

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, February 15, 2024

1:30 p.m.

(Paragraph numbers coincide with agenda item numbers)

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Board of Directors was called to order in person, by teleconference, and remotely - Conference Access Information: Phone Number: (669) 444-9171, Code: 83084606454#, <https://dcdca-org.zoom.us/j/83084606454?from=addon> at 1:30 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Board members in attendance from the DCA Boardroom were Sarah Palmer, Martin Milobar, Gary Martin, Miguel Luna, Robert Cheng, and Adnan Anabtawi. Tony Estremera participated from Valley Water Headquarters Boardroom.

Alternate Directors in attendance remotely were John Weed, Royce Fast, Dan Flory, Russel Lafevre, Bob Tincher and Dennis LaMoreaux.

DCA staff members in attendance were Graham Bradner and Josh Nelson. Valerie Martinez participated in the Board Meeting remotely.

DWR staff members in attendance were Katherine Marquez and Rylan Gervase.

3. CLOSED SESSION

a) PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION DISCUSSION

(Government Code Section 54957)

Title: Executive Director

b) CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2): 2 cases

- i. *Sierra Club et al. v. California Department of Water Resources*, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2020-80003517

- i. Petitions regarding the Department of Water Resources' certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Conveyance Project.

4. OPEN SPECIAL MEETING & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Sarah Palmer convened the open session at approximately 2:10 p.m. and led all present in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

There were no reportable actions from the closed session.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 24, 2024, Special Board Meeting

Recommendation: Approve the January 24, 2024, Special Board Meeting Minutes

Motion to Approve Minutes from January 24, 2024, as

Noted: Estremera
Second: Milobar
Yeas: Palmer, Milobar, Martin, Luna, Estremera, Cheng, Anabtawi
Nays: None
Abstains: None
Recusals: None
Absent: None
Summary: 7 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as MO 24-02-01).

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

a) February DCA Monthly Report

Information Item

DCA Executive Director, Graham Bradner, presented to the Board an overview of the monthly board report. He began with Section 1: Work Performed in January 2024. The Program Management team completed the midyear budget review. This review allows DCA to view all the work that has been proposed and contracted through various task orders, assess the progress, and consider any potential changes. DCA does address potential changes through the year as a continual process. The midyear point provides the opportunity to see the direction the DCA is heading towards and guides how the second half of the year will go. This allows DCA to consider any changes that can be made to contracts and task orders, which provides the opportunity to daylight what the estimate at completion (EAC) will be for the fiscal year. DCA is starting to forecast an underrun of just under \$4M for the fiscal year, more details on this in the budget section of the report.

Mr. Bradner moved on to the Administrative functions, stating that the alignment tours are starting up again. DCA held about 20 tours last year and will be conducting tours starting in the spring and continue through summer and fall.

President Palmer asked if the tours would be changing as now there is a selected project.

Mr. Bradner stated that there does not seem to be any change to the tours as DCA was touring the proposed Bethany alignment project last year. DCA will continue to add and change different variations tailored to each audience with specific interest and timelines in mind. DCA will continue to look for ways to improve the tours.

Mr. Bradner continued to the Engineering section; the Engineering team is working on the estimate for the Bethany Reservoir alternative. DCA is also evaluating potential innovations that could reduce impacts, cost schedule, or improve constructability. DCA's plan is to reflect those potential innovations through a secondary estimate. The primary estimate will be a complete estimate of construction activity, soft cost, budget for community benefits and environmental mitigation costs. The secondary estimate that the DCA will develop using the cost savings innovations is more to take the primary estimate and deduct costs associated with various quantity, effort, equipment, and labor reductions. The timeline for the updated estimate is quarter two (2) and DCA has a graphic that will be shown later in the staff reports section. The graphic lays out these activities through the course of the year and depending on the Boards choice, it can be a continuous item that can be talked about during the regular board meeting updates.

Mr. Bradner went on to update the Board on Fieldwork activities and stated that the DCA completed most of the fall program in December 2023. There were a few locations that DCA was not able to access and is still working through with the team to gain access, but overall, the team had great success. Currently, the Fieldwork team is taking consideration of potential priority of future investigations to support continued evaluations of the Bethany Reservoir alternative alignment and construction refinements as the project continues to evolve. The work done under the initial study mitigated negative declaration (ISMND) was very broad in scope and looking to understand conditions across the Delta and fill data gaps. One key factor is that the future investigative work would be more focused and specifically aligned with the preferred project and less broadly distributed across the Delta. Mr. Bradner stated to the Board that DCA is in the early stages of the planning process and will keep the Board updated as the team makes progress.

