STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, March 11, 2020
3:00 PM
(Paragraph numbers coincide with agenda item numbers)

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

1. WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Stakeholder Engagement Committee (SEC) was called to order at Willow Ballroom, 10724 CA-160, Hood, CA 95639 at 3:01pm.

Director Palmer explained that Ms. Keegan's absence was due to health precautions and reminded to try to keep as much distance from one another as possible.

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

2. ROLL CALL/HOUSEKEEPING

Committee members in attendance were Angelica Whaley, Anna Swenson, Cecille Giacoma, David Gloski, Douglas Hsia, Isabella Gonzalez-Potter, Jim Wallace, Malissa Tayaba, Mike Hardesty Philip Merlo, Peter Robertson and Sean Wirth. Ex-officio members Gilbert Cosio and Michael Moran were also in attendance. Tribal representative alternate Jesus Tarango also attended.

Committee members not present included Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla, James Cox, Karen Mann, Lindsey Liebig and Dr. Mel Lytle.

DCA Board Member in attendance was Director Sarah Palmer (Chair). In addition, DCA and DWR staff members in attendance were Kathryn Mallon, Valerie Martinez, Joshua Nelson, Phil Ryan, Andrew Finney, Graham Bradner and Carrie Buckman.

Ms. Palmer reviewed housekeeping items. Members should sign in for accurate record-keeping. Members of the public can fill out and submit speaker cards in order to speak during the public comment period. Meeting is being filmed and webcast live and will be posted on the website following the meeting. The meeting space has been rearranged to allow for additional space between workers and members. Due to the spaced-out nature of the meeting, some may not be captured on video while they are speaking. Members are asked to speak into microphones so their comments can be heard and recorded. Please be mindful of cameras and walk behind them if leaving the meeting. Emergency exits were reviewed.

Ms. Palmer provided an overview of materials provided to SEC members and members of the public. Documents were printed and provided on flash drives for SEC members. These documents included the current meeting agenda, meeting minutes from last meeting, question tracking packet, meeting presentation and a map book.

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.

The meeting agenda was reviewed.

3. MINUTES REVIEW: February 26, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting

Ms. Palmer asked if there were any comments on the minutes, which were distributed to members, provided as hard copies at the meeting and posted on the website. Any changes can be reported to Jasmine Runquist. No objections or changes were reported.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS

[Editor's Note: Item 4 is a single discussion item. Subparts are listed for clarity.]

a. SEC Questions on Previous Technical Presentation

Ms. Mallon thanked members for their attendance, especially in light of the COVID-19 situation. The first agenda item is for members to ask any questions or provide feedback from constituents on the presentation from the last meeting. Comments are exclusive to the previous topic. Time has been reserved at the end of the meeting for non-agendized topics.

Ms. Mallon said a full conceptual alignment is being presented today and she wants to ensure enough time for questions to be asked. At the last meeting, the focus was on the maintenance shafts and retrieval shafts; it was on the heels of talking about the launch shafts. The tunnel alignments along both corridors are divided into four drives, which means there would be four TBMs tunneling about an average of 10 miles. That would be a 40-mile length on both proposed corridors. It was discussed there would be a maintenance shaft every four to five miles along the tunnel drive to allow for preventative maintenance on the machine. Retrieval

shafts at end of the drives will be used to pull the TBM out of the ground. Shaft sites are much smaller than the previously discussed launch shafts site at about five to 10 acres instead of 100 acres. At the last meeting, we also reviewed layouts and truck traffic, and also reviewed the process for screening and selecting facilities.

Ms. Mallon asked if there were any questions or comments on maintenance or retrieval shafts and noted that conversations that stray off-topic might be cut off.

Mr. Hsia said he visited an active launch shaft for a tunneling project along with three DCA staff. The site was in Santa Clara [editor's note: the site was actually located in Redwood City] and the project was for purposes of sewage. The launch shaft site sits on 4.5 acres and is tunneling for 3 + miles. Features that were noticed included the perimeter surrounded by a silt fence to prevent any water from breaching the construction site. There was muck management happening on the site. Trucks were entering and leaving site travelling to Tracy every day to deliver muck.

The noisiest equipment observed at the site was the water cooler and the ventilation. The sheet piling which was supposed to be silent, was not observed during visit. It had already been done when prior to the visit. There was an escape route for an endangered mouse, when they get to Bair Island. The tour also featured a visit to the tip of the TBM. When TBM tunnels, sound is not heard on surface.

Ms. Mallon asked if the tour was helpful in reference to the proposed project.

Ms. Hsia said the site he visited might not be proportional to the proposed project. Ms. Mallon said a larger site in Los Angeles could be visited but it is a longer trip. This site visit was the closest one. If folks would be interested in a tour at the Los Angeles site, please indicate your interest in an email.

Mr. Hardesty asked if the project sites will be seen from the freeway. Are the sites going to be recovered afterwards and not be an eye sore? What will shaft sites look like at end of project?

Ms. Mallon said that end use will be a topic for a future meeting. It may have to do with dual benefits that may be incorporated in the project. DCA plans to solicit SEC feedback. The goal is to leave the project as discreet and small as possible.

Mr. Hardesty asked what percentage of sites will be recovered. Ms. Mallon said this will be good discussion for a future meeting; to figure out what sites will look like at the end of construction.

Ms. Martinez asked if there are any further questions on this topic. She mentioned to the committee that this is the point where they'd like to gather as much information as possible as the process is moved forward.

Ms. Swenson said landowners have asked when DCA would contact them and by what process will land be taken. It didn't seem like even 3% of the people she has spoken to would willingly give up prime farmland for the project. When will landowners be notified that their properties are the targets and by what means does DCA intend to take their land?

Ms. Buckman said DWR sent all landowners within corridors (over 14,000) were sent scoping notices that asked them to weigh in during scoping . The process for real estate and ROW follows decisions about the project, so it is far away and will be a process undertaken by DWR.

Ms. Swenson asked what landowners should do if they didn't receive a scoping postcard. Things have been sent out that landowners never received. Ms. Buckman said landowners should please email DWR's general Delta Conveyance or scoping email address. If DWR receives a note sent to either address, DWR will respond and ensure the landowner is added to the mailing list.

Ms. Martinez asked if any other technical elements need discussion. A lot of information was shared at the last meeting. It would be appreciated to receive any sort of response or technical guidance. Members said that having a blank canvas during this exercise has been difficult, so we are trying to reverse the process and instead provide members with a conceptual layout on which they can provide feedback. The next part of the conversation should help with that.

b. Integrated Project Siting & Logistics: Central Corridor

Ms. Mallon said at the last meeting the suggestion was made to present proposed sites and then let members comment, rather than the open-ended approach. This led to today's presentation which includes conceptual sites for the necessary facilities along both the East and Central Alignments. This is what is provided in the map books distributed. The presentation and map books also include the logistics work being proposed, including road improvements, new roads in certain locations, bridges, bridge work, barge landings and rail. This is the precursor work needed to take place prior to initiating construction at the tunnel sites.

The information from today's meeting is also provided on a flash drive for each member. Proposed alignments and layout plans are provided in broad terms, but give sense of size and scale. Construction duration, logistics routes, rough truck traffic estimates are also provided. Mr. Ryan will be leading the presentation and members are encouraged to ask questions throughout the presentation. Some facilities in the South Delta will be shown for the first time and will be discussed in more detail at next meeting, but the whole system is being presented for this meeting so members can think holistically.

Mr. Ryan reminded members of the disclaimer that explains this information may change as the engineering team works with the environmental team. The presentation will first review the Central Corridor site plans, starting from the north and going south. The information shown is based on a 6,000cfs flow capacity, with two intakes that are 3,000cfs each. Site plans were shown for Intakes 2 and 3 and for Intakes 3 and 5. As a reminder, theses intake sites were selected because of their characteristics relative to the river, the developed community, and their proximity to other sites. Intake 2 is the shallowest and Intake 3 is the deepest. When the intake structures are actually designed, Intake 2 will be the longest and Intake 3 would be the shortest for the vertical plate screen option. The dashed blue line shows the tunnel between the intakes. Regarding access to the intake sites, the idea is to put a support site/park-and-ride lot at the I-5 interchange off of Hood Franklin Road for delivery consolidation, employee parking and a temporary batch plant. The employees would be bused from this lot to the intakes. There would also be trucks that travel between the batch plant and the intakes. Hood Franklin Road would be widened until just over the slough, and then a new haul road would be

developed at the base of the old railroad levee at the back of the fields up to each intake site. The concept is to alleviate traffic on Hood Franklin Road. Details have not yet been developed about whether there would be dedicated truck lanes on Hood Franklin Road, but the new haul roads would just be for construction traffic. Those roads could become permanent roads that are used for sediment removal after the project is constructed.

Because Intakes 2 & 3 result in a longer tunnel, an extra maintenance shaft is needed between the intakes and the Launch Shaft site. This maintenance shaft is shown placed at the edge of the Stone Lakes area where Lambert Road goes over. The concept is to develop a new interchange off of I-5 on Lambert Road. This interchange could also be used for the intake and tunnel support traffic. Lambert Road is currently not heavily used because there is no interchange from the freeway. Shown are the same haul roads that would allow serving the intakes and some of the facilities further south so that construction traffic would be reduced on the existing roads in the area.

