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked if they are a federal power distributor. Is it a different grid?

Mr. Ryan said he is unsure of the details, but they will follow up on that. WAPA is mainly a distribution entity. They have many hydroelectric facilities around the west that they move power for, but he's unsure if they own those or not. Power can be put on the grid and it can be wheeled to WAPA, then distributed to the project.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked for a better understanding of the sources of power to the project as it relates to WAPA.

Mr. Ryan said he's unsure where the ultimate source of power is. The DCO team is working on it, but he can't speak for them on that at the moment.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla requested that the SEC be informed at a later date when possible.

Mr. Moran asked if the new haul road going up to Bethany will stay after construction is done or if it would be restored.

Mr. Ryan responded that he believes this one will stay.

Mr. Moran mentioned to consider that it's a big foraging/migratory area for a list of bird species, so minimizing any impacts along those grasslands is really important. Also, the wetland by the Southern Forebay, the rail is bordering that. Consider drainage patterns and substrate as there are hard-pan soils there, so any disturbance could change the hydrology within the wetland, even though it's not the construction zone of the wetland.

Ms. Mann commented that the mention of a heliport and first-aid center makes much sense, except there is an airport very close. Why would the airport not be used?

Mr. Ryan said it actually might be used. As of now, the EPR provisions are to reserve space and footprint for these types of items but final details for emergency response is yet to be worked out with the local agencies and the project proponents. Without speaking for the airport, we could work with them to do that because we do have the facilities onsite and a decent travel path. It's certainly a possibility.

Ms. Mann asked how does the Byron Highway section in orange on the presentation graphic interact with the expansion of Byron Highway from Discovery Bay, Brentwood to Mountain House where the four lanes are being expanded? Would that be a part of it?

Mr. Ryan said for the Central and East options from the presentation, Byron Highway would not be expanded. However, the roundabout is intended to be consistent with one of the alternatives that they're planning for the changes out there. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority, that's the authority for this road is still working through the alternatives. The intention is to be compatible with whatever they decide to do. Relative to Mountain House, it's mainly applicable to the Bethany Alternative and for that, their four-lane expansion would be extended up to the new Lindemann Rd Interchange. The details as to where Mountain House is in doing that work are yet to be worked out, because they're not sure of their timing.

Ms. Mann said considering the construction of a project of this intensity, would a new fire station be built in Byron?

Mr. Ryan responded that the emergency response plan at this point in time has the facility at the site, but team and project proponents are open to working with the local communities to figure out final service. Right now, there is room for one fire truck and contractor crew on the site.

Ms. Mann added there is no fire station at all in Byron.

Mr. Ryan clarified that there's one nearby that's closed.

Ms. Mann said yes, and Discovery Bay had two, but one is also closed there. So, there is one fire station that services Discovery Bay, Byron, and all the farmland area.

Mr. Ryan said what is trying to be done in the footprint section of the EIR is to not put additional burden on the local facilities. That being said, it doesn't mean we wouldn't work with the local emergency service providers to help either fully or partly with some of those services later on.

Ms. Mann mentioned that there's an intersection where Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Joaquin are all in the same vicinity. She asked if this would add more to the complexity?

Mr. Ryan said absolutely, especially with Bethany for emergency response in determining who's really responsible for serving the area.

Ms. Mann added that Mountain House has one fire station and they are San Joaquin County.

Mr. Ryan mentioned he believes that the Bethany facility itself is in Alameda County.

Ms. Mann said the nearest fire station for Alameda is Livermore which is a problem.

Mr. Ryan said this is why the team is proposing for now to have emergency response on site.

Ms. Swenson asked if there is a name or a way to identify the wetland? Is it a protected wetland? It's concerning to see a wetland in the middle of construction for the project. Please follow up with what the plan will be to mitigate. A name or a way to commonly identify would be appreciated.

Mr. Ryan said the DCO does the wetland evaluations. The DCA simply tries to get out of the area when they identify them. Ms. Buckman might have more information on the wetlands and details regarding mitigation.

Ms. Buckman said the wetland does not have a formal name, but it was identified as part of the process to map wetlands and waters of the US. In general, with looking at potential effects, the first step is to try to avoid effects wherever possible, which leads to the conversations with the DCA about moving facilities or looking at options to avoid impacts. The next step is to analyze remaining effects and identify mitigation. We have not yet reached that part of the process, but we will be looking at whether or not we need further mitigation.

