

SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 09.22.2021

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Response Date	Response Status
17.01	6/23/2021	David Gloski	What is the difference between CEQA and what the Corps does? Do you work together and share information?	CEQA and NEPA have similar requirements, with some minor differences. NEPA includes analysis of some resources that are not part of CEQA, such as Environmental Justice and socioeconomics. DWR is including chapters on these resources in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to provide information for Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) development (but it will only be included in the EIR for disclosure purposes). From a reader's perspective, the clear difference is that the Corps has guidance to limit EIS documents to less than 300 pages, so the main body of the EIS will be shorter than the EIR. DWR will share information with the Corps, but the Corps (as lead agency) will determine if (and how) that information will be included in the EIS.	Carrie Buckman	9/22/2021	Responded
17.02	6/23/2021	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What administrative draft is coming out in the next few weeks?	DWR is working towards releasing the Draft EIR for public review in mid-2022.	Carrie Buckman	9/22/2021	Responded
17.03	6/23/2021	Anna Swenson	What is the timeline for the public to comment on the draft?	DWR is planning a 3-month public review for the EIR, which is roughly twice the required length of 45 days. The Corps will determine the review period for the EIS.	Carrie Buckman	9/22/2021	Responded
17.04	6/23/2021	Cecille Giacoma	Why is the Environmental Justice (EJ) survey confidential?	That is how surveys are designed. A lot of times people do not want to participate in a survey if they feel that their personal information is going to be used somehow. We just make it clear that it is confidential. We just want to make sure we protect all people who participated.	Janet Barbieri	9/22/2021	Responded
17.05	6/23/2021	David Gloski	In the Southern Forebay footprint diagram, does it mean that during the project you're using the area of the forebay to do treatment of this RTM stockpile and then it would turn into a forebay?	That's correct. With the current conceptual design, the RTM would be generated from two different tunnel drives; the north drive on the main tunnel from the pumping plant area, and the south tunnels that drive from the southern end of the forebay to connect to the Banks Pumping Plant approach channel. The construction plan would include two separate areas to test, spread, dry, and stockpile the RTM within the footprint of the Southern Forebay.	Graham Bradner	9/22/2021	Responded
17.06	6/23/2021	David Gloski	Have there been any internal discussions regarding the project delivering fresh water to the South Delta and the dual tunnel being redundant going up to Bethany?	For contributions from the Southern Forebay to the south Delta during emergencies, this is a topic still under discussion as part of the Community Benefits Program. Regarding redundancy, the Central, Eastern, and Bethany alternatives are dual conveyance alternatives, which means that new facilities would work together (and complement) the existing diversion facilities. Diversions could take place either at the new intake in the north Delta or through Clifton Court Forebay in the south Delta. These systems would work together to complement each other, providing some level of backup. Banks Pumping Plant was designed to incorporate some level of redundancy to allow the facility to continue to function during maintenance activities; the new pumping plans for all three alternatives would incorporate similar principles.	Carrie Buckman	9/22/2021	Responded

SEC Member Question/Comment Tracking Log Updated 09.22.2021

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Response Date	Response Status
17.07	6/23/2021	Dr. Mel Lytle	How was the flood impact the with this new ring levee to neighboring areas all the way to Elk Grove modeled? Secondly, how did you come to this analysis that a 100 yr protection would be significant?	The flood analysis in the area of the Twin Cities Complex was performed using the "North Delta Hydraulic Model", which was developed in the HEC-RAS modeling software. The model was obtained from Sacramento County. The exercise compared the inundation extent and timing within the area of the Twin Cities Complex for current conditions versus conditions that included the temporary ring levees for Central/Eastern and Bethany, and likewise for the permanent stockpiles. A 100-year return period hydraulic event was used since it is a widely available regulatory surface and consistent with the geometric design standards for Delta levees (Hazard Mitigation Plan and Delta-Specific PL84-99).	Graham Bradner	9/22/2021	Responded
17.08	6/23/2021	Mike Moran	What would the Bethany Alternative look like with a tie in with the federal Central Valley project?	If a CVP connection were included with a Bethany Reservoir Alternative, the Bethany pumping plant would include a few extra pumps and there would be one more 15-foot diameter aqueduct leading from the pumping plant to the CVP Delta-Mendota Canal (DMC). The connection location would be along the DMC and adjacent to the Bethany pumping plant; essentially in the same location as the DMC facilities for the Central and Eastern Alternative. The aqueduct would terminate at the DMC in a outlet structure that would drop flow into the DMC. A control structure would also be included in the DMC between the aqueduct outlet structure and the Byron Highway. The DMC control structure would be in essentially the same place as the equivalent structure for the Central and Eastern Alternative. Excess excavated material would be stockpiled on the west side of the DMC along the canal and encroach on the field a small amount. Excess material from the east side would be taken to the Bethany pumping plant stockpile area.	Phil Ryan	9/22/2021	Responded
17.09	6/23/2021	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Regarding flood control, has analysis been lined up with Climate Vulnerability Assessment from the Delta Stewardship Council?	The Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Adapts Vulnerability Assessment does not indicate an increase in flood risk for the area proposed for the Twin Cities Complex under future conditions, nor does the likelihood appear to increase beyond the minimum (less than 0.5% probability) annual flood hazard under future conditions. The Delta Stewardship Council's study would appear to confirm the site selection for the Twin Cities Complex has lower vulnerability relative to many other locations within the Delta.	Graham Bradner	9/22/2021	Responded
17.10	6/23/2021	Cecille Giacoma	To clarify, the ring levee is temporary for construction and then will be removed?	Yes, the ring levee would be removed following construction.	Graham Bradner	9/22/2021	Responded
17.11	6/23/2021	Douglas Hsia	Regarding the South Delta Connection, connecting the DCA to the federal facility seems like an afterthought. Why was it not considered beforehand?	The South Delta connection to federal facilities is not part of the proposed project because Reclamation has not indicated interest in participating. The DCA has been developing this information throughout the conceptual design process, but it has not been the focus of SEC discussion because it is not the proposed project.	Carrie Buckman	9/22/2021	Responded