STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING
Wednesday, June 24, 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 via RingCentral video conference at 3:03 pm.

Director Palmer welcomed the SEC and meeting guests and thanked all for their participation. The meeting is being held via phone and video conference pursuant to Governor Newsom's Executive Order N29-20 in response to the COVID-19 State of Emergency.

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

2. ROLL CALL/HOUSEKEEPING

Committee members in attendance were Angelica Whaley, Anna Swenson, Cecille Giacoma, David Gloski, Douglas Hsia, Isabella Gonzalez-Potter, James Cox, Jim Wallace, Karen Mann, Lindsey Liebig, Malissa Tayaba, Dr. Mel Lytle, Peter Robertson and Sean Wirth. Ex-officio members Gilbert Cosio and Michael Moran were also in attendance. Philip Merlo didn't attend. Tribal representative alternate Jesus Tarango didn't attend.

Members Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla and Mike Hardesty were not in attendance

DCA Board Members in attendance were Director Sarah Palmer (Chair) and Barbara Keegan (Vice Chair) In addition, DCA and DWR staff members in attendance were Kathryn Mallon, Valerie Martinez, Joshua Nelson, Don Hubbard, Graham Bradner, Nazli Parvizi, Claudia Rodriguez, Jasmine Runquist and Carrie Buckman.

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

Ms. Palmer reviewed housekeeping items. Members of the public can request to speak during the public comment period by emailing claudiarodriguez@dcdca.org. Written comments will be added to the record but not read during the meeting. Patience is appreciated, as this is the first teleconference for the SEC. DCA will work to ensure everyone is heard and receives the information needed.

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

3. MINUTES REVIEW: May 27, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting

Ms. Palmer asked if there were any comments on the minutes, which were distributed to members. Any changes can be reported to Jasmine Runquist. No objections or changes were reported by SEC members.

4. RALPH M. BROWN ACT REMINDER

Mr. Nelson presented reminders regarding the Brown Act, in light of some changes since he last presented to the SEC in November 2019. The Brown Act is part of the Government Code and is California's open meeting law for local agencies, not state agencies. The purpose is to ensure that most discussions and deliberations occur in a public setting. Meetings must be held open and public. A meeting is defined as any gathering of a majority of the members at the same time and place to hear, discuss or deliberate upon any matter under their jurisdiction. The majority is 10 members of the SEC, excluding ex officio members. No serial meetings are allowed, which are defined as any SEC members discussing any SEC business outside of a standard meeting. A serial meeting could include standard communication or the use of an intermediary.

California Emergency Services Act gives the Governor the authority to suspend State law in an emergency and has done so regarding the Brown Act. The Executive Order N-29-20 does not have an end date but applies until state or local health officials are no longer requiring or recommending social distancing. The Order states that previous requirements for teleconference/electronic meetings have been suspended. The following are the requirements for current teleconference/electronic meetings:

1. Public can "observe and address" board
2. Agenda is timely posted (72 hours for regular meetings)
3. Notice says how public can observe and comment
4. Implement and advertise a procedure for "receiving and swiftly resolving" ADA accommodation requests
5. Make reasonable efforts to adhere to Brown Act as closely as possible to maximize transparency

Communication during virtual meetings should be done through the RingCentral platform, avoiding texts and instant messages. These texts and messages could be subject to disclosure. The Brown Act suspension has not eliminated the ban on serial meetings. Participants should be muted when they are not speaking during the meeting to help with background noise. The "raise hand" feature should be used when wishing to speak. "Video off" should be used thoughtfully.

Mr. Gloski said that at the last meeting, during the non-agenized portion, he asked if the SEC could hear from members that attended the DCA Board meeting and it was cited that it would be an issue with the Brown Act. Can this be explained?

Mr. Nelson said one of the requirements of the Brown Act is that any substantive discussions of the body must be included on the agenda. If there is something not on the agenda, there cannot be a substantive discussion. There is a safe harbor in the Brown Act for brief comments, reports, or future agenda requests. When that particular discussion turned more substantive is when it was suggested to be added to a future agenda.

Ms. Martinez informed that there were no requests for public comment on this item but reminded to submit requests for public comment to Ms. Rodriguez at this point, so that they may make their comment later in the meeting.

5. STAFF PRESENTATION & COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

a. DWR Tribal Engagement & Other Updates

[Editor's Note: due to technical difficulties, the presentation on tribal engagement occurred later in the meeting but is included in the minutes in this section in order to more accurately capture the information associated to the agenda items.]

Ms. Agustinez introduced herself as a member of the Navajo Tribe who has been working with DWR for 13 years as their Tribal Policy Advisor to engage with the tribes in the Delta regarding DWR programs and projects.

DWR is committed to proactive engagement with tribes who are interested in the Delta Conveyance Project. Ms. Agustinez thanked Mr. Tarango and Ms. Tayaba for their roles in the SEC.