Mr. Moran added for reference that Eastern Contra Costa County Habitat Conservancy might have some kind of a designation for that wetland.

5b. Ongoing Outreach Efforts

Ms. Barbieri described some of the activities DWR has planned over the year or so with goals of providing public information, building awareness in the community, providing access to information, transparency, and providing avenues to the planning process of the environmental review. Ms. Barbieri provided a Public Outreach and Community Engagement plan with six elements. She began with informing about the DWR planning informational webinars around June to September to provide a deeper dive into some of the topics of interest in advance of the EIR. Then she moved on to the Community Benefits Program, which would be explained later in the meeting. Ms. Barbieri mentioned stakeholder engagement work that would be presented by Ms. Parvizi. Ms. Barbieri then mentioned the public participation element. Ms. Barbieri followed up with course agency coordination and acknowledged that there are a number of planning and permitting activities for coordination with the public and agencies.

Before going into some of the details for all those activities, Ms. Barbieri mentioned that there is a focus on the tribal outreach effort. Two things she highlighted were to ensure compliance with AB 52 through formal consultation, and the other was to ensure input and engagement across all of the public information and public participation activities program. This included more informal discussions with the Tribal Engagement Committee and then an annual Tribal Informational Meeting.

Next, Ms. Barbieri mentioned there is a focused Environmental Justice outreach effort. DWR has special consultants on board with Ag Innovations to help ensure that all of the outreach activities programs follow the best practices for engagement with disadvantaged communities. Ms. Barbieri added that she thought about doing virtual workshops in coordination with EJ focused organizations while being cognizant and responsive to EJ needs as the DWR, with DCA support, moves onto when the Draft of the Environmental Impact Report becomes available.

Ms. Barbieri then presented activities for public information including E-blasts, blogs, backseat videos, presentations, briefings, and other media. Deep Dive videos are where the DWR took some of the discrete topics and turned those into videos with DWR's technical experts to provide information. The team will try to turn these into shorter videos. Ms. Barbieri understands that people like to receive their information in different ways, and they are trying to be as comprehensive and responsive as possible.

Ms. Barbieri then addressed the informational webinars. The idea was in response to comprehensive environmental documents in the past. In lead up to when the Draft Environmental Impact Report becomes available next year, the DWR will provide some background information about different areas that will be covered in the EIR. Ms. Barbieri gave the example of providing information about the assumptions on methodology. She thought that it would be a helpful way to provide small chunks of information leading up to the CEQA document. The DWR is primarily focused on the EIR but there are other planning and permitting activities and the agency coordination that goes along with that.

Ms. Parvizi provided an overview of DCA outreach activities for the near future. The DCA is now waiting for feedback on what DWR will need over the course of the next year as they prepare the EIR. SEC meetings are slowing down as there's less technical material to review. Ms. Parvizi added that this is an opportunity to think about how to take those materials and be responsive to the fact that there are folks that still don't feel like they understand the project and how the DCA can essentially repackage those materials. Ms. Parvizi continued that this could include

translations, taking out certain bits, or if somebody just wants a presentation on a particular topic, such as intakes. Ms. Parvizi added that SEC meetings will continue as long as it makes sense.

The virtual tours will be in both Spanish and Mandarin Chinese translations in order to be able to reach more folks. There will be informational video series similar to the virtual tours that'll be more graphic and help explain some of the different concepts. The DCA website remains a great resource but the team recognizes that there are ways the DCA could optimize it and make it easier to find materials and expand the DCA's offerings. Social media updates and information sharing through Facebook, Twitter, and all DCA'S social media channels will continue to be a resource.

DCA will be starting a monthly newsletter to share with the SEC. The team is happy to provide presentations and materials for committee groups as requested. The DCA tries to do their best to be as proactive as possible but there are different interest groups that might just care about the different impacts. Ms. Parvizi continued that they are more than happy to come out to meet with folks for anything regarding the project. The hardest thing to tackle is when folks say they don't know anything about the project after the DCA offered to meet, and they refuse.