Mr. Wallace asked if Hood Franklin would be widened or if a parallel haul road would be constructed. Mr. Ryan said Hood Franklin will be widened. Whether or not the new lane(s) is dedicated to construction traffic, or not, has not yet been determined. It could be a wider road for everyone that is shared.

Mr. Wallace said the Hood Franklin interchange is a clover leaf already and asked what kind of improvements are necessary to go over I-5? Mr. Ryan said it's mainly about how offramps interact with roads to make it more efficient for traffic coming out of the consolidation center (Support Site). A member of the team who is specializing in roadwork could provide more information.

Mr. Wallace said east of I-5 on Hood Franklin is a busy road because it dumps into the school right there in Franklin and may create a bottle neck going east, unless that road is also improved. Mr. Ryan said that is good feedback that the team will record.

Mr. Wallace said haul roads have a specific purpose and are usually just designed for a project. Would the proposed new haul roads be removed and reclaimed at the end of the project? Mr. Ryan said the post-construction plans for new haul roads will vary depending on feedback and other analysis throughout the process about how to remove sediment from sites. The amount of sediment trucks required will vary with conditions and have not yet been quantified. This topic will be discussed more at a future meeting once the calculations have been better refined. The thinking is to keep the haul roads that are developed in the north after construction rather than using Hwy 160. The post-construction plans for the roads further south may be different, and the plan may also vary if Intake 5 is used.

Mr. Wallace asked if the sediment trucks Mr. Ryan was referencing are the trucks that are hauling muck out of shafts during construction or trucks that are removing sediment during operations. Mr. Ryan said that he was referencing the trucks that would be needed to remove dried sediment from the sediment basins at the intake sites. The calculations on the estimated quantity of sediment that will need to be removed will be developed later in the process. DWR will first need to perform the modeling on how the project will function to determine the amount of water flowing through the intakes.

Mr. Wallace asked if there would be a lot of trucks running on the roads once the project is built. Mr. Ryan said there will be trucks that are removing sediment. The amount of trucks will likely be higher in the summer, and the number of trucks will be higher in some years than others. The river sediment load is a lot worse some years than others.

Mr. Wallace said he is just trying to make the point that once the project is done, there will still be truck traffic.

Ms. Palmer asked if the truck traffic during maintenance would be a lot less than during construction. Mr. Ryan said the discussion would be more appropriate at a future meeting when more data is available.

Mr. Gloski asked where is the launch shaft. Mr. Ryan said the launch shaft will be discussed shortly, but noted that if Intakes 2 & 3 were selected for the proposed project, Intake 3 would include a maintenance shaft and Intake 2 would include a reception shaft. The prior WaterFix project planned for the launch shafts to be at the intake sites, but that is not being considered in the new conceptual plans.

Mr. Ryan then reviewed the conceptual site plans and logistics if Intakes 3 and 5 are selected. These two intakes would have the same road coming in and the same consolidation center (Support Site) at Hood Franklin Road, except the road going north would only feed Intake 3 and then there would be roads south. The presentation slide shows more than one road, but not all roads may be used because the team is still evaluating the options.

Ms. Mallon said it would help to hear from members about the Support Site being considered. The Support Site would contain all employee parking in order to prevent worker traffic to the intake sites. The idea is for employees to park there and take an electric bus to the intake sites in order to reduce traffic on the roads. Deliveries could also come to the Support Site and then timed to be delivered to the intake sites during low traffic periods. These are the ideas incorporated to reduce traffic effects, but the Support Site does create a footprint. Feedback from members in this regard would be helpful.

Mr. Wallace said there is a currently a temporary construction site at the corner of Hood Franklin and 1-5 that is possibly owned by CalTrans. Hood Franklin is a heavily travelled road and is everyone's way into Elk Grove from Courtland, Hood and all over.

Ms. Swenson said instead of prioritizing a construction lane, there should be a dedicated road for residents and for moving farm equipment. The construction traffic should be timed to be most advantageous for the people of the Delta. There should not be an assumption that the construction project has priority.

Mr. Moran asked if there could possibly be two roads to the intake sites that could be alternated. Mr. Ryan said that's the idea of having Lambert and Hood Franklin. Mr. Moran asked if there would be traffic on both roads every day, or if the truck traffic would be on one of the roads on certain days and on the other road on the other days. Mr. Ryan said various options would be considered, such as choosing the lowest traffic windows. It may be better if the route is I-5 to Lambert Road, especially if Intake 5 is selected. The traffic could also be divided by intake, if Intakes 3 & 5 are selected. Mr. Moran said he's thinking about minimizing

impact and showing there is a lighter day and a heavier day so that local folks can make a choice on which route to take.

Ms. Whaley asked if there has been investigation into extending Elk Grove Blvd. instead of using Hood Franklin Road. Mr. Ryan said an analysis was done on the existing roads, but if a road goes through Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge, it will not be considered.

Mr. Ryan introduced the slide for Glanville Tract Launch Shaft Site. A launch shaft siting analysis was conducted and this site was selected because the access at I-5 means most of the traffic can be confined to a small area adjacent to the freeway and the shaft site. There will be some impacts to Twin Cities Road, Franklin and Diersson, but the impact was much less than with some other options for moving trucks off the freeway. The main site would be for segment delivery, concrete batching, employee parking and RTM storage. The shaft site is across the freeway.

One of the big advantages of this location is the ability to make bulk deliveries by rail via the Union Pacific and a depot that would be developed. The conceptual site footprint shows the area that would be needed for all the activity that goes on at the site. As a reminder, the sites can require up to 400 acres.

Ms. Swenson asked how many acres are depicted on the presentation slide for the Glanville Launch Shaft Site footprint and how many acres are specifically for RTM storage. Will the RTM storage be on the site long term, or only during drying? When will the land used for RTM storage be relinquished from the project and allowed to go back in production, if possible? Mr. Ryan said the drive site itself is around 20 acres. Mr. Bradner said the area labeled RTM storage area is about 200 acres; the area to the south of Diersson is about 300 acres. In regards to duration, it will be based on ultimate decisions about RTM and how it could potentially be beneficially reused. Mr. Ryan said later in the presentation there will be slides regarding construction activities by year. When the shaft is active, the RTM area will also be active. What is ultimately done with the RTM will determine whether the site remains as an RTM storage area or if the RTM is moved to another area.

Mr. Gloski asked if there would be a conveyor belt going from the launch shaft to the RTM storage area. Mr. Ryan said there would be a conveyor taking materials from the launch shaft to the RTM storage area. (Note: This is now shown on the corrected drawings.)

Mr. Cosio said there is no levee on the east side of the proposed RTM storage area. It floods quite a bit and is called Franklin Pond. Is DCA going to build a levee there? The Glanville Reclamation District relies on the railroad embankment as a levee, even though it leaks when the water comes up. Mr. Bradner said DCA is working to understand the issue and understands that it's a complex mechanism. There's not an upstream levee to block the flow and it flanks around the top of the Cosumnes River levees. At this stage, DCA is working on a perimeter berm to ensure RTM is contained and isn't able to travel during a flood. Details are still being worked out and DCA intends to be coordinating with the Reclamation District (RD) and any others who have interest.

Mr. Wallace asked how high the RTM storage elevation and the perimeter berm would be, because the airport there would have Part 77 airport space restrictions for penetration. Mr.

Bradner said the perimeter levees themselves would probably be at most 10 feet tall, but the height of RTM storage depends on the tunnel size. The height of stockpiles isn't yet known but estimates could be as high as 20 feet for maximum production and if RTM was contained in the storage area. The project will need to account for FAA restrictions on take-offs, landings, orientations, etc.

Mr. Ryan said moving south from the Glanville Tract Launch Shaft Site there is a maintenance shaft shown at New Hope Tract. As a reminder, TBM comes in at a maintenance shaft, gets tested, parts are replaced as necessary and maintenance is performed that requires access to the face of the TBM. Maintenance shafts are an important feature of the project to ensure proper care of the TBM's as they continue on their long drives. Maintenance shafts are relatively small sites and the acreage depends on their elevation. The largest maintenance shaft is about twenty acres, but most maintenance shaft sites are approximately 10-15 acres. If the Central Corridor is selected, improvements would be needed to Walnut Grove Road because it would be used for accessing New Hope Tract Maintenance Shaft and for getting to the next shaft on Staten Island. There would also be road improvements to Vail Road and Lauffer Rd, and a new haul road would be needed at the very end to get to the site.

Mr. Hsia asked why West Walnut Grove Road would need to be extended from the railroad to Mokelumne River. Mr. Ryan said the road would be extended because it would provide access to the next shaft, which is on Staten Island and will be discussed momentarily.

Mr. Ryan said going south from the New Hope Tract Maintenance Shaft, the next site would be the Staten Island Maintenance Shaft Site. This site would be accessed using Walnut Grove Road and the existing bridge to Staten Island Road. Developing maintenance shafts generates a relatively low number of trucks for which the existing bridge is expected to be suitable. Road improvements would consist of pavement overlays all the way down to Staten Island Road. The portions of Staten Island Road that are dirt will be paved to minimize dust generation.

