

Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)

Steering Committee (SC) Meeting

April 24, 2009, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
California Farm Bureau Federation Conference Room
2300 River Plaza Ave, Sacramento, CA

Draft Meeting Notes

Associated documents/handouts:

- Agenda
- BDCP Draft SC Meeting Notes March 13, 2009
- BDCP Draft SC Meeting Notes March 27, 2009
- Draft Tentative Schedule of Agenda Topics for the Steering Committee Meetings – May 8-June 19, 2009
- Revised SAIC Terrestrial Species Goals and Objectives Working Draft

Action Items and Key Decisions

- BDCP Draft SC Meeting Notes March 13, 2009 approved
- BDCP Draft SC Meeting Notes March 27, 2009 approved

Updates

- DWR reported that the experimental “bubble curtain” (including bubbles, lights, noise) is now operating at the head of Old River in a test to determine if it will function to keep juvenile salmon out of Old River and in the mainstem of San Joaquin River.
- USBR announced supply allocations of 15% for north of the Delta and 10% for south of the Delta

Process and Schedule

Karen Scarborough presented *Draft Tentative Schedule of Agenda Topics for the Steering Committee Meetings – May 8-June 19, 2009* (see associated handouts/documents). It was announced that SC meeting schedule has changed and that there will not be a SC meeting on May 1 and that the SC will return to its usual every other Friday schedule. SC members discussed upcoming schedule changes and agenda topics including: requests for more detailed presentations and time to address water operations, including the likely need for multiple SC meetings to discuss water operations; coordination of terrestrial conservation measures with surrounding HCP/NCCPs; request for a report on DFG meetings with neighboring counties involved in HCP programs to brief them on the status of BDCP (DFG to report at May 22 SC meeting status of coordination with surrounding HCPs); request for an update on DRERIP evaluation synthesis process; process and schedule for development of first draft of metrics and targets; and need to reconvene working groups and technical teams. The May 8 SC meeting will include a “primer” on Delta water operations and relationship to BDCP.

Public Outreach

Karla Nemeth described the upcoming trip to Washington, DC with SC members Ann Hayden (EDF), Campbell Ingram (TNC), Laura King Moon (SWC), Kim Delfino (Defenders of Wildlife), Ara Azhderian (SLDMWD), Greg Zlotnick (Santa Clara Valley WD), and Roger Patterson (Metropolitan). There will be

briefings with members of the House and Senate, the Department of the Interior, including FWS and USBR, and EPA.

With respect to the NEPA/CEQA process, a link is available on the BDCP web site for submitting EIR/EIS scoping comments. In addition, the disposition of comments on the October 31, 2008 conservation measures documents has been posted on the BDCP web site.

NMFS raised the topic and SC members discussed the description of other stressors conservation measures and their relationship to operations and habitat restoration conservation measures as presented in the BDCP Public Outreach brochure.

Public comment:

Deanna Sereno representing Contra Costa Water District asked when the rest of the scoping meetings will be posted. Delores Brown indicated they would be posted after the comment period deadline.

Implementing Structure/Governance Working Group

Marc Ebbin reported that the Governance WG will be reconvening on May 6 and will focus on 3-4 of the 5 policy issues such as non routine/routine adaptive management decision making processes, the role of the implementing entity and Fish Agencies in the implementation of BDCP operations-related measures, and BDCP's relationship to larger regional governance structure. The next Governance WG meeting is May 6. The goal is to start on a draft of Chapter 7, *Implementation Structure* to bring back to SC for review

Conveyance Working Group

Paul Cylinder gave a summary presentation of the East and West conveyance facility alignment comparisons that were discussed at the Conveyance WG meeting. Highlights included the history of the BDCP process that has led to current thinking, including the conservation strategy short-listing analysis, the options evaluation, the December 2007 Points of Agreement document which identified the decision by the SC to focus on a dual conveyance approach, and the Overview of Conservation Strategy produced in December 2008-January 2009. Jim Watson (DHCCP) presented a comparison of the engineering components of the western and eastern alignments.