Director Luna asked if the investigations are aligned along the east of the alignment.

Mr. Bradner stated that currently DCA over the last few years has collected 170-180 exploration points distributed throughout the system. There is a lot of data in the central Delta, much historical data that has been collected along the levies and long previous iterations of the project. Along the eastern margin of the Delta there are wide gaps of unknown conditions and information. DCA is continuously filling in the gaps with

information collected. To complete the final design of the project, DCA would need about 1,500-2,000 exploration points, while currently, the DCA is trying to understand the subsurface conditions and the variability.

Mr. Bradner continued to Section 3: Budget, DCA has an approved budget of \$40.4M with an EAC showing \$36.5M. The DCA has committed just under \$35M to date with about \$1.5M in reserve. As the spring approaches the underrun could shift to accommodate surveys, geotechnical work, and other activities.

Mr. Bradner stated in figure one (1) of the cash flow chart, expenses to date are still tracking as anticipated with the planned costs. The Controls team and Contract managers have done a great job forecasting their activities and turning those into actual expenditures. The DCA has not re-baselined the project, it will continue to stay where the line on the graph is and monitor the progress. There has been an increase in activities starting in the second half of the fiscal year due to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) decision on the project. It is uncertain whether the accuracy of the forecast will be maintained or if it will start to drift.

Mr. Bradner stated that the Program Management support activities are ongoing and linear in terms of how they spend the year. The project definition reports have a delayed status due to DCA intentionally delaying the start of the reports. The definition reports are associated with the procurement activities that will eventually be needed. DCA's vision for the engineering documentation is to have a preferred project engineer's report prepared by next fiscal year. The preferred project engineer's report will be the big picture document for the Bethany Reservoir alternative that contains all the engineering documentation. Currently the preferred project engineer's report is spread out among multiple engineering project reports with different alternatives, flow rates, addenda, supplements and other pieces that make it difficult to track. The DCA will produce a preferred project engineer's report that will remove any alternatives, anything that is not relevant to the preferred project and create a cohesive document that will include information that has been used to date. The preferred project engineer's report would then be supported by basis of design reports what the DCA tentatively called project definition reports. The project definition reports will be focused on the specific project features which will provide next level engineering information that will be necessary for procurement of feature design contractors. DCA is currently assessing the project priorities and Mr. Bradner stated that the project is not in the position to start the project definition reports.

Mr. Bradner stated that the investigation program is on track as the DCA is completing the lab analysis and all the documentation will have the calendar year 2023 data report ready for the internal use by the engineering team as they continue to look at subsurface conditions and evaluate those assumptions.

Director Cheng stated that State Water Contractor (SWC) staff were thinking that there's additional budget that's necessary for other tours outside the scope of the director's tour and wanted to know if Mr. Bradner had any conversations with SWC staff, Director Cheng mentioned that the Board was having those discussions.

Mr. Bradner stated that he had not had any discussion with the SWC staff. DCA is fully capable of managing tours and has reserve set aside. The Delta tours are an important part of the project and happy to take folks out on the tour and provide all the necessary resources. There may be a gap in terms of getting folks to Sacramento if they don't live locally and the DCA would appreciate the help in terms of making that happen.

No further comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

b) DCA Environmental Compliance Committee Concept

Information Item

DCA General Counsel, Josh Nelson noted that with the recent certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). DCA is viewing the next steps and deciding when it would be best to establish the Environmental Compliance and Mitigation Committee. This committee is specifically identified in the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) as well as the bylaws and needs to be established within 60 days of an approved project. As an approved project is not defined, DCA staff's recommendation is to not establish the committee now but establish it once DCA is ready to move into the construction and implementation phase. The reason for that is the work that DCA is currently doing is still within the planning phase. As stated in the previous month through a JEPA amendment, there was clarification that the planning phase would continue until all permits were obtained and the project is ready to move into construction and implementation. It is most appropriate for the Environmental Compliance and Mitigation Committee to be established once we are ready to move into construction and implementation. However, this is a Board advisory committee and it is a Board decision as to when to establish the committee. Accordingly, DCA staff wanted to bring this item before the Board to obtain feedback. If the board is comfortable with the staff's recommendation, no actions are required. If the Board would like to move forward with establishing the committee, there would need to be a resolution that can be made during a future meeting.