The next stop going south is the Bouldin Island Launch Shaft Site, which is a fairly big complex. As was mentioned in the siting studies, the goal is to have two modes of transport to all launch sites. Bouldin Island has been evaluated quite a bit and this launch shaft site was chosen mainly because of the geotechnical issues on Bouldin Island. A new barge landing would be built in Potato Slough where some of the segments and bulk deliveries will come by barge. It is close to the San Joaquin Deep Water Ship Channel, which is already an industrial ship channel. A new interchange would be built on Hwy 12 to minimize disruption of trucks trying to get off Hwy 12 onto the island. There would be improvements to bridge over Little Potato Slough and road-widening and surface improvements all the way back to the freeway, including some work on the off-ramps on Hwy 12 at the freeway.

Mr. Bradner said DCA is currently determining improvements to existing levees on the launch shaft sites. Construction will be taking place at these sites for several years and it does seem appropriate to look at improving those existing levees as a risk-reduction measure. This is being considered rather than the ring levee concept.

Ms. Swenson asked if DCA is only considering levee work for Bouldin, or also for levees across from them. It's an interconnected system and when one area is improved but another isn't, that area can be put at risk. Mr. Bradner said risk transfer will be part of the analysis and

evaluation moving forward. At the moment, the effort is to understand the conditions of the Bouldin Island levees and evaluating the potential impact on the tunnel drive site.

Ms. Swenson asked how many acres is the Staten Island Maintenance Shaft. Mr. Ryan said all of the maintenance shafts are in the 10 to 20-acre range, and most are 10 to 15 acres.

Ms. Swenson asked how many acres of the Bouldin Island Launch Shaft Site would be used for RTM storage. Mr. Bradner said the site is about 250 acres or so.

Ms. Swenson asked if DCA is working with the Reclamation Districts to ensure there is great data, experience and all the goodness that Reclamation Districts can bring. Mr. Bradner said the DCA is working with Reclamation Districts.

Mr. Ryan said moving south from Bouldin Island is the Mandeville Maintenance Shaft Site. The presentation slide shown is an overview that shows the Mandeville Maintenance Shaft and the Bacon Island Reception Shaft. These islands are relatively hard to access, so this slide shows the whole system for how these sites would be accessed. Coming up from Hwy 4, there would be a new bridge over the EBMUD Mokelumne Aqueduct and the railroad. There would be improvements to the road along the railroad. A new bridge would be built to get onto Bacon Island because the current bridge and configuration would not be sufficient for the traffic. To avoid driving on the levee roads, a new road would be developed on the interior of Bacon Island with access to the reception shaft, and then continuing north to a new bridge onto Mandeville Island. There would be a road through Mandeville Island up to the maintenance shaft site. Ms. Mallon noted that the slide has a mistake and should say Mandeville Island Maintenance Shaft instead of Mandeville Island Reception Shaft.

Mr. Moran asked if the proposed new barge site on Bouldin Island would be used to transport RTM once it is tested, dried, etc. Mr. Ryan said it hasn't been determined yet what the RTM will be used for, but barges could potentially be used to transport RTM from this area. Barge would be the best way to get RTM off of this island.

Mr. Hsia asked what is the sequence of the construction of all the shafts. Mr. Ryan said he will be discussing construction sequencing in detail later in the meeting.

Mr. Hardesty asked if the new bridges constructed for the project would be permanent or temporary. Mr. Ryan said the idea would be for the bridges to be permanent, but if there was opposition to that idea it could be discussed further. However, DWR will most likely need to be able to access these shafts. There will need to be something left, but it is not yet known how robust that access needs to be.

Mr. Gloski asked if the proposed new barge landing on Bouldin Island is on the south side of the island because it is more barge accessible than the north side. It would be closer to Hwy 12 if it was on the north side. Mr. Ryan said the preference would be to have the barge landing closer to the shaft than closer to Hwy 12. Mr. Bradner said having access from the barge site to the shaft would help avoid the use of Hwy 12 because the barge site would be used for major material loading and off-loading. DCA wants to avoid crossing Hwy 12. Mr. Ryan said barging up the Mokelumne River is much more challenging as well and would be more disruptive to the people in the marina.

Mr. Gloski said one thing to consider about the location of the proposed new barge site is that the area is popular for weekend boaters. The series of little islands in that area is referred to as "the bedrooms" and there will be a lot of boats out there every weekend. When it comes time to site the barge landing, it will be important to visit the site and perhaps talk to some of the people who recreate in that area. Ms. Mallon asked if a weekend barging restriction would be helpful, and Mr. Gloski said yes. Ms. Mallon asked how the area looks during weekdays in the summer. Mr. Gloski said it depends on whether the Tiburon Yacht Club is there or not.

Mr. Robertson said the bedrooms are a cornerstone event for Delta boaters. The area gets packed frequently, and on long weekends especially. North Delta people and Bay Area visitors visit this area and it gets a lot of use.

Mr. Gloski said there are also some commercial interests there, as many visitors head to the area restaurants in the morning. Because the location is very natural, there could be some aesthetics considerations in placing a barge landing there.

Ms. Mallon asked if this site was considered for Reclamation Districts to pick up access material to use for their own needs, would RD's want to conduct those pick-ups on weekdays? Mr. Cosio said yes.

Mr. Hsia said when barges move through Walnut Grove, the bridges have to open up, which holds up traffic on the local roads. Barges are very disruptive. Mr. Ryan said the logistics routes have been planned carefully concerning barges and have intentionally avoided barge routes that cross bridges. Right now, there are only two areas where barging is being considered.

Mr. Gloski said DCA might consider getting the barge landing right out on the San Joaquin River, west of where it is currently shown on the conceptual site plan map. Ms. Buckman said DWR is considering the need to incorporate habitat mitigation efforts as part of the project and doing that close to an area where RTM is located would be helpful as part of that mitigation. The idea was to leave that corner on the San Joaquin River open because it would be suitable for habitat restoration. This is part of the reason it was avoided for a barge landing.

Mr. Gloski said there is currently a lot of habitat restoration going on in Franks Tract. Ms. Buckman said separate mitigation efforts will be needed for the expected impacts of the Delta Conveyance project. Other ongoing habitat restoration efforts do not count towards the additional mitigation that will be required for this project.

Mr. Gloski said that most people will associate the two since the projects will be occurring in a parallel manner.

Mr. Swenson said Delta bridges are part of the Delta's appeal. How is the historic value of a bridge retained if a bridge is upgraded to a modern level? Who is involved in the process of determining which bridge will receive an update and how the upgrade will be done? Will DCA invite stakeholders from the community to have input? Ms. Buckman said it will be evaluated in the CEQA process.

Mr. Wallace asked if the aggressive amount of infrastructure on Bouldin Island has anything to do with who owns the island. Ms. Mallon said Bouldin Island was selected because of the constraints around drive lengths. With 10 to 15-mile drive lengths and trying to avoid Staten Island for a major launch site, Bouldin becomes the only option with major road and barge access. Bouldin Island is right along Hwy 12 and the San Joaquin River Deep Water Ship Channel. When DCA was looking at the criteria for launch shafts, which are the major centers for construction of the tunnel project, Bouldin Island had some features that made it suitable. There isn't another island in the Central Delta alignment that has those features. Mr. Ryan added that Venice Island, immediately to the south of Bouldin, is completely inaccessible.

Mr. Ryan showed a close up of the Mandeville Maintenance Shaft Site and then a close up of the Bacon Island Reception Shaft Site. The existing bridge for Bacon Island would be kept open while a new bridge is built. As a reminder, all of this information is still conceptual and more detail and definition is still being developed.

Mr. Gloski asked if new bridges would be built to certain height specifications in consideration of boaters. There will be an advantage if boaters are not waiting for bridges. Mr. Ryan said new bridges will be built high enough for boaters to pass under. Ms. Mallon noted that construction trucks will also not want to wait for bridges to lower in order to get across.

Mr. Ryan showed the last maintenance shaft on the Central Corridor, the Byron Tract Maintenance Shaft Site. It is adjacent to Discovery Bay. Since it is a maintenance shaft, it is not a major worksite. As a reminder, this is where the TBM will be serviced as it approaches. A new road is depicted coming up from Hwy 4. Because the frequency of traffic is less in this area, there isn't a sophisticated interchange needed, but there will probably be some turn pockets. Please note that the slide mistakenly labeled the road south of Hwy 4 as a New Haul Road, but it should have actually labeled it as a New Access Road, as it will be used to access the Southern Complex.

Mr. Ryan then showed the conceptual site plan for the Southern Forebay Facilities, which Ms. Mallon mentioned will be discussed in detail at the next meeting. This planning work for this is a little more developed, so some nice graphics will be available for the next meeting. The tunnel terminates at the Pump Station at the north end of the Southern Forebay. The Southern Forebay Site was selected through analysis of sites in the area and will be discussed in greater detail at the next meeting. The tunnels terminate in a shaft that can overflow under certain conditions, but normally they would feed into the pump station, and the pump station would lift the flow into the reservoir and then through a series of conveyance features that feed the state pumps. There is a Launch Shaft Site depicted, and the overall site is large in order to accommodate the Forebay, which is approximately 750 acres of water surface. The site would also contain RTM and peat storage areas. DCA intends to use RTM to build the forebay embankments. RTM processing and managing will generally be conducted inside the footprint of the reservoir. There will also be segment storage to feed the tunnel drive. A similar area will be included in the southern end of the forebay site to feed the southern tunnel drive. There would be a double tunnel between the Southern Launch Shafts and South Delta Conveyance Facilities because the project's capacity is to deliver to water to the Southern Forebay, and then match the capacity of the state pumps, which is about 10,500cfs.