Ms. Parvizi continued that she is very sensitive to what Mr. Cosio said about collaboration and stated that she appreciated the distinction there but thought that there's a role in which the team can make sure folks are properly informed. The DCA doesn't try to persuade opinion on the project but does try to make sure people have the right facts. That's what's important. Everyone might not always agree on what we think facts are, but between the DWR and DCA teams, it has always been collaborative. Ms. Parvizi reiterated that the DCA will take more of a back seat as the DWR continues to do their immense outreach efforts as well. Hopefully this give folks an idea of the ways the DCA can get information out to folks.

Ms. Martinez said she hopes this begins to shed some light on a number of efforts that are trying to push information out. She reminds everyone that it's complicated, it's a hard project, it's complex. It's a large region that continues to try to be a partnership truly from the standpoint of how the organization can provide information that then perhaps the SEC members can move forward to their individual constituencies. Your thoughts can always be sent via email, that's definitely a good way to try to move that discussion forward.

Ms. Swenson said she appreciated Ms. Parvizi's very comprehensive list. The only problem is 99% of it relies on broadband which is an inequity in the Delta. Many people in the Delta do not have access to good broadband. Ms. Swenson validated that the DCA team has tried to reach people, but she doesn't know how the DCA will overcome the terrible issue with broadband in the Delta.

Ms. Parvizi agreed that was a really great point and mentioned that she doesn't know how comfortable she would feel, or others would feel about indoor meetings yet. Even if folks are fully vaccinated, there are some advantages given the weather of being able to put together outdoor meetings. She added that pre-Covid, the DCA was dropping off materials at libraries and post offices. She thinks that there's a level of comfort for staff at least to be able to bring materials to folks. There has to be a mutual agreement of what seems safe when it comes to meeting, but the DCA is getting ready to be able to hold smaller meetings in person. This has to be a conversation with all parties involved on whether or not there should be in person or not,

or if it could just be material drop offs to help address the issue of equity. Ms. Parvizi stated she hopes that's something that the DCA can start moving ahead on for the fall.

Ms. Palmer reminded everyone that if the SEC members have ideas in terms of where else the DCA can drop materials off to please let them know and the DCA will do their very best to make sure that happens.

Ms. Moreno said that all the outreach efforts would be great if people have access to the Internet. SEC meetings require access to the Internet. Ms. Moreno appreciated the materials that were given but added that they are complicated. SEC members can look at PowerPoints and know what it is about but the average person does not. She mentioned that they hadn't been able to reach as many people as they had claimed.

Ms. Parvizi said she was not trying to put numbers on things or make any claims, but she believed the DCA remained open in terms of reaching as many people as possible; it is a two-way street.

Ms. Moreno referenced one of the last meetings, where Ms. Parvizi said the attendance for these meetings increased by 300%, but when Ms. Moreno looked at the participants of these meetings everybody was either the SEC, DWR, or DCA. There weren't many people who are actually just regular community members.

Ms. Parvizi responded that this was true, but participation still increased massively since there were so few people for in-person meetings. Again, she assured they do not try to paint a picture.

Ms. Moreno pointed out that meetings were at 3:00 in the afternoon and some had to be late. Participation has increased 300%, but for who?

Ms. Parvizi answered that these are the numbers and if there were folks there that weren't staff, the team was transparent. Those were folks who are attending the meeting. It is not about trying to lie about the numbers because there were more people. She continued that there are some people who do have broadband access and it means they are able to attend the meetings in a way they certainly were not when it was about 10 to 12 people at in-person meetings. She said they weren't putting a flag down and this is the absolute best situation.

Ms. Moreno said that for in-person meetings, people in Hood were given a tiny postcard that looked like junk mail. The postcard would have meeting dates on it, and it wasn't explained what the meeting was or the importance of it so the information could be misleading. There won't be a whole lot of participants when nobody really knows what it is or tossed it because it looked like junk mail.

Ms. Parvizi reminded Ms. Moreno of her role as an SEC member, which was the whole point of the SEC. She confirmed the team had gone in-person to post notices to the post offices and the libraries. She confirmed there were also postcards sent since they are easy to carry and put around. DCA materials would be dropped off at some places but there needs to be a two-way street. Ms. Parvizi agreed that the DCA hasn't reached everybody 100% but they are willing to

work with anyone to get there. She added that Ms. Moreno as Hood's representative should aid in the outreach effort and she should reach out to DCA staff with any issues.