DWR is engaging with tribes in accordance with state consultation policies and AB-52. Ms. Agustinez informed that the land in the Delta has been traditionally used by tribes. Tribal sovereignty is the recognition that there a difference in the public engagement process. As

sovereign nations, tribes are not a public entity. Specific engagement is required to have meaningful engagement, as laid out in state consultation policies. It is through government to government communication that lead agencies have the responsibility of maintaining confidentiality. Tribes are encouraged to be engaged in the public scoping process, voicing the concerns of tribes.

Governor Newson issues E.O. N-10-19 and the water portfolio followed shortly after. This executive order began the new planning process for Delta Conveyance and also set in motion that a state or local lead agency is required to offer Native American tribes, with an interest in tribal local resources located within their jurisdiction, the opportunity to engage in government to government consultation with agencies preparing CEQA documents. These orders are further defined in E.O. B-10-11, CNRA Tribal Consultation Policy, and DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy.

AB-52 is a CEQA amendment that further clarifies the role of tribes in the CEQA process and recognizes the tribal sovereignty of tribes in California government. It also recognizes that California Native American tribes have an expertise with regard to their history and practices and emphasizes the importance of incorporating tribal knowledge into the government analysis for the protection of tribal cultural resources.

As the lead agency for Delta Conveyance, DWR issued a Notice of Preparation under CEQA in January and began AB-52 tribal engagement. Other previous projects (such as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and California WaterFix) did not use AB-52 as they predated it. Prior to the release of the NOP in Fall 2019, DWR conducted pre-AB 52 engagement meetings, after the release of the Water Resiliency Portfolio.

AB-52 applies to all California tribes, defined as federally recognized tribes and non-federally recognized tribes and all CEQA lead agencies. If a tribe wishes to participate in AB-52, they must submit a written request to the lead agency. The lead agency will then begin the consultation prior to the release of a Negative Declaration or EIR.

Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) are defined under AB-52 as "a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a 'California Native American tribe,' that is either on, or eligible for inclusion in, the California Historic Register or a local historic register, or is a resource that the lead agency, at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, determines should be treated as a Tribal Cultural Resource." Any consulting agency is required to conduct a search list through the Native American Heritage Commission, as well as maintain a response list.

Since the release of the NOP on January 15, 2020, notifications for the Delta Conveyance Project were sent out to 121 tribes. They were informed of the availability of the NOP and given an invitation to consult with DWR under either AB-52 (for tribes that were on DWR's AB-52 list) or DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy. Tribes who were not on the DWR AB-52

consultation list at the time of the release of the NOP can still request consultation under DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy at any time during the course of the project.

Many tribes are working on currently reopening as a result of COVID-19 and DWR is working on moving forward with rescheduling meetings.

The pre-AB52 meetings with tribes took place on September 11, 2019 and November 12, 2019. DWR also assisted with the development of a Tribal Engagement Committee formed from an independent body of tribes in the Delta who meet monthly. DWR has been invited to provide technical assistance and advises on an invited basis.

Aside from that committee, DWR plans to schedule quarterly Informational Update Meetings for tribes and anticipates regional meetings throughout California, as well as at tribe governmental meetings, per invitation.

COVID-19 caused for tribes to close their reservation boundaries and close tribal economic businesses. DWR began receiving formal letters from tribes in April requesting to pause all consultation meetings due to COVID-19. In response, Governor Newsom issued E.O. N-54-20 which provided a 60-day extension to apply to CEQA projects, effective as of April 22, 2020. It was focused on the timeframes to initiate consultation, so it did not apply to the Delta Conveyance consultation process because that process was already initiated.

Ms. Agustinez mentioned she can return to the committee whenever an update is necessary or requested. She also shared a list of other resources.

Ms. Giacoma suggested that DWR's Tribal Consultant remain engaged in the process.

Ms. Agustinez informed that the engagement with DWR is pursuant to statutory guidelines. Tribal sovereignty is an issue and sometimes the public may not be aware of the coordination taking place within the government agencies and the consultation process. She will continue to be engaged.

Ms. Buckman provided an overview of current DWR environmental activities. The Draft Scoping Summary Report, which is the draft report capturing scoping-related information including comments received and scoping meetings transcripts, should be released in July. A Section 404/Section 10 application for the Department of the Army was submitted pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. Work continues on the initial steps for development of the Draft EIR. DWR is working to address comments received and complete the environmental process for the Soil Investigation IS/MND.

In regard to NEPA, this project is different in that it does not have a federal project proponent. This means that a regulatory agency will be the NEPA lead. DWR needs to formally engage the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to allow federal

agencies to determine the NEPA lead. An initiation letter was required for flood management from the local sponsor to initiate the Section 408 process; the Central Valley Flood Protection Board sent this letter in May. A Section 404 application is needed for wetlands and waters. With the submittal of the Section 404/Section 10 application, DWR has now formally engaged the USACE and is expecting the identification of the NEPA lead soon.