Mr. Ryan said there is a lot going on in this area. The intent is to extend rail from the existing UP line to bring RTM from the north since not enough will be generated from the launch shaft in this area. RTM will be picked up from the railroad near Glanville and brought to the Southern Forebay Facilities Site. Because of the railway configuration and how it crosses Byron Highway and State's consideration of developing Hwy 239, DCA is consolidating development or the area with those plans to accommodate the railroad. The slide depicts the railroad coming up into the site and there are several sidings for loading and unloading segments and RTM. Byron Hwy would be re-routed, and the old highway bed would be used as an access road to the site, coming off the existing highway, especially early in the project. A bridge would be needed to clear the railroad. A new access road would be developed in a fairly unpopulated area to connect the facilities to the existing Banks Channel, and there are two control structure there, one for the new project, and one to allow both the new and existing project to be operated together.

Ms. Swenson asked if there are historic railroads, would DCA build a parallel railroad? If RTM can't be reused, what would DCA do with the RTM and how would the project supplement the materials needed for the project? Is there any plan to upgrade the aqueduct that connects with the project since it is currently subsiding, is at a very heavy earthquake risk and is losing 30% of its water because it is not enclosed? Is there any plan for this project to correct that so we aren't building a multi-million dollar plumbing system and then putting it in a sieve?

Mr. Ryan said to his knowledge the conceptual plans are not adjacent to any historic railroads and clarified that the project would be off to the side of the railroad beds along Stone Lake rather than on them. The railroad in the Southern Forebay area is not a historic railroad.

Mr. Ryan said the aqueduct downstream is a separate state action. Ms. Buckman said the state is looking at infrastructure throughout the State Water Project and identifying necessary improvements.

Regarding Ms. Swenson's questions about RTM, Mr. Ryan reminded members that the team that studied the ITR did not study the RTM to the extent that it has been studied by the team working on the project. Mr. Bradner said there was follow-up presentation to the DCA board in which the ITR representative leading the effort said that the RTM could potentially be used for the purposes proposed. The ITR was referring to structural fill, but in follow-up conversations about what was intended for the project, the ITR representative was starting to contemplate that it could potentially be reused. From a geotechnical perspective, DCA is confident that the material meets specifications. Further evaluation will be conducted to determine if RTM does in fact meet all the requirements for embankment fill, but based on the work that has been performed to date, it does appear to meet all the geotechnical requirements. There is some additional study going on for metals content and other effects of the conditioners that will be used in the tunneling operation to ensure that it is truly appropriate, but indications are that the tunnel material will be reusable. The team is heading in that direction but will keep vetting it out.

Ms. Swenson asked if there would be a third-party verification of RTM's usability so the public knows it's not DWR's sole decision and that it's a decision based on the realities of science and research. Ms. Mallon said there will be documents to support the conclusions when the geotechnical work is completed.

Mr. Merlo said there is strong Spanish and Anglo evidence from the early 19th century that the area portrayed on the slide as the spoils area near the Southern Forebay was once heavily populated with Delta Yokuts. What type of archeological studies will take place in this area? Ms. Buckman those studies will take place primarily through the CEQA process. DWR is conducting AB 52 consultation as well as consulting under DWR's tribal policies with tribes that may not be listed under AB 52. There is an extensive outreach process to obtain as much information as possible.

Mr. Robertson asked if the project's workdays would be five days with double shifts. Will barges or other commercial vehicles be moved on the weekends? Ms. Mallon said DCA can make those restrictions on construction barges; these are the types of comments needed from SEC members. Mr. Robertson asked for weekend barging restrictions to be considered.

Ms. Mallon clarified that tunneling is planned for five days per week, but there is maintenance planned on Saturdays, so it would be a very light day with no tunnel boring. No work is currently planned for Sundays.

Mr. Gloski said he won't be able to attend the next meeting when the Southern Delta facilities are discussed in detail. There is currently a problem with algae in the South Delta during the summer. Could the project perhaps help address the bad water and algae, either through its design or through mitigation efforts, by taking some of the water and flushing it back into the Delta if there is a challenge there? Ms. Buckman said the issue can be considered when mitigation is discussed, but the process is not there yet.

Mr. Wallace asked if the Southern Forebay is an above ground facility, and if so, how tall is the levee that will create the forebay? Mr. Bradner said the top elevation currently in consideration is 28 ft. For comparison, Clifton Court has a reservoir rim of about 15 ft. In terms of natural ground surfaces in that area, they range from a minimum of about -8 along the eastern side up to 13 on the embankment on the western side of the Forebay.

Mr. Wallace asked if the Forebay would be subject to the Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) codes. Mr. Bradner said the Southern Forebay would be a DSOD jurisdictional facility.

Mr. Wirth asked to discuss the slide with Intakes 2 and 3 in the area near Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge, which is one of the most threatened wildlife refuges in the country. Part of it is constrained by urban development to the east and north. Putting in the haul roads as currently configured would add impacts to the west and south, further threatening the area for sensitive species. On the Staten Island Maintenance Shaft map, a maintenance shaft is depicted in a pinch point to the east of Staten Island Road. That area has been a very successful roost site for the Greater Sandhill Crane over a great number of years. Sandhill Cranes require very long sight lines in order to consider using a roost site. It would be much better to find a spot for the maintenance shaft where the island is a lot wider. Keeping it in the place it is shown on the map would mean it is no longer available for a roost site. A lot of the cranes use Tyler Island because it is a very good placement for a roosting pond. Ms. Mallon asked Mr. Wirth where on the map would be a great spot for the maintenance shaft. Placement of maintenance shafts is pretty flexible. Mr. Wirth said it would be better if it were placed further south because the island is wider further south, but then it would not be on the tunnel as depicted in the map. Ms. Mallon

said the tunnel would be moved to that shaft. Mr. Ryan said placing the maintenance shaft at the widest part of the island would be a little too close to the drive shaft, but the team can definitely look at it. Ms. Mallon asked if it would help to get further off the road. The intent was to go along the corridor of the road to minimize adding new roads, but if adding a new haul road would help access a better spot, it could definitely be considered. This is one reason Mr. Wirth is on the committee; to help with siting facilities in light of the concerns of terrestrial species. Mr. Wirth said he can discuss it further. Further south the island is wider, significantly better and won't have as much impact on the roost sites long term. The northern end of the island tends to be a flood zone to create roost sites because it is so close to Tyler Island, a good foraging area for the cranes. It should be discussed in greater detail.

Ms. Swenson asked what kind of studies have been done to ensure that the noise and vibrations from tunnel boring won't affect the cranes? How do we know that the cranes will stay? Mr. Wirth said there were studies performed in the last project. Ms. Swenson said she'd request that this be studied because the cranes are a highlight of the Delta. Ms. Buckman said this will be studied in CEQA but members are encouraged to submit scoping comments requesting specific analyses.

Mr. Tarango said that he appreciates Mr. Merlo's comments about the Yokuts and Mr. Wirth's concerns for the cranes. It is disturbing to see that the project would consider other options on behalf of the cranes when tribes have already expressed that the intake locations affect sacred, religious sites. Why are the intakes not being moved for tribal people? All three intake sites are highly sensitive. Tribes are still waiting for responses to their AB 52 consultation requests. While there is appreciation for being part of the process by serving on the SEC, it is hard to participate when it seems DCA is more in tune with boating and fishing concerns than with the concerns of indigenous people. The Miwok and Nisenan people still consider themselves stewards of the Delta along with the other members of the SEC. Tribes hope to hear more from DWR about the AB 52 consultation. It hurts to sit here when it seems we are quick to jump on nature, but not for tribes. A road would not be placed through Stone Lakes because it is protected, so why isn't the same respect given to my ancestors? Hopefully there is an effort to move faster to respond to tribes who are asking for that information.

Ms. Tayaba said that tribes are still waiting for their AB 52 consultation. There are huge concerns with where the intakes are going and with the new roads. Those areas are all very important issues that tribes are waiting to discuss and adjust in their meetings with DWR. This project is painful to watch. The cranes mean a lot to native people. Why is a 40-mile tunnel being planned through the biggest estuary on the west coast? The locations of the intakes are so sensitive to tribes, that it is unclear why they are even an option. The project wouldn't be built through someone else's cemetery. Besides the pipelines, there are other factors. Why haven't these factors been considered? The Northern tribes have been having this fight. We need our salmon back. No one is talking about salmon or the animals. Native peoples have a direct relationship with the animals, land and water. Tribes are waiting for their meetings and have a lot of concerns.