Ms. Moreno said she has been actively conducting outreach since appointed as the Hood representative. She has been taking the materials given to her and distributing them. Ms. Moreno was referencing to even before the Hood position was created.

Ms. Parvizi stated that the role now is that the DCA has time to work with her to ensure that folks have the information needed because there's an EIR coming and that's really where the public will comment.

Ms. Palmer said if there's a need for improvement in some way, let the DCA know and will do their very best to do so.

Ms. Martinez said the SEC meetings can be accessed via phone. Ms. Martinez asked Jennifer Malone to let folks know how to access to the meetings by phone because a lot of people do not know that's an option.

Ms. Malone said that anywhere any sort of meeting information is posted, whether that be in a lobby or at any post office etc., there will be the phone number and the access code to access the meeting. Anyone can always call in. Ms. Malone added it may not be the best experience simply because there isn't any visual, but it is important to make sure that everybody was aware that anyone can call into the meeting.

Ms. Moreno replied that would be great if the Delta had cell phone service.

Ms. Martinez acknowledged all Ms. Moreno has contributed as well as how she continues to be a valuable source of information and knowledge for Hood. She added that this sounds like an ongoing issue that needs continued work.

Mr. Hsia asked how does the DWR conduct outreach differently from the DCA.

Ms. Malone responded the outreach that DWR conducts is focused on everything related to public information and public participation for the whole program. Everything related to next year when the Draft Environmental Impact Report comes out, DWR will be responsible for that. All of the public information about the program like fact sheets, background information, background videos, and reporters that call with clear queries is handled by DWR. The DCA is more focused on the discrete issues around design and engineering. DWR covers the whole program and the DCA covers just those things that are the purview of the DCA.

5c. "Your Delta Your Voice" Survey Results

Ms. Taylor introduced herself as the Executive Director at Ag Innovations, a nonprofit that focuses on collaboration at the intersection of complex natural resources issues. They work in community engagement as well which is why they've taken on environmental justice and outreach to disadvantaged communities of the Delta.

Ms. Taylor said the goal of the EJ survey was to gather direct input from the disadvantaged communities in the region about how they work, live, recreate, and experience the Delta. There was a focus on communities that are historically burdened, under-represented, people of color, and low-income communities of interest including indigenous and tribal members.

There were 2,117 total participants and of those, 540 were Delta region DAC participants, meaning Delta region Disadvantaged Community. These terms were used interchangeably. The terms mean the same thing where DAC is defined as non-white, or has a household income of less than \$60,000, or they were designated by ZIP Code and household income below \$75,000. Zip code was determined using **Cal Enviroscreen** and the DWR Severely Disadvantaged Community mapping tool. There was a subset of that group which is the Delta region Severely Disadvantaged Community (SDAC). SDAC is defined as a household income less than \$45,000 or by ZIP Code and their household income is less than \$60,000. The presentation focused on the Delta region SDAC and Delta region DAC. Ms. Taylor noted they wanted to be inclusive so the region is around the 5-mile statutory boundary around the Delta to include those who are still very connected and consider themselves part of the Delta but may not be within the 5-mile statutory line. The survey was translated into Mandarin Chinese and Spanish, with 311 participants of the Chinese survey and 12 of the Spanish survey.

The response to the question, “Have you ever participated before in a public process related to a Delta tunnel proposal?” had interesting results. The response was over 60% in Delta, Delta DAC, Delta SDAC, and all respondents have never participated in a public process related to Delta tunnel proposal. The survey made inroads with members who hadn’t been engaged before in the Delta region.

Another question from the survey was, “What’s most important to you?” On the survey, the participant dragged different priorities above the line with up to six choices. There was also an option to suggest their own priority. Cleaner air and drinking water and natural environment where the top two followed by well-maintained levees. For Delta region DAC participants and Delta region SDAC participants clean air and drinking water was the top priority and for all respondents it was natural environment.

The next question was, “What do you like best about the Delta region?” The top five priorities are again the same throughout. The top five were beautiful rural landscape, quality of the natural environment, slower lifestyle and small-town feel, access to outdoor activities, and history and culture of the area. For the larger group of all respondents there was a shift in order with access to outdoor activities being third over slower lifestyle and small-town feel. Ms. Taylor pointed out that diverse cultures, local jobs, and access to affordable quality housing were selected less often than Delta region DAC respondents.