Director Anabtawi stated that he appreciates the staff for reviewing this and identifying that sort of ambiguity of the approval term. Committees and participation take a lot of time from everyone and it's important that those committees are focused and provide value as committee members and those participating.

President Palmer stated that there was some issue in terms as to when this decision would happen and appreciated the legal opinions and the staff work that put this forward. She asked if the Board was able to bring this forward at any time.

Mr. Nelson stated that yes, the Board may bring this topic up at any time.

Mr. Nelson stated that this doesn't mean that DCA wouldn't be doing outreach efforts as stated by Ms. Valerie Martinez. DCA and DWR are making substantial outreach efforts that are ongoing regardless of this committee being established.

President Palmer stated that this committee makes sense to be established in the future.

Mr. Bradner stated that the DCA had the stakeholder engagement committee that was sunset towards the beginning of the public process associated with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This was done in part to avoid confusion with engagement and involvement of the role of that committee relative to those other more regulatory mandated public Processes by DWR. There are permits remaining that have also mandated processes of their own and delaying the committee may be appropriate.

President Palmer stated that it makes since, DCA is the construction authority.

No further comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

c) Adopt Resolution Establishing the DCA Finance Committee; Ratify President's Appointments to the Committee

Approve Resolution

Mr. Bradner presented to the board that in the past DCA has had budgets as small as on the order of \$21M. While DCA's budget this year is around \$40M, DCA anticipates something similar in the next fiscal year. As the program continues to grow and progress, Mr. Bradner expects the complexity of the budget process and activities being undertaken will continue to grow. Mr. Bradner believes the timing is right to start re-evaluating DCA's processes and consider how DCA allows this process to grow with likely expanding the budgets and work scope.

Director Palmer stated what DCA may be needing in terms of a finance committee and looking to have board alternates placed on committee with a board member chairing it. President Palmers considered all board members are qualified and deciding who may have the time to set forth to join the committee. The distribution of the committee is to represent people from the southern, middle and northern areas of the state. As a result, Director Gary Martin has consented to chair this committee, Director Martin Milobar has

also consented to be on this committee. President Palmer will also serve on the committee.

Recommendation: Motion to Adopt Resolution Establishing the DCA Finance Committee; Ratify President’s Appointments to the Committee

Motion to Adopt Resolution Establishing the DCA Finance Committee; Ratify President’s Appointments to the Committee, as

Noted: Luna
Second: Anabtawi
Yeas: Palmer, Milobar, Martin, Luna, Estremera, Cheng, Anabtawi
Nays: None
Abstains: None
Recusals: None
Absent: None
Summary: 7 Yeas; 0 Nays; 0 Abstain; 0 Absent. (Motion passed as Resolution 24-02).

Director Cheng asked if the membership process was on an annual basis or what is the current thought.

President Plamer stated that the group has not gotten to that point yet.

Mr. Nelson stated that currently in the resolution it would be a two-year term following a fiscal year basis with the initial appointment expiring on June 30 of 2025. This is a decision point for this board and if there is a desire to modify that, the board would need to modify that in the resolution when adopting it.

No further comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

d) **The Economy of The State Water Project Report**

Information Only

Mr. Bradner presented to the board, DWR, Policy Advisor Rylan Gervase that is currently the policy adviser for the State Water Project (SWP). Mr. Gervase leads key communication initiatives and projects. Mr. Gervase helps develop policy for special projects in the Suisun Marsh and Bay Delta. He also manages the SWP Federal funding program. Prior to his role at DWR, Mr. Gervase advocated for water and environmental policy for local governments as a legislative representative for California special district Association from 2017 to 2019. From 2013 to 2017, Mr. Gervase developed legislative legislation as legislative aid for Oakland assembly member Rob Bonta. Mr. Gervase graduated from Sacramento State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Government and Spanish. After graduation, Mr. Gervase was selected as a Jesse M Unruh

assembly fellow where he learned the legislative process and was mentored by senior staff in the California State Assembly.

President Palmer welcomed Mr. Gervase.