Mr. Ryan said in order to construct the site plans as shown for the Central Corridor, there is a series of construction projects. The slide showing all these projects also shows the tunnel as a dashed blue line, but as a reminder, the tunnel will be 150 feet underground and will not be seen on the surface. Ms. Mallon said the next part of the presentation will show all the projects

from the previous slides in one integrated map. Mr. Ryan will review the 16-year construction period to show where the active construction sites are year by year. Feedback from members at the last meeting expressed the desire to understand holistically what's going on throughout the Delta year-to-year. Year by year the projects will be displayed when they are being constructed, and as they are completed, they will disappear from the map. Obviously, logistics will be displayed early and then will not be displayed once those logistics projects are completed and the larger feature sites will start to appear on the map. The estimated volume of truck traffic in the construction areas will also be shown, with light yellow representing light construction traffic and dark yellow and orange representing heavier traffic. The goal was to find a user-friendly way of describing the construction schedule year-to-year so members can track how long a particular site is in construction from the time that it is displayed to the time it is not. The top of the slide shows the year of construction. There shouldn't be anything on these drawings that you didn't see in the previous slides in terms of projects that are needed to complete the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. Mr. Ryan added that the slides show the construction on the roads, but not the use of the roads.

Mr. Ryan said year one would start with some of the early work needed to get access to the sites such as at the intakes area near Hood Franklin Rd., the main drive site at the Glanville Launch Shaft Site, the Bouldin Island facilities, and some of the stuff to rearrange traffic and get access in the South Delta. All of that traffic is relatively light. They are sophisticated projects so the duration is somewhat lengthy, so the traffic is spread out over the whole year.

In the second year, the development of some of the roads- such as Hood Franklin Road- would be completed, so they are no longer showing on the slide, but other projects would begin, such as the barge landing and the rail spurs. The traffic for these projects will create similar traffic loads because they are longer term projects.

In year three, launch shaft construction begins for some of the longer drives. The Glanville Launch Shaft would be started because it is the longest drive. The bridge over the Mokelumne, Aqueducts and railroad would be started that eventually feeds the road into Bacon and Mandeville. The map depicts more construction traffic density for what seems like a smaller project, the New Hope Tract Overlays and Access Road. The concept is to minimize the length of the impact, so some of the projects are planned as "fast burns". Their construction would take less than a year, but there would be intense traffic during the several weeks it takes to complete the project.

In year 4, some of the roads are finished and work begins on some of the shafts. The southern shaft begins in this year, as does the Byron Tract Maintenance Shaft and Intake 5. Some of the roads are completed to get to maintenance and other shafts. The bridge over the railroad is still being developed in this year. The Byron Tract Maintenance Shaft Access Road and Staten Island Overlay projects show higher traffic density because they are fast burn projects.

In year 5, tunneling begins on Bouldin Island and at Glanville Tract, and the pump station is started. Intake 3 is also started. The in-water work for the intakes is being staggered. In their second year, the intakes have a fair amount of construction traffic. Some of the major launch sites also start to have a fair amount of truck traffic.

Moving into year 7, the Southern Forebay is started because RTM is being generated and needs to be transported down to that area. The shafts are beginning to appear so that the TBM can move through them. The traffic again shows that the intakes are some of the highest trafficked areas.

In year 8, the south reception shaft appears because there is a tunnel out of the Southern Forebay that moves down. What is shown is that in years 7 and 8, there are a lot of active construction sites. This is the peak of the activities.

Year 9 is similar; it is mostly adding projects in the southern Delta and a few maintenance shafts. Again, the activity is high in the major work sites.

In year 10, some of the sites are completed, to they are not displayed on the construction map. The reception sites are still there because they will eventually receive the TBM's. There will still be work at the major shaft sites, but Intake 5 is completed by year 9, and Intake 3 is still under construction.

In year 12, a number of projects fall off. The important thing to note is that as the project nears completion, there is a fair amount of work at the tunnel shafts and they are being lined, things are being moved and the sites are being demobilized.

By year 13, construction is complete except for demobilization. However, there are still three years left on the schedule. It takes a year to line and get out of the two shafts at the Glanville Tract Site.

In years 15 and 16, all the main mechanical features are shown again on the map because now the project would be commissioned. There is very light traffic during this period, but it does take a couple of years to test the system, shake out the bugs and do the warranty work. The project is completed after year 16. The schedule will be refined over time. This is the schedule that exists today and won't be the final schedule. Mr. Ryan said he would personally hope the project could be completed in less time.

Ms. Swenson asked for a post-construction map that represents the truck traffic, activity and noise that will be present during operations. Mr. Ryan said that is something the team could provide.

Mr. Gloski said it was great to see the layout of the construction and asked if it would be possible at some point to develop an overlay of the benefits such as parks and other facilities that might be developed. Ms. Mallon said DCA will be working with members soon on those benefits.

Ms. Martinez said laying the features on the map seemed like a better way to get feedback from the SEC members. This same process will be repeated for the Eastern Corridor in the next portion of the presentation, which will be after the break.

Ms. Martinez announced that the refreshments would be served by staff instead of being self-serve in order to minimize the sharing of communal serving utensils.

Ms. Palmer recessed the meeting for a break.

Ms. Palmer reconvened the meeting.

c. Integrated Project Logistics

Mr. Ryan reviewed the information for the Eastern Corridor. The information in the North Delta and the South Delta is identical for both Corridors, so those portions of the presentation can move more quickly. As can be seen on the NOP map, the Corridors start together in the north, then they split and then they come back together in the south. The main focus will be to show the differences between the two Corridors.

The information for Intakes 2 and 3 is the same for the Eastern Corridor as it was for the Central Corridor. Again, if Intakes 2 and 3 are selected, there is an additional maintenance shaft needed (Lambert Maintenance Shaft). If Intakes 3 and 5 are selected, there is one less shaft. Ms. Mallon said she is assuming it is preferable to folks in the North Delta to have one less shaft that has to be constructed and used as part of the project, and noted that members were agreeing by nodding their heads. Mr. Ryan said only difference between the Central Corridor and the Eastern Corridor from the Glanville Tract Launch Shaft Site is a slight angle difference in the tunneling. Regardless of corridor selected, there would be tunneling in both directions; toward the intakes and toward the southern facilities.

Ms. Mallon noted that compared to the last project, switching to a tunnel drive from this location eliminated the truck traffic needed to deliver liners to the intake location, thus reducing truck traffic into the Hood area. It also allows all of the RTM to be concentrated in that area where it is more easily transported. As long as the project is along the rail, there is flexibility in where that RTM can be moved. This placement is seen as a significant reduction in truck traffic coming off of the I-5 and into the inner Delta. Mr. Ryan said it also allows the intakes to be completed for the most part while the tunnel is being driven so the TBM is just pulled out at the intakes and there isn't a big tunneling operation taking place there.

Mr. Bradner said there is a mistake on the Eastern Corridor's New Hope Tract Maintenance Shaft slide. The slide shown was the configuration for the Central Corridor and mistakenly was not updated for the Eastern Corridor. For the Eastern Corridor, the maintenance shaft is positioned further to the east. The presentation will be fixed before it is posted online.

Mr. Moran asked if it was the same latitude but closer to I-5. Mr. Ryan noted it is correct on the previous slide, which shows the site encircled by a green rectangle.

Mr. Bradner said there are different preserves and areas that DCA is trying to avoid and set-back from, so this is a very constrained area as members may recall from looking at the area on the Central Corridor. For the Eastern Corridor, the New Hope Tract Maintenance Shaft was placed further to the east and a little further south than it was for the Central Corridor option. A corrected map will be provided.

Mr. Ryan proceeded to show the remaining conceptual siting for the Eastern Corridor alignment. The next location is the Brack Track Maintenance Shaft site, which would be accessed off of Woodbridge Road. A new haul road would be needed up to the maintenance

shaft. An overlay would be used for Woodbridge Road and then a new road would be built to the shaft.

Moving south, the next site is the Terminous Tract Reception Shaft. The TBM goes in at Glanville Tract and comes out at Terminous Tract Reception Shaft, which will receive a TBM from each direction. This shaft is right along Hwy 12. The road improvements needed here are different than if Bouldin Island was used. There would simply be an overlay on Hwy 12 to ensure the pavement is not damaged, but the interchange would not be improved and the road would not be widened because the truck traffic is considerably less. Reception and maintenance shaft construction traffic is almost identical. When the TBM is pulled out at the reception shaft at the end of the tunnel drive, the TBM is broken down and hauled away in trucks, so there is a bit more activity at the end, but there isn't as much traffic as in the beginning. That's why there would only be road improvements in the Eastern Corridor option, but road widening in the Central Corridor option.

Next is the King Island Maintenance Shaft, which would be accessed via Eight Mile Road. Due to the low amount of traffic, the existing bridge would be used as-is. The bridge does not appear to need improvements for the amount of traffic anticipated to the maintenance shaft, but an overlay would be used on the road to get there.

The next facility going south is the Lower Roberts Island Launch Shaft, which is another major site. Quite a bit of work has gone into the conceptual planning of this site. At this site there is the opportunity to develop road, rail and barge, but the likelihood is that only rail or barge would be selected. This will depend on conversations with the Port of Stockton and other entities. There is an existing new entrance to Rough and Ready Island in the Port of Stockton area. A new access road would be constructed along the railroad line, and then two new bridges would be built: one for rail and one for road. Once the bridges were in, rail and road would be extended to the site. The other opportunity is to have a barge landing along the Ship Channel. DCA could contemplate the use of an existing very small barge landing that is adjacent to the site, but it doesn't seem to be big enough for the project, but it might be a feature that could be incorporated. As members may recall from the siting studies that were shared at the last meeting, this area on Lower Roberts was proposed because of the proximity to logistical access. Mr. Bradner said this site's levee approach would be similar to Bouldin Island. The note on the slide is incorrect: instead of saying ring levees, it should say evaluation of existing levees. DCA is particularly looking around Turner Cut and will be coordinating further with the Reclamation District.