Another question was, “What concerns do you currently have about living or working in the Delta?” The top five priorities were drinking water quality, levee maintenance and flooding, quality of the natural environment, and then it dropped down to quality roads, and traffic. For SDAC the traffic is slightly higher than quality of roads. For all respondents, levee maintenance and flooding, and quality of the natural environment were higher than drinking water quality.

The next question was, “Do you spend much time visiting the Delta waterways and natural areas?” This question was proposed to find out if Delta region DAC, those who might be

historically burdened, or had lower income were actually in the waterways as often as the community who had more income, or had more privileges. It was found that 70% of Delta region DAC respondents do spend at least once per month at the waterways and natural areas. This was slightly lower for SDAC and all respondents.

Next was, “What activities do you do most frequently in the Delta?” The top two priorities for Delta Region DAC respondents were hiking, walking or running, and water activities. The responses changed between SDAC, all respondents, and DAC. SDAC respondents by far chose hiking, walking, or running, most frequently. “Just hanging out” was the second most frequently selected, water activities was the third and Birding, hunting, or wildlife was the fourth most frequently selected by SDAC, and were considered fairly close.

Ms. Taylor referenced one of the questions that was a map where respondents could drag markers and there was a range of things respondents could ask. Respondents could also drag markers and share additional information or comment, including outdoor activities, fishing spots, historical cultural sites, gathering places, businesses and services, and other special places. Outdoor activities were by far the most marked spots. The concern about outdoor activities continued throughout the survey.

Ms. Taylor provided some highlights from the Special Places Mapping feature of the EJ survey. The most frequently selected outdoor activity were water activities. 96% of Delta DAC respondents identified historic and cultural sites as needing improvement. Locke was identified in 41% of those historical and cultural sites. This really stood out as a place that many people identified as important and something they were proud of and reflected Delta heritage and its history.

Another question was, “Are there services that are needed in your community?” This question required a comment where 55% of Delta region DAC Respondents commented yes, social services are needed. (Editor’s Note – there was an error in the initial information reported. The percentage has since been corrected to 67%). These comments were sometimes just plain yes, or sometimes said at home services, or a food bank was needed. The top services identified in those comments were homelessness services, food bank services and food security.

Another question was, “What potential benefits of the proposal could you see for your community?” More than 2/3 of Delta region DAC respondents commented that there are no benefits that will come from the project. Other responses included there might be training or improvements to the natural environment like clean drinking water or access to the natural environment. Ms. Taylor noted that at the time of the survey, the Community Benefits Program hadn’t been formulated, so the survey was not created or delivered with that in mind. When respondents said there are no benefits there also wasn’t anything for them to react to in terms of what benefits might be.

The three biggest points of interest in the natural environment and preserving the Delta are community, agriculture, and heritage. For many they spoke to how their quality-of-life is interwoven with life on the water. Outdoor activities are important to Delta DAC participants, including hiking, walking, running, and water activities. Services are needed, especially around homelessness.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked what percentage of DAC and SDAC participants come from the urban versus rural Delta? What are the differences in the responses to those questions?

Ms. Taylor couldn't speak to that. It wasn't an analysis that was done but thought it was a really interesting question. There are 2,000 responses and many of them are GIS so questions like rural or urban, and questions of legacy communities becomes a challenge. Ms. Taylor reminded that people identified themselves by ZIP Code, so the ability to identify participants was limited to A. whether the respondent put that in, or B. if the ZIP Code is tied to the communities of interest.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked if data would be by zip code in the report?

Ms. Taylor responded no, but it was an interesting thought. There will be a range of maps where people put drop-down marker.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla wasn't worried about the drop-down markers and was more interested in knowing where the DAC and SDAC communities came from. She added ZIP Code data would be really important to give understanding of how and who was using the Delta by even participating in the survey.

Ms. Taylor said they'll see what can be done. It's possible it would be out of scope.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla added the reason she wants to match up responses to the ZIP codes is to better target those who are fishing for that much sustenance and where is that water recreation really coming from. Were there only two in Spanish?