DWR conducted an economic analysis of the SWP to assess its importance and the need for investment in its aging infrastructure. The SWP, which is over 60 years old, requires billions of dollars in refurbishment and rehabilitation to maintain its current water service level of about 2.4M acre-feet per year. An additional 10% reduction in California's water supply due to climate change further necessitates massive infrastructure projects like the DCP to help modernize the water system for the effects of climate change. The study compared the SWP service area to other national economies and found that a portion of California receives most of its water from the SWP that is about 27M people and 750,000 acres of irrigated farmland across the state. The first takeaway of the study found that just this portion of California served by the SWP has a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of \$2.3T, making it the equivalent of the world's eighth largest economy. According to the graph, that would put the SWP between the economies of France and Italy. California has a \$3.5T GDP, which makes that the fifth (5) largest economy in the world. The SWP is feeling a great deal of economic growth in California, which more than most of the entire economy is supported by the SWP. The SWP supports the largest economy in the United States out of any major water system and the second largest economy of any water management system in the world.

Mr. Gervase continued to present to the Board that the median household income of the service area of the SWP is about 20% higher than the rest of the United States. This shows that there is a significant economic benefit to having a stable and reliable water supply provided by the SWP. The second part of the study compared alternatives to the SWP to see if it would theoretically be cost effective to replace with another source. DWR looked at a variety of different sources including water conservation projects, storm water capture, water recycling and desalination. As shown on the graph, the range of costs for the SWP is about \$250 per acre foot and that's for customers in the Central Valley. For the Central Coast customer that range goes up to almost \$1,500 per acre foot. This is primarily due to pumping costs and the extra energy of getting the water to those areas. The only other alternative source of water that was comparably cost effective is the water conservation projects starting at around \$400 per acre foot ranging up to \$1,500 per acre foot. A water conservation project is less scalable to a utility level like the SWP if looking at the lower end of the scale. The \$400 per acre foot projects include low flow toilets, high efficiency shower heads, high efficiency appliances, etc. Items that simply are not going to produce the scale of water that the SWP will make available to contractors. The other sources of water were comparatively much more expensive without including conveyance. If there were to be a desalination plant built on the coast, that would require a conveyance infrastructure to communities inland. This would add a substantial amount

to the cost of those projects. In result of the study, the SWP is in fact one of the most affordable and cost-effective sources of water in California.

Mr. Gervase continued on, stating that 8.2M people living in disadvantaged communities in California rely on affordable water from the SWP. This would be about three quarters of all residents who live in disadvantaged communities in California and about one in three customers are a resident of a disadvantaged community. Many of these communities are in the Inland Empire of California, Los Angeles, the Central Valley and the Feather River watershed area. The final portion of the study concluded that the SWP supports 750,000 acres of irrigated farmland that produces up to \$19B in agricultural products and other crops a year, supporting 160,000 farm jobs in the state. The four (4) major agriculture counties that receive SWP water have sustained growth since the 1960s. Currently Kern County has received the most agricultural production growth and heavily relies on SWP water to irrigate its farmland. DWR also looked into other industries supported by the SWP and found that 800,000 businesses are indirectly relying on the SWP water and those businesses support 8.7M full-time jobs. Mr. Gervase stated that this is evidence pointing to the SWP as a key part of California's economy to assist in driving agricultural production, full-time employment and industry throughout the state.

Mr. Gervase stated that DWR conducted a study in collaboration with The Berkeley Research Group in December 2023 that highlighted the value of the SWP to California. There is a separate study focused on other public benefits including economic benefits, water supply, flood control, hydropower, environmental benefits, and recreational benefits. DWR is making a case for projects like the SWP as well as helping persuade policy makers in the public that is needed to keep investing in the California water systems.

Director Milobar stated if DWR knows what percentage of agricultural production leaves California and benefits other states.

Mr. Gervase stated that this goes beyond their scope of this study, DWR does not investigate what happens to the product once it leaves California. He will make a note and follow up when available.

Director Milobar stated that there needs to be some contribution of where those products end up. It's an important aspect as to where some of the funds should come from.

Director Martin stated that this presentation reinforces the importance of the SWP. Director Martin stated that when the Delta Conveyance is constructed and the costs are rolled out, if there is a way to see how those numbers might change.

Mr. Gervase stated that DWR is continuously looking for ways to bring in state and federal funding to help keep the cost of water down due to the necessary investments. There is time to continue brainstorming and find ways to bring in funding for the project. Mr. Gervase stated that he assists with the federal funding program to help identify opportunities through infrastructure bills that have been passed in recent years.