Ms. Swenson asked how the new access road would be connected to I-5. Mr. Ryan said the new access road shown would be served from the existing major port access road. Ms. Swenson asked if the maps could be revised to show how the roads connect to I-5. Mr. Ryan said the intent is to show an overall traffic flow. The maps show is the things that will be built as part of the project, but it is understood that SEC members would be interested in the actual direction traffic is expected to move.

Mr. Ryan said next is the Lower Jones Tract Maintenance Shaft. It is along the same area being considered for access to Bacon and Mandeville, but this is a smaller version that doesn't go as far. There would be a bridge over the Mokelumne River Aqueducts and the railroad, and the road would be improved from the bridge to the maintenance shaft.

Further south is the Victoria Island Maintenance Shaft, which is right off of Hwy 4 near the Old River Bridge. There would be a new haul road over the canal.

Next is the Southern Forebay which is identical regardless of Corridor option, except that the tunnel comes in at different angle.

Mr. Ryan noted said that members are probably able to see that the access roads are simpler and there are less bridges needed for the Eastern Corridor option as opposed to the Central Corridor option. Additionally, there is not as much peat ground in the Eastern Corridor because it is closer to edges of the Delta. From an engineering perspective, the ground is more stable. The Eastern Corridor is a longer route, but some of these aspects are trade-offs from an engineering perspective. The Eastern Corridor is easier to get to because it's closer to I-5. It is also less of an imposition on the San Joaquin River than the barge landing proposed near "the bedrooms". The impacts are shifted more towards the I-5 corridor on slightly better ground, and is further away from the Sandhill Crane.

Mr. Ryan reviewed the year-by-year schedule for the Eastern Corridor. The map displayed shows all of the projects that were presented on the previous slides. Only Intakes 3 and 5 are shown on the map, but the process would be similar if Intake 2 was selected. As a review, the main drive site will tunnel from Glanville Tract north to the intakes and south to Terminous Island. The Lower Roberts Launch Shaft site will drive north to Terminous Island, and the Southern Forebay Launch Shaft site will tunnel north to the Lower Roberts Launch Shaft Site. There is a small, shorter double tunnel at the southern end.

Year 1 of the construction and truck traffic overview is nearly identical to what was shown for the Central Corridor option, but the Hwy 12 improvements are much shorter and are less of a project because the road is just being overlaid instead of widened. However, work would be beginning at the Port of Stockton because that is the major access that would need to be developed on the Eastern Corridor. There are relatively low levels of traffic impacts in the beginning.

In year 2, the Consolidation Center/Support Site for the Glanville Launch Shaft begins. Railroad is being extended in the south and bridges are still under construction in the Stockton area. There are similar traffic levels as year 1.

In year 3, some roads are going in to the first maintenance shaft while other roads are being finished up. In this year the road is added that goes from Port of Stockton to the bridge. Some of the roads needed to relocate Byron Hwy are now finished. Again, some of the short projects have high traffic because it's just an overlay and a small road that would be completed in only a few weeks.

In year 4, shafts are starting to appear and Intake 5 is started. The two longest drives, Glanville and North Launch Shafts, are started because they need to get going early in the project. Those shafts are what drive the schedule. Some of the work required to get the North Launch site ready requires more trucks than the Glanville Launch Shaft because of the elevation and the need to move the fill around.

In year 5, some shafts and the second intake are started. The bridge is finished, so the railroad road begins and then the roads to the other shaft can start. The Pump Station and the Southern Launch Shaft are also started. Traffic starts to pick up pretty much everywhere throughout the project.

In year 6, more shafts are appearing to stay ahead of the tunneling. All the other major sites are still active. There is lots of activity at the main tunnel sites and intakes.

In year 7, there are more shafts. Now that tunneling has started, material is being generated and transported on railroad to begin constructing the Southern Forebay. The reception shaft for the Southern tunnel appears in this year as well. In this year, nearly the whole project has traffic.

In year 8, some of the nuances and shafts have been added in. A couple of the roads are completed. Traffic peaked in year 7, but it is still pretty high in the South Delta in year 8.

In year 9, the TBM will have passed some of the maintenance shafts, so they are no longer in use. The South Delta Conveyance Facilities are started near south end of Byron Hwy. Traffic is still heavy but is starting to disperse.

In year 10, a lot of shaft construction is finished. There may be a small amount of work at some of these shafts, but the construction projects to build them will be mostly finished. In year 10 there is still major work in the south as work on the pump station picks up and all the structures in the south. The traffic there is about the same level it is at intakes and the main drives.

In year 11, the facility sites are starting to drop off. Both intakes are still under construction and the construction in the south is still going. Traffic begins to lessen in this year, because the majority of traffic is from hauling dirt and concrete pours.

Year 12 is very similar to year 11 and has nearly the same traffic patterns.

In year 13, most construction projects are finished. The north drive is done and the tunnel has already been received. Work has been completed at the intakes, and the last TBM will be soon be arriving at Terminous. There will be some traffic generated for receiving the TBM.

In year 14 the shaft is finished. Traffic is relatively light, and work is finished in the south.

Commissioning begins in years 15 and traffic is light. During this time, the system will be tested and debugged. It takes quite a while to go through this process, especially for the large pumps.

In year 16 is the same as year 15, and then the project will be done.

d. SEC Clarifications on Item 4

Mr. Moran commented on the Southern Forebay Facility, although it is not within the footprint, it's reaching a pinch point with the coastal hills, migratory corridor for birds of prey, and strong cultural sites along this area, too. It's just outside of the footprint by the airport. The vernal pools are right near there, as well. Byron Hot Springs to the north; not sure what the

groundwater source is or if it would be impinged by the tunnel. There is constantly the idea of refurbishing the Byron Hot Springs Hotel & Resort.

Mr. Wallace noted relative years are reflected in the schedule. In a perfect world, what's the start date for construction year 1? When will construction on the project be started?

Ms. Buckman said they are looking at permitting by end of 2022, but there is a period between that and when construction starts that would be about three to five years. There is not a timeline identified for that yet. Ms. Buckman said she is nervous putting dates to it because there are still so many unknowns.

Ms. Mallon said the predecessor to beginning construction is getting the CEQA analysis completed, obtaining approval from the Delta Stewardship Council and getting change in point of diversion approvals. Then it would be some mitigation projects that need to take place before construction can start. Land acquisition can drag on in certain areas; Army Corps permits for intakes would also require mitigation. It is difficult to predict a start time.

Mr. Wallace said his prediction is sometime in the way, way future.

Mr. Merlo said the presentation underscored that the project is going to make a lot of people very mad in this area. Pretty much every demographic or cultural community is going to have a lot to say about this project. Whether you go through the center of the Delta, you're dealing with a lot of environmental impacts to ecosystems or along the sides of the Delta where you'd impact a lot of people in Stockton. What types of goodwill campaigns are you considering? Anybody in Stockton that looked at this would be very irritated because it's going to have a lot of impacts on us.

Ms. Mallon said as DCA works with the SEC and continues in this process, some upcoming meetings will look at dual-purpose for these facilities, leaving excess material for reclamation districts and help with levee maintenance. There is potential for creating some recreational spots (boating community is looking for more docking locations); there is a possibility of leaving the rail depot behind to benefit movement of agricultural goods; also, the environmental mitigation that DWR will propose as part of the project.

Ms. Buckman said mitigation work has not been done yet. There needs to be a project first to analyze potential impacts, then try to mitigate those impacts to reduce or avoid them. It's coming but we're not there yet.

Mr. Cosio asked what's the estimated cubic yards needed for the new forebay levees? What will go along the pipeline itself at the surface? Will those properties be impacted at all? Mr. Bradner said about 7 million cubic yards is required for the forebay and total expected is about 10 million cubic yards. Ms. Mallon clarified that this means 3 to 4 million cubic yards in excess.

Mr. Ryan said in between shafts, people who live along that alignment, other than ROW issues, probably wouldn't know they're there, unless an emergency were to happen. The whole idea of placing these maintenance shafts is to help minimize the chances of having those kinds of problems. Above the tunnel, shouldn't know it's down there.

Mr. Cosio said the last plan included dewatering along pipeline. Is that going to happen this time?

Mr. Ryan responded only what's necessary to build the actual shafts. Most of it gets built by D-walls which would result in minimal dewatering to build those sites.

Ms. Swenson said this project amazes her every meeting. She is shocked that for something that won't come online until 2043, they are proposing placing a financial burden on children for a benefit so far in the future. Thinking about the advancement of technology, in the 23 years between now and project completion, what all will come to light? DWR is being short-sighted and placing huge debt based on some guesses and processes that not everyone agrees on. Clearly, it will be destructive to Delta, to the multi-generational families and to the reclamation districts. She doesn't believe there is the right to place that financial burden on the children of California for their forever future. We read the technical report and the price tag keeps jumping. This debt is going to destroy historical lands, hurt Native Americans and so many people in California with such an extreme price tag based upon assumptions and outdated technology. Please think about the impact. Many people don't understand that the price of money gets more and more expensive as time goes on.