Ms. Taylor said 311 in Chinese and 12 in Spanish.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said she feels like there's a gap in who got the survey or who responded. She acknowledged that collaboration with EJ communities is like getting vaccinations done. If there is a community that isn't responding because they are not reached in the right way, then there is something missing or there's a trust gap. She is interested where they came from and in the source within those communities.

Ms. Taylor shared how outreach was approached. There were four goals for approaches to outreach. One was to increase overall visibility and survey participation which was using traditional methods like Facebook, Eblast, etc. The survey was made to be short, interactive and engaging. A solid foundation for web-based actions was created with web visibility, social media, and methods. The next step was to increase participation by disadvantaged community members who live or work in the Delta. They worked with about 40 different community organizations in various ways to get the word out and that was both to limited English speakers, as well as low-income households. About 400 community organizations were called and they got about 10% to take action. Keep in mind this effort happened in the midst of the census and the election. For disadvantaged community members, outreach was tested with Univision, the Sacramento Cultural Hub, radio spots and videos in Spanish. Traditional Spanish language media channels were used. They weren't as successful as it could've been and there are some things to change if another survey is conducted in the future.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked if the San Joaquin County end of the Delta was included.

Ms. Taylor responded yes and mentioned outreach including bag stuffing at food banks was done. They passed out flyers with school meals. Flyers were handed out in other places and also posted in post offices. Ms. Taylor added they were targeting non-English speakers via the translated surveys, had everything translated, and had Spanish-speaking language media. As for the Chinese community, Mr. Hsia really tapped into his networks, got the word out and produced 300 responses with that work. Ms. Taylor added that this might be something that could be collaborated with Ms. Moreno for Hood, as well.

Mr. Moran asked if survey questions will be in the report?

Ms. Taylor said yes.

Mr. Moran said he wanted to know about the statistic that 90% of respondents eat fish they caught from the Delta four times a week. He also added to what Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said about having access to as much of ZIP code data as possible.

Ms. Taylor confirmed the fishing question was accurate.

Mr. Hsia was curious as to why \$75,000 was considered low income? He believed \$75,000 was not a bad income.

Ms. Taylor responded that there will be an entire appendix devoted to it about why they made the decisions that they did. What qualifies as DAC or SDAC depends on ZIP Code and household and if household income is less than \$75,000. The reason was because **Cal Enviroscreen maps** ZIP Codes with other kinds of concerns like pollution. There were maybe 20 different indicators, so if someone lived in a ZIP Code that is being considered to be disadvantaged by **Cal Enviroscreen**, they thought to just include them, however \$75,000 was used as an income cap partly to differentiate it from SDAC which also had an income cap. This figure seemed reasonable within the ZIP Codes, otherwise the disadvantaged community category could have included someone living in the ZIP Code with a higher income. There needed to be a reasonable way of defining X amount of income.

Mr. Cosio commented that the number of people that found levee maintenance important stood out to him. It is nice that the locals really understand that's a big thing. The proposed project is going to have a secondary and tertiary impact on the tunnels and a drop in the funding of levee maintenance. It has been well documented over history that levees have always been an issue since the 50s, even before the State Water Project was even funded. Every time it comes up, it either does not get funded or they just get avoided saying that an earthquake takes them down, so they will build tunnels. At some point the levees can suffer because the tunnels may lessen the desire to want to maintain them.

Mr. Moran added that the Conservancy and other folks have had a lot of outreach regarding mercury and city fishing, so if there were a way to get these numbers he would appreciate it. Four meals of fish per week is really astounding and also cause for great concern due to the high mercury levels. It would be important to have that data available as soon as possible.

5d. Community Benefits Program Update

Ms. Taylor provided an update on the Community Benefits Framework Program. The presentation includes ideas from the Community Benefits interviews and also allows an opportunity for SEC members to provide input and project ideas.

The team conducted 44 interviews from February 1st to March 19th. One of the questions asked about thoughts on the Community Benefits Program and the majority supported the concept. That's the bookend to the question asked in the survey about what benefits do you see with the proposed project. Concerns included complexity and feasibility; trust; need for oversight and enforceable commitments; lack of in-Delta capacity, which was important in terms of the design of the Program and how it might roll out; the question will projects last throughout construction and after? and a desire for more CEQA information first (impacts assessment, mitigation).