SC members asked for clarification on topics raised in the presentation including: status of engineering design; schedule and process for determining canal conveyance capacity and the role of Conveyance WG in that process; status of on-going land surveys; addressing Fish and Game Code section 1600 streambed alteration requirements; request for cost comparisons; reversibility of alignment decision during the planning process; value of taking additional time to fully evaluate both alignment options within the BDCP; potential impacts of tunnels on terrestrial habitat and species; and process for development of conservation measures specific to each proposed facility options. SC members requested development of criteria to facilitate SC selection of an alignment. More specific comparative information on the East and West alignments will be provided and it is anticipated the SC will identify an alignment to carry forward in BDCP planning at the May 8 SC meeting.

Public comment:

Ann Spaulding representing the City of Antioch asked if today's SC presentation will be posted today. Chair responded that postings on the BDCP web site usually happen within 2 days of the SC meeting.

Barbara Bryne (PCL) asked if the indirect costs of a surface canal (e.g., maintenance) were included in the comparison of costs with tunneling.

Susan Wilson-Broadus (DWR-DHCCP) asked for clarification on costs for the facility and asked how many pumping plants were planned on the western alignment option.

Daniel Kelly representing Sacramento County requested that all socio-economic impacts (especially related to agriculture) be addressed when factoring costs for the project.

Mark Wilson of Clarksburg asked if the evaluation matrix will be on the website (evaluation matrix has not yet been produced). Mr. Wilson also requested that irrigation districts be considered in the evaluation process. Chair responded that such issues would be fully evaluated in the BDCP EIR/EIS.

David Bolland representing ACWA asked whether the length of each alignment was the same. Mr. Watson responded that by coincidence the total lengths were about the same.

Oshe Meserve indicated that even though BDCP members made decisions in 2007, there were more members now along with in-Delta representation that had not been at the table back then. Consequently, Ms. Meserve suggested that new SC members be educated about how the decisions have been made over the course of planning.

Other In-Delta Facilities Evaluation (presentation summary from Joint WG)

Jerry Johns presented a comparison of potential in-Delta facilities for near-term and long-term implementation:

- 2-Gates Project
- South Delta Improvements Program
- 3-mile Slough Project (A Franks Tract Project Option)
- Isolate Old River
- South Delta Setback Levees and Channel Improvements

The Chair indicated that there would be no decision today, but will bring the topic of in-Delta facilities up at a future SC meeting. SC members comments included: the need for a robust through-Delta conveyance for drought years; desire to continue to evaluate the isolated Old River option; DFG commented that simple is better and that it is better to have fewer in-Delta elements.

Public comment:

Justin Fredrickson (CFBF) raised concern that fish agencies seem to discourage use of any barriers. Representatives from the fish agencies indicated there were no policies that opposed the use of barriers.

Biological Goals and Objectives Working Group

Will Stelle presented the *Revised SAIC Terrestrial Species Goals and Objectives Working Draft* (see associated handouts/documents). The document is the current draft of the working approach under NCCP. The terrestrial goals and objectives are in a format similar to the aquatic goals and objectives; however, the goals and objectives for terrestrial and wetland species are largely habitat based. Metrics have not been

developed, as metrics will be acreage metrics drawn from conservation measures. Next drafts of goals and objectives are expected to be developed next week.

SC members discussed the development of the terrestrial goals and objectives and the roles and responsibilities of the Terrestrial Resources Subgroup and DFG in that effort.

Attendees

Management and Representatives

Karen Scarborough (Chair, The Natural Resources Agency)

Marc Ebbin (DWR, The Natural Resources Agency)

Will Stelle (The Natural Resources Agency)

Laura King Moon (State Water Contractors)

Karla Nemeth (The Natural Resources Agency)

Keith Coolidge (California Bay-Delta Authority)

Jerry Johns (DWR)

Federico Barajas (USBR)

Paul Robershotte (USACE)

Brent Walthall (KCWA)

Ara Azhderian (SLDMWD)

Greg Zlotnick (Santa Clara Valley)

Kurt Arends (Zone 7)

Kim Delfino (Defenders of Wildlife)

Ann Hayden (EDF)

Anthony Saracino (The Nature Conservancy)

Greg Gartrell (CCWD)

Steve Ottemoeller (Friant Water Authority)

Melinda Terry (North Delta Water Authority)

John McCamman (DFG)

Dan Castleberry (FWS)

Russ Strach (NMFS)

Paul Cylinder (SAIC)

Pete Rawlings (SAIC)

On phone

John Cain (Natural Heritage Institute)

Gary Bobker (TBI)

Randall Neudeck (Metropolitan)

Jason Peltier (Westlands)

Other attendees

See sign-in sheets