Ms. Martinez reminded that the scope of this meeting is engineering.

Mr. Moran said as far as the mitigation and goodwill effort, these things go in a sequence. Is there a way we can make that sequence public? That way folks can see there is that mitigation coming down the line and there could be some public benefit coming down the line. DCA could be talking to county's Habitat Conservancy Plans and other jurisdictions that might be eager to look at mitigation funding and projects where this takes place and have that discussion up front.

Ms. Mallon commented that she does not disagree.

Mr. Robertson said he's been talking about recreation, specifically bigger boats and other things on the Delta, but also wants to discuss foot recreation that happens on the Delta, which is huge. This includes family hiking, parks, shore fishing and non-powered crafts. We recognize and embrace this community. They need specific things, so when goodwill projects are discussed, DCA should keep those kinds of projects in mind. They're not expensive but the impact really goes a long way for those people.

Ms. Martinez reminded that we'll be rolling into the roundtable discussion and encouraged asking for clarification on the topic if necessary. Following that will be the discussion about tours.

Ms. Mallon said before we move on to tours, she would like to clarify some things and ask some questions to committee members.

Mr. Gloski commented that the construction sequence provided at this meeting was great. If it's possible to overlay the tunnel being built with a highlighted section, that would be interesting to see. Mr. Ryan said that was the goal, but it was too late with timing.

Mr. Gloski said it sounded like Mr. Ryan mentioned the Eastern Corridor alignment would be easier to engineer, yet the schedule looks like it's the same number of years for construction regardless of corridor. Is it the cost the same in each corridor? Does the "easiness" have anything to do with time and money?

Mr. Ryan said he cannot yet comment on cost because there is no cost estimate at this time and cost is not part of the CEQA process. Some drives are a little bit longer on the Eastern Corridor, but they can be scheduled in the same amount of time. The sequence shows a little more going on in year 14 in the Eastern Corridor than there was on Central.

Ms. Mallon said the schedule is driven by the longest drive with corresponding logistics and TBM removal. The longest drive on the Eastern Corridor is slightly longer than the longest drive on the Central Corridor which makes the overall schedule just slightly longer on the Eastern. Some of the logistics projects happen to be a bit easier on the Eastern because it's closer to I-5.

Mr. Hsia asked if it takes longer to build the Eastern alignment, is there any other reason not to go for the Eastern alignment?

Mr. Ryan said at this point in time, he's not judging the alignments. That is for the CEQA process to do. DCA will evaluate them both equally and let environmental analysis determine the better choice.

Mr. Cosio said the recent NOP described the finished product as a tunnel dual conveyance. Will the DCA work on timing and the improvements needed for levee stabilization along the pathway? Ms. Buckman responded that there are other programs that DWR can consider for Delta improvements.

Mr. Cosio commented that he is concerned how that will fit into the timing. Ms. Buckman said she is not sure, but she will follow up.

Ms. Giacoma said there was the allusion to using spoils to improve the ability to carry on agriculture in area, as a by-product of this project to make improvements in the Delta, but how can agriculture carry on when water is diverted out of the Delta? Species have suffered from over drafting of water. Now you're going to put three more separate intakes in addition to the through Delta water removal, how will you support species and agriculture when so much water is being removed. Mr. Ryan said this will be analyzed in detail by CEQA in the EIR. There are tradeoffs in where the water moves and where it comes out. Essentially, it's the same water on one side or the other. Ms. Buckman said this is a big part of the CEQA analysis, but the idea is to divert at high flow times to reduce effects on downstream species.

Ms. Martinez encouraged comments from the committee, especially if we haven't yet heard from you.

Mr. Hardesty said today's conversation clearly points out that the interests in Solano aren't necessarily going to be quite as acute as those along the alignments. However, the discussion did cover the impacts that might be occasioned by mitigations. To be clear, the Solano County region, particularly the North Delta region, and the Yolo Bypass are bearing an unusually heavy burden for supporting diversions to the State Water Project (SWP). This will be one of the

major issues that needs to be addressed with Solano County users. There are at least seven ongoing projects that potentially meet SWP obligations, for which there is no necessary benefit to Solano County. It has an impact on the agricultural community that has not been well discussed, nor addressed by the state.

Ms. Swenson commented she was expecting to see impacts on properties across from the intakes. Would like to see some more detail about what will happen to the levees, the homes, and the folks that are directly across from intakes. Can those levees be armored? Do homes need to be set back? Which properties could potentially be in that footprint of impact directly across from the intakes?

Ms. Mallon said one of the future topics, which is contingent upon levee studies, is to talk more thoroughly about how the existing levees will be addressed as part of the construction of this project. Some of the questions we will address stem from Gil's testimony. The plan is to bring that here so it's clearly understood. Some levee projects that we think may be necessary for this project haven't been shown yet, as we're not there yet, but we will be.

Mr. Wirth said his understanding is there is some flexibility in terms of the placement of the maintenance and the reception shafts, how would you bracket those on the map, in terms of the wiggle room north to south? Mr. Ryan responded that generally as long as shafts can stay within 5-ish miles of on another along the drive, that ensures the health of the TBM. Looking for sites that are not next to homes, refuges, preserves, etc. starts to focus you into certain areas; the options are limited due to those constraints. That is the challenge. Ms. Mallon said she'd look at placing maintenance shafts maybe every 4-5.5 miles. If you go 4 miles, an additional shaft may be needed, and it gets a bit iterative. That's the kind of wiggle room that DCA has been working into its analysis. Mr. Ryan mentioned the shafts don't have to be completely in a straight line. Mr. Bradner added that two weeks prior, the team presented figures to show configurations. On those maps, you can see which areas are excluded due to constraints. Those maps that were provided to members give a sense of how much flexibility is on those sites.

Ms. Mallon asked if anyone had any thoughts regarding the barge landing location on Deep Water Ship Channel on the Eastern Alignment. That is a central hub for construction, so there will be the need to move a lot of goods and materials there. Are there any comments on ideas of barges there vs. extending rail in that area?

Mr. Moran asked where the barges are coming from and where are they going to. If you're so close to rail, why would you have barges?

Ms. Mallon responded that it's likely one or the other that would be used to relieve truck trips. One of the advantages of barges is that there will be excess material generated there, and that could turn into an area where the material could easily be swung around the Delta using barges. One of the advantages of rail is the close proximity to Stockton for wheeling materials. Stockton has the capacity for concrete and liner manufacturers. A lot of these ideas are about removing tremendous amounts of traffic from the roads. Where we put the launch sites, we'd like that to also coincide with places where that material could either be wheeled around easily or used in that location.

Mr. Robertson said one of the hassles with barges is bridges. Delta bridges are extremely old. Is anyone tracking up and down time? Barges won't fit underneath; they'd have to open them up which screws up traffic on water and on land. For that reason, the preference is to use rail. We're going to have a bridge going out for about four months.

Ms. Mallon asked if there is bridge going up and down there on the Deep Water Ship Channel.

Mr. Robertson said no but when you come out of it, they do. The Sacramento Deep Water Channel has nothing until you get to the edge of Ryer Island.

Mr. Merlo asked if the RTM would go to Stockton for companies interested in using it for concrete. Ms. Mallon clarified that RTM would not be going from the Delta to Stockton, but tunnel liners from Stockton would be a major delivery to the launch sites. RTM could be carried to a lot of places on rail.

Mr. Hsia stated in Santa Clara muck was being shipped to Tracy. Does anyone know where in Tracy they're shipping to? Ms. Mallon said they heard it was being used for some sort of agricultural purpose, but they will follow up to get an answer.

Mr. Hardesty said the discussion needs further review because given that the work is being done in the Delta, soils that are competent for levee repair are valuable resources. Barges would be easier to use for levee improvement. Rail has single points of delivery. Barges could be valuable, and we shouldn't foreclose that option.

Mr. Merlo commented based on where that spur travels to in Stockton, mostly low-income areas will be affected by noise and traffic. Stockton hasn't invested in over or underpasses and at-grade crossings will cause bottlenecks south and west of downtown during heavy traffic. During heavy traffic times, there would be serious impacts.

Mr. Moran asked if material coming out of the Lower Roberts Launch Shaft Site need to go to the Southern Forebay. Mr. Bradner said that there will be material coming out of that site as the TBM drives north. It will depend on schedule and timing. If needed, it could be swung around like Ms. Mallon mentioned, from Twin Cities, down to the Southern Forebay. It'll come down to the schedule. Ms. Mallon said there is rail up there and they know they can swing rail around. Two and a half miles of tunnel material has to swing down there to balance out, which leaves excess material at the Lower Roberts Site.

Ms. Mallon said DCA is very sensitive about emergency access and how the project may impact the ability for emergency vehicles to get around. She asked Ms. Giacoma to spend some time pointing out areas of concern to ensure it gets addressed. An answer isn't needed right now and it may take some time to think about, but if there is information to offer, that would be helpful.

Ms. Giacoma said Hwy 12 and Hwy 160 and the connecting roads between them and I-5 are critical and very heavily trafficked. It would be difficult to get EMS through if more traffic was added to the existing traffic. There is a lot of shipping and a lot of semis that use those roads also. Ms. Mallon said DCA will spend some time considering how to address that concern, where it is through adding shouldering or widening the roads. Do emergency vehicles need to

be placed in certain areas to reduce effects? There is currently no plan for construction traffic to use for Hwy 160.