Recommendations included funding existing programs/avoid competing with existing programs; use of existing community action plans, other Delta project plans; fund savings accounts for residents to use for education/job training; provide lump sums for legacy communities; ensure planning and oversight are locally driven; solicit broad input about different types of project to consider.

The question now is what do you think about the community benefits concept? What should the program's purpose and objectives be given what you know about the Delta? What's your reaction to the proposed program components? What do you think about the proposed categories of benefits? Do you have any project suggestions? Ms. Taylor opened up the discussion for answers to these questions and any input from the SEC.

Chair Palmer added that the SEC can also send in their responses via email if that is preferable.

Ms. Barbieri added that there is a specific email address just for community benefits-related information which is deltaconveyancecbp@water.ca.gov. The DWR website also has a community benefits section with a form that can be used, as well.

Ms. Swenson commended the translated slides from this presentation. She added that personally she does not support the Community Benefits Program. While she appreciates the efforts, with the history of Community Benefits Programs, no amount of money is worthwhile to the Delta. Until something concrete is shown that would last, she is unsupportive.

Ms. Martinez reminded that support for the Program does not at all equate to support for the project and the team understands that.

Ms. Mann agreed that the Delta nor anything within the Delta is for sale. The Delta water is for the entire state. It's great to see some responses to the survey, but keep in mind the comparison of that number to the entire Delta community from Stockton to all the towns of the waterways affected. The sampling is not sufficient to decide what to offer and does not speak for the entire Delta.

Ms. Taylor informed that the sampling was only 44 people and nowhere near what they hope to reach. This was looked at as a type of draft to hopefully gather more information. She

understands where they are coming from. Although it's not what you agree with, the team understands that if a Community Benefits Program was decided upon, it would need to reflect the entirety of the Delta.

Ms. Martinez asked for some clarification on what exactly the Community Benefits Program is so that no one misinterprets the intended purpose.

Ms. Barbieri mentioned that the presentation is available on the DWR website which might be helpful for folks to look at. The community benefits concept is a defined set of commitments made by project proponents and created in coordination with the local community to create lasting tangible and potentially significant economic and social benefit to the residents, businesses, and organizations facing project impacts. Some acknowledgements were made in the presentation as well regarding why create a community benefits program that may also be helpful. They were to acknowledge that the direct project benefits e.g., State Water Project reliability are not located inside the Delta, acknowledge that if the project is approved it could have potential adverse effects that Delta communities may endure through construction, and acknowledge the limitations of traditional CEQA environmental mitigation typically affords.

Ms. Moreno asked if crop loss or job loss during construction will be included anywhere?

Ms. Buckman said that will be included as part of the environmental document. A potential change in agricultural land use will be assessed and mitigation will be identified, if possible. Agricultural mitigation within the Delta is pretty limited so ways to fully mitigate impacts might be difficult, but the team will be taking a look as part of the environmental document. If there are any ideas regarding mitigation for agricultural communities, please do share with the team.

Ms. Taylor added that benefits don't necessarily have to be tied to a mitigation. One way to think about it is what would really be a benefit to the Delta? In this case, talking about agricultural communities, what would be really beneficial in general?

Ms. Moreno said the biggest benefit would be no project. She added that when this was first presented, there were several different examples of various types of community benefits projects shown and she asked if there were any examples that directly related to this particular project, but nothing has been shown. It's hard to say what would help. This is a very specific community and it's difficult.

Ms. Martinez reminded that the chat is only visible to the meeting panelists, but a question was asked regarding where to find past workshops. Where can those be found?

Ms. Taylor said DWR has a Community Benefits Program page where everything is stored. That link can be provided.

Ms. Giacoma commended Ms. Taylor for pulling residents together from the Delta. It's helpful to hear what they have to say. An important issue is water quality which could be a topic for community benefits to ensure there is water quality and levee protection. She has previously asked for a map of the aquifers and has pointed out that all of the residents and the farmers depend on wells. There's no effort to trap the aquifers to protect against when drilling starts

and land gets redistributed. Before thinking about community benefits, community necessities might be a better place to start.