Director Martin stated that there does seem to be room for growth for the SWP and have the cost remain competitive with alternative sources. Director Martin asked if there was any plan once Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) is completed and implemented which may reduce the amount of agriculture that is able to be done in the state.

Mr. Gervase stated that he does not have a direct answer to SGMA but does know that DWR is concerned about the matter. The expected reduction in water supply will require solutions to develop enough water. This may include alternative projects that were presented earlier. DWR is looking to ensure the water supply for the next 50 years and every solution is on the table and feels that the SWP is the most cost effective to the state compared to alternatives.

Mr. Bradner stated that DCA is working with DWR and economists to provide a full cost evaluation versus the benefit analysis that is expected to be released in quarter two (2) of this year. The analysis will acknowledge the timelines around the construction timing and accrual of benefits. The next steps supported by the SWC and then individually within the water agencies considering different financing alternatives and options. The process of the cost estimate and benefits analysis will shed light on the situation.

Director Martin asked if this analysis will be made available to the board and agencies.

Mr. Gervase stated that yes, these documents will be made available to the board. He has brochures that have great information.

President Palmer would like a few of the slides.

Director Luna stated that this presentation highlights the importance of the DCP. The DCP project is crucial as the SWP contributes 67% of the state's GDP. Failure to plan and invest in non-urgent times will lead to higher costs. The project serves 8.2M people in disadvantaged communities and will provide clean portable water to over a million people. Director Luna feels very fortunate to be on this board and to be able to plan and educate on this issue. When people oppose the project with just opposition and not looking at the new numbers and the facts of how it serves and how it can serve, it is very helpful in the communication aspect. He is very thankful of the Investments that the state has made that has allowed for the state to have this reliable source of water.

Director Cheng stated that he appreciates the time DWR took to create this report. He noted that there is recognition that the SWP is a wonderful asset to the state and investments need to be made. With the desalination experience that Director Cheng has, the source presented in the study challenges previous valuations of desalination and provides a more accurate price tag. This information will serve the board members well.

Director Anabtawi appreciates the ability to step back and understand the presentation. The project is too important to abandon, considering its impact on the economy and the communities it serves. Being a part of the Mojave Water Agency, this reliability and cost of water is always on his mind. It is expensive to supply water to that region of the state and understands that the availability of water to each region of the state varies.

President Palmer stated that she agrees with Director Anabtawi regarding all regions in the state have different water necessities. Regarding agriculture, it is more than just dollars and cents, it is a crucial part of the state and nation. President Palmer asked if the cost of conveyance was also included in the cost analysis that Mr. Gervase provided.

Mr. Gervase stated that the cost of the conveyance project was not included in the cost analysis presented.

Mr. Bradner asked if President Palmer was speaking regarding the DCP or the general conveyance of water.

President Palmer stated that it was moving water in general.

Mr. Gervase stated that this analysis does have the cost of general conveyance folded into the analysis.

Director Estremera stated that it was a great presentation.

Ms. Osha Meserve, Local Agencies of the North Delta, Public Comment, criticized the report and sees it as an insult to say that the SWP is considered a cheap source of water. Ms. Meserve believes that the project has not been paying the full cost of taking water of out this estuary and in result part of the reason as to why the Delta is experiencing at times a permanent drought, harmful algal blooms, an increase in salinity and the fisheries; particularly salmon and other listed fish are in such poor conditions. Ms. Meserve believes that this report that was presented is an admission to show that it cannot support itself and has been told that the DCP would have the beneficiaries pay for the project. The beneficiaries do not and can't pay for the project. Ms. Meserve stated that the report is incorrect with the statement that due to the project the economy is working. Ms. Meserve stated that there is no effort to balance the reasons as to how the economy is doing in certain areas. With the charts, it is believed that without the cost of the tunnel they are useless. Ms. Meserve is interested in knowing what the total cost of the tunnel will be and understands that the DCA is currently working on the report. She also believes that the

SWP could be invested in some of these other alternatives. Ms. Meserve stated that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) mentioned that the tunnel would only serve about 15% of the customer needs. In addition, the EIR does not mention that the customers would be abandoning previous infrastructures. The current infrastructure needs to be maintained and have more respect for the Delta communities that bear the brunt of these actions.

No further comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

7. STAFF REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

a. General Counsel's Report

DCA General Counsel, Josh Nelson, informed the Board that the annual Form 700s are due by April 2, 2024.

No comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

b. Treasurer's Report

DCA Treasurer, Katano Kasaine, informed the Board that this report is for December 2023 and January 2024. DCA ended January with an ending cash balance of \$1,037,222. The balances for prepaid expenses and accounts payable as of January 31, 2024, were \$202,849 and \$1,174,917, respectively. For the same period, advances amounted to \$800,000 and total net position was \$219,242.

No comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

c. DCP Communications Report

Mr. Bradner informed the Board that DCA has a very busy year ahead. DCA has the updated cost estimate and benefit cost analysis coming in during the middle of quarter two (2) time frame and then that preferred project Engineers report is identified for end of quarter 3. If the Board would like to adopt and introduce these milestones into the monthly report or any other location that would be beneficial.

President Palmer finds this graphic useful.

DCA Communications Manager, Valerie Martinez informed the Board that the Communications team has been working collaboratively with DWR and the Governor's office to ensure transparent public information dissemination. Speaking to the chart the Executive Director just walked the board through, there is a lot of planning for the various activities rolling out in 2024. Ms. Martinez stated that as Director Luna's mentioned, we

have a huge responsibility to ensuring that communities throughout the state understand what the project is and all the different components it entails. DWR has created materials such as brochures, Fast facts, and videos to enhance public understanding of the project. The Board members are welcome to receive the materials if requested and disperse them to their various agencies and general managers. The Communications team continues to work on the closer looks and highly recommend looking at the tunneling video and fact sheet. This does lay out how the project is being built and how the completion will be like. Another great piece is the seismic video, which talks about how the project addresses seismic issues. From a social media standpoint, the Facebook page grew by 100 likes, click-through rates for the work that is being pushed out continues to be at 2%, which typically sits at .8% for the industry. Putting this number into perspective, that is 104,000 video plays in January for the two (2) videos stated above. 1,700 people visited the website last month.

The Communications team is focusing on the Public Water Agency (PWA) one pagers. The team has created about seven (7) fact sheets for different agencies. These are being created at the request of the agencies through coordination with DWR. If any Board member is interested in having a one-pager completed for their agency to inform Ms. Martinez and she will work with her team. The alignment tours are set to resume starting at the end of February. DCA had approximately 200 people attend the tours last year. Many participants enjoyed the tour and have a better understanding of the project and how it will impact communities. Mr. Bradner and Carrie Buckman have teamed together to provide briefings and updates to some of the member agencies. The General Managers are encouraged to call DCA and have Mr. Bradner and Ms. Buckman provide those briefings to the boards and the community.

Ms. Martinez continued to present to the Board, DCA is preparing for the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) Conference. Claudia Rodriguez and her team have secured a booth in a strategic location with high traffic.

Ms. Martinez continued to present to the Board that DCA is excited about the Legislative Education Program and how it is shaping out.

Director Luna expressed that he feels DCA has the correct Communications consultant and demonstrates excitement over a tunneling video and he himself shares that excitement. Director Luna continued to mention that the Legislative Education Program is on track, they are outlining a cadence and identifying parties that will be engaging with. There has been great progress with meeting with DWR and the DCA, there may not be much update during the March 2024 meeting but will have some substantive information in April 2024. Director Luna proposed that Ms. Martinez do a presentation for the Delta Conveyance Finance Authority (DCFA) as they seemed very interested in understanding the tools and information.

President Palmer stated that there would be members attending the Washington, DC ACWA conference and if there is any informative material of the project that can be taken, President Palmer will take with her on the trip.

No further comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

d. DWR Environmental Manager’s Report

DWR Program Manager Katherine Marquez is presenting for Carrie Buckman. Ms. Marquez informed the Board that DWR reached an important milestone in December, releasing the Final EIR at the end of 2023. DWR is focusing on the water rights process and submitting a change in point of diversion petition to start the water rights hearing later in the year and the federal and state Endangered Species Act compliance. In addition, the Army Corps is continuing to coordinate their National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.

No comments or questions were received from the Board, nor were any public comment requests received.

e. Verbal Reports

No verbal reports were received.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

No future agenda items requested.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comment requests.

10. ADJOURNMENT:

President Palmer adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m., remotely-Conference Access Information: Phone Number: (669) 444-9171, Code: 83084606454#, <https://dcdca-org.zoom.us/j/83084606454?from=addon>