Ms. Giacoma said that Hwy 160 accesses the Delta from the west side. Ms. Mallon asked if there were concerns for any of the roads coming west off of I-5.

Mr. Wallace said it may be better to ask what is the current capacity of emergency services in the North Delta. Those services don't currently exist.

Ms. Giacoma said the existing roads are so crowded now, that it's likely new roads or highways would be needed. The existing situation is barely working now and there are constant accidents as a result. Ms. Mallon said it would be helpful if Ms. Giacoma could provide any ideas or areas of particular concern in her comments during meetings.

Ms. Mallon said discussions with rail consultants raised the idea of leaving behind the rail depot in the north after construction as a potential benefit to the Delta for agricultural purposes. The SEC agricultural representative is not present today, but the depot is an example of a potentially beneficial feature that could be left behind after the project is constructed. This is a question for SEC members to weigh in on.

Mr. Hsia said historically there was a railroad from Walnut Grove to Sacramento, but it is not currently being used.

Mr. Wallace said it has been a long time since there has been a railroad and agriculture has grown in the Delta. Leaving extra siding or tracks might not do anything given how long the project will take for the project to be constructed, and he thinks rail needs to be pulled out after construction.

e. Public Comment on Item 4

Ms. Palmer opened public comment on Item 4.

Barbara Daley, North Delta Cares, said she arrived late but thought she heard Ms. Buckman say that a goodwill campaign has not started yet, but then thought that it was mentioned that DCA was beginning to work at the Port of Stockton. Ms. Buckman clarified that Mr. Ryan may have mentioned working on ideas with the Port of Stockton, but there have definitely not been any Delta Conveyance projects started. The proposed project has to go through CEQA before the project is even considered, and then there are quite a few other associated environmental permits required. Also, in regards to "goodwill campaigns," Ms. Buckman said she is talking about mitigation options. After impacts are identified in CEQA, ideas are presented to reduce, avoid or offset the impacts identified through CEQA.

Osha Meserve, Friends of Stone Lake National Wildlife Refuge Association, said she has made some comments before but wanted to comment again about how the maps are coming together. Stone Lake National Wildlife Refuge has a boundary that is designated by Congress. It includes the entire area. On the maps shown, only the lands that have been purchased by the public is included or are under easement. It does not appear to be mapped properly. The entire boundary of the refuge must be included and anything through that area must be

considered part of a wildlife refuge area. Just because Fish & Wildlife Services hasn't purchased that property yet doesn't mean that it couldn't be purchased. There are also private lands within that same area that are in agriculture. Nothing would be purchased unless it was a willing seller with Fish & Wildlife Services, and that is one of the really good partnerships we have had with this area. Take a closer look at that area. Having Hood Franklin Road through the refuge and in front of the just finished Blue Heron Trail is where all the kids come to learn about wetlands and birds is not appropriate. There needs to be sensitivity towards a lot of different kinds of people and animals. Saying that Hood Franklin Road is going to be a main haul route is really unacceptable and it is surprising after everything that happened in the last round. With respect to the map that shows existing water infrastructure in the Delta, it doesn't include the thousands of agricultural and other intakes that are in the Delta. Perhaps it needs to be on a separate map, but it isn't correct to say that the municipal intakes are the only ones that exist in the Delta. There are thousands of intakes that we need to worry about and that the project should be planning around.

Dan Whaley, local resident, said the map over the extension from Elk Grove to first intake is shorter distance and less intrusive, but the City of Elk Grove has not been included in the process. The City has already approved a $1 Billion hospital and emergency center at I-5 and Elk Grove Blvd. How will the hospital be affected by the pile driving? The Kammerer Road Interchange that is going to go from Hwy 99 to the town of Franklin and eventually to I-5 affects everything DCA is talking about doing. It is not included and should be analyzed before the process moves forward. It looks like the map shows the railroad tracks at Freeport being covered. There is no real explanation as to why historical railroads are currently being covered by rock by DWR? If the ITR discussed at the last meeting is being disregarded and DCA has better ideas, how can we trust independent studies on muck materials and that DCA won't also ignore their ideas as well? If it cost $1 billion to fix the 1,700ft spillway at Oroville, how can you say this tunnel wouldn't cost at least $75 billion, and shouldn't we have a construction cost before we start a project?

5. Non-Agendized SEC Questions or Comments

Ms. Martinez said this is about outreach being conducted by members, questions that members want included on the Q & A packet or discussions for future meetings.
Ms. Palmer clarified that this is a time for members to discuss things that are not on the meeting agenda. Ms. Martinez reminded that the conversation still needs to be within the scope of the SEC committee.

Ms. Giacoma said she previously requested a list of the soil conditioners that will be used. The tracking packet said the request was responded to, but that list has not been received.

Mr. Wallace asked if it would be easier to just get BASF to provide material safety data sheets.
Ms. Mallon said some materials are proprietary to the driller. Conditioners available are constantly evolving, improving, changing and those in use currently might not be used in the future. DCA can provide info on the range of products available today, but those conditioners might not be what's used in future.

Ms. Martinez thanked Ms. Giacoma for bringing attention to the question since she felt it was not answered. Mistakes can be made and DCA appreciates the opportunity to correct them when they do occur.

Ms. Swenson said in regards to the ITR, she would like to see copies of all the documents that were provided to the ITR team and listed in the ITR report.

Ms. Swenson said the Delta Protection Commission (DPC) is pushing forward the National Heritage movement in the Delta and she is dismayed at the parallel processes in light of Ms. Mallon's comments that DCA is working with them. DCA needs to work with everyone existing in the Delta, because while DCA is planning, the DPC is implementing a plan that you might be dropping a feature on top of or DPC might be doing improvements on an area that might not exist after the project. The DPC's actions with the Delta's National Heritage status shouldn't be wasted on areas that won't be of significance or relevance due to the project. There has to be more collaboration and close collaboration. DWR and DPC are both state departments that should be talking to one another. Ms. Mallon said she and Ms. Buckman will be at their meeting on March 19th in Stockton.

Mr. Wallace said he met with the new consultants for the National Heritage Area. When the National Heritage Area was authorized, there was language in the legislation that said the status could not be used to stop the tunnel conveyance project. DPC right now is saying they are aware of the proposed conveyance project, but they are not really going to address it in the National Heritage Management Plan.

Mr. Gloski said the question tracking packet numbering was changed and it was difficult to find his earlier questions. He also asked for the Excel version of the table so he can filter his questions and track the status. Also, a "closed" status could be helpful to distinguish between questions that received a response but are still outstanding and questions that have been completely resolved. Ms. Mallon asked members to let us know which questions they deem to still be open. Ms. Martinez said DCA is working hard to build the relationship with SEC members and asked members to let staff know if there are questions that still need follow-up. It could be that the question wasn't fully understood, it was lost in translation or there is some other unintentional circumstance.

Mr. Moran reported on outreach being conducted in the Southwestern Delta. As far as the public is concerned, the Franks Tract Futures Project is tied very closely to this project. He will be speaking to the Municipal Advisory Committee about Franks Tract Futures so that folks who ask about this project can be directed to the correct sources of information.

Mr. Moran said he hosted a presentation on why tunnels are being proposed and there were about 15 attendees, including a representative from Senator Glazer's office. The presentation was very well received; a lot of confusion was generated. DCA's outreach efforts to non-classic Delta users is appreciated, such as to residents of cities, water users, etc. along the Pittsburg Antioch shoreline who don't even know that the Delta is there and what it provides for them. Members of the National Heritage Council showed up and reiterated that the tunnel project is not considered in their efforts.

Ms. Martinez provided information about the SEC tours planned for members. There are corridor tours planned for March 19 and March 24. Members signed up for the March 19 tour include Mr. Hsia and Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla. On March 24, members signed up include Mr. Cox, Ms. Swenson, Mr. Wirth and Ms. Mann. The final tour scheduled at this time in on April 14 and

covers two locations: fish screen manufacturing facility and Red Bluff Intakes. Members signed up include Ms. Hsia, Mr. Cox, Ms. Mann and Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla. Please let staff know if you need to change, cancel or sign up for the tour.

Ms. Swenson asked if the SEC members could invite guests to attend the tours. Mr. Nelson said the tours are not open to the public. DCA is ensuring less than quorum of the SEC attend so that the tours are not technically a meeting of the SEC. Ms. Swenson asked if members of the public could follow the tour vehicles. Mr. Nelson said he will follow up.

Ms. Swenson said the people who will be affected should be allowed to see where the project will be sited. Ms. Mallon said if Ms. Swenson would like for the DCA to consider arranging public tours, that can be submitted as a request. The first focus is the providing the tours to members as part of the SEC process.

Ms. Martinez said all members on the SEC for reason and represent certain constituents. DCA is making every effort to drill down to each member's respective specialty and has distributed a personalized questionnaire to each of them. Please look differently based on the unique perspective that put you on this committee.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT Non-Agendized Items

Ms. Palmer opened public comment for non-agenda items. There were no public comments.

7. NEXT MEETING

8. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Palmer adjourned the meeting at 6:13pm.