Ms. Taylor mentioned that there were several mentions of groundwater in the EJ survey, so it's helpful to hear this further elevated. The relationship to groundwater was certainly a theme.

Ms. Giacoma added there isn't a current seismic study either which addresses levee safety and groundwater. It all ties together. The paramount concern of the people is protecting their water.

Ms. Taylor asked if there is a specific area that really has the connection between levees and groundwater or is it throughout the Delta?

Ms. Giacoma responded that it's throughout the Delta. It's a very dynamic place. It depends on the integrity of the ground and the water source. With a massive tunnel to divert the river, it's terrifying to the people who live here. These kinds of questions don't seem to really be addressed. They're the most important questions.

Mr. Cox commented that he has spoken to many people in the fishing community regarding the Community Benefits Program and the basic feeling is that it's something no one trusts. Many people that it's the same thing again of promises that have been made in the past that never go anywhere. The fishing community is being left out of the discussion on water projects even though we have a lot of input. He plans to present ideas at the next workshop, but the bottom line is there is still a lot of mistrust with any sort of benefits program.

Ms. Taylor said it's important to note the trust that needs to be built and also that the fishing community has some ideas that need to be shared.

Chair Palmer noted that there is an overall theme of distrust that the team will keep in mind.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla shared that she feels there's sometimes the misconception that a community benefits program is in lieu of mitigation when it's not. Mitigation is what needs to be done legally to minimize impacts. A community benefits program centers around ideas of how to protect the community, it's certainly not buy-in into a project. She reminded that when AB-32 was introduced it did not take into account mitigation for air pollution and because EJ communities opposed cap and trade, they were not at the table. Having lived through the AB-617 process as an attempt at remediation, it's not something that should be lived through again. It did not hit goals and did not help the community. There are reasons to be distrustful but keep in mind that the majority of people are not involved in discussions of water and water quality.

Mr. Cosio asked about the turnout for the first workshop. He mentioned that the day he got notice was the day they had to register. He heard from others that they also felt it was sprung on them. What are you expecting for the next workshop?

Ms. Taylor said notices went out at least a month before the first workshop and then a couple of other messages were sent.

Ms. Barbieri added that postcards were also sent, there were postings at post offices, and they reached out to press folks. They did extend the registration window for this next workshop. Anyone can participate but the registration is just to ensure they have sufficient facilitators and such. The first workshop had about 125 people registered and about 35 people actually participated. It's hard to say why those numbers are that way. For the next workshop, it's at about 115 people currently.

Ms. Taylor said to please share any thoughts they might have about better noticing. The next workshop will include breakout groups, so it will allow for more dialogue and deeper discussion.

Ms. Swenson noted that extra reminders are always helpful, in terms of the workshops.

Ms. Taylor informed that the next workshops are May 6th at pm and May 25th at 6pm.

5e. Public Comment on Item 5

Ms. Meserve representing the Local Agencies of the North Delta commented on the first community benefits meeting. Having the participants masked from each other makes participating harder. Participants couldn't see other comments, other people, etc. so it would be better if it could be more open because it was very restrictive. It was brought up that it's difficult to picture how the CBP would be carried out. This discussion might need to happen again after the draft EIR. Having participated in higher iterations of the tunnel project, there was a lot of disagreement about if the mitigation measures were adequate and how these issues would get resolved to benefit the community.

Ms. Martinez said that Ms. Taylor mentioned some adjustments will be made to be a little more interactive.

Ms. Taylor said yes, there will be small group facilitators and it'll be in a meeting setting.

Ms. Martinez also pointed out the web address for the Community Benefits Program which is water.ca.gov/deltaconveyance. From that page, there is a button on the right that says Community Benefits.

Chair Palmer also added the address to the meeting chat.

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS & NEXT MEETING

Chair Palmer discussed future agenda items.

Ms. Martinez noted that the next SEC meeting is June 23rd. Meeting cadence will slow down after this meeting for the summer.

Ms. Parvizi added that the next meeting from there will be in the fall sometime.

Chair Palmer informed that newsletters will be sent out in the meantime with updates.

7. NON-AGENDIZED SEC QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

This is the time and place for SEC members to address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee’s jurisdiction but that are not on the agenda.

There were no SEC questions or comments at this time.

8. 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 at this time.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Keegan adjourned at 5:50 P.M.