The Section 404 application includes a project description, an assessment of the impacts to wetlands and waters, and avoidance and minimization measures. DWR has already submitted the application to initiate the selection of the NEPA lead agency. No permit will be issued until after CEQA, NEPA, and other permitting processes are complete. The 404 application includes only one alignment because the Crops would not consider an application with multiple options. For that reason, only the Eastern Alignment was used in the application. To clarify, this does not constitute a decision; no decision will be made until after the environmental process is complete.

Mr. Cosio asked how the actual Section 404 application package that DWR submitted to the USACE can be located, and what is USACE's public notice process?

Ms. Buckman said the application is on the website. Ms. Parvizi can send out links to committee members. There is also additional background information on the website. The USACE's public notice process depends on how they proceed with NEPA. Should they become the NEPA lead, their notice would be combined with a Notice of Intent.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked what will happen in terms of having a lead agency for NEPA and what the NEPA process looks like with the President's executive order rolling back NEPA processes for water projects? Can the SEC be updated if there are any changes in the process?

Ms. Buckman said DWR doesn't anticipate the executive order to affect the NEPA process for this project. There is uncertainty with the NEPA process until we identify the federal agencies' roles, but if anything changes SEC members will be updated.

b. Delta-wide Soils Transportation and Balance

Mr. Bradner presented on RTM maintenance and soils material balance within the project. Between 6 and 15 million cubic yards (MCY) of RTM will be generated during tunnel boring operations, depending on differing tunnel diameters. Roughly 20 MCYs of soil fill will be needed at the project sites for various project features. The effects of hauling and logistical constrictions highlight the need to optimize onsite material uses to the extent that is practical and acceptable.

There are common RTM generation sites between the two alignments, including Twin Cities and the Southern Complex. The Central Alignment also has Bouldin Island as a

generation site and the Eastern Alignment has Lower Roberts. These are the locations where RTM will be generated throughout the project.

The tunnel depth is expected to be around 130 to 160 ft. below the ground. The material will include older soils consisting of sands, silts, and clays with the occasionally buried stream channels. Peats or organic materials are not anticipated to be encountered at the tunnel depth. This is not the material that will be excavated from the shafts.

Previous testing of RTM was performed about seven years ago that took soil samples collected from 19 borings along the expected tunnel alignment and depth, which at the time, was an alignment similar to the Central Alignment. The samples were blended with three typical soil conditioners and tested for material properties, strength, permeability, and toxicity. The conditioner application was purposefully higher than industry typical values to highlight the effects of the conditioners as they are mixed with the soil and determine if there were any changes to the soil properties.

Regarding the historical geotechnical laboratory testing, there are a couple different categories. Soil classification is the testing performed to determine material type. There are ASTM classifications for different soil types. Moisture content, Atterberg limits, and gradation and hydrometer help identify the gradation of the soil, the percentages of the different components, and what kind of soil is being dealt with. The constructability of the material is also assessed in terms of optimum moisture content and maximum dry density. Geotechnical performance is related to the shear strength of the soil, for example, when the material is used for an embankment construction.

Mr. Bradner presented a table summarizing the criteria of the geotechnical standards for embankment fills. The first column lists the characteristics, these are defined by laboratory testing. The second column is the USACE geotechnical levee practice and the third column is the CCR Title 23 which is the California Code of Regulations are the requirements for embankment fills that are specified by these two agencies. They govern what types of material meet specifications and requirements of embankment fill. This is what is used to take the laboratory testing that was performed and evaluate if the material is suitable for embankment construction. The right side of the table shows Samples without Conditioners and Samples with conditioners, i.e. RTM. The samples without conditioners are used as a base line to determine material properties and the characteristics of the soil extracted. The samples with conditioners look at the changes to determine if the resulting products still meet the specifications and requirements.

The first row of the table, Maximum particle size, says that according to regulations, material cannot exceed 2 inches in diameter. Based on this material, less than 1% qualifies as a gravel. A gravel material is anything between ¾ of an inch and 3 inches. The vast majority of this material is appropriate for embankment fill and anything oversized would be screened out.

The second row, % Fines is the amount of silt and clay found in the sample. USACE requires 20% of fine material and CCR Title 23 requires 30%. The base line condition has 67% to 69% fines and RTM has some variability with 45% to 71%.

The third and fourth rows, Plasticity Index (PI) and Liquid Limit (LL) are measures of soil plasticity. Both regulations are between 8 and 40 for PI, and the material met the requirements. Liquid Limit is less than or equal to 45 for both regulations. It's related to highly plastic materials and whether or not they have expansive properties. The samples without conditioners came in at 38 and the RTM came in between 40-46 which is workable and used often within the Central Valley. This can be addressed by zoning the use of the higher plasticity material or blending it with other soils to bring down the liquid limit.

The last row, Other Criteria, is mostly referring to trashes and similar materials that could be brought into a fill. This is not something the team is anticipating encountering at any of the tunnel depths being discussed. There are also additional criteria for saturated unit weight and organic content referenced by the Title 23 standards that would be met by all materials collected in the RTM.

Additional geotechnical testing was done regarding the strength and compressibility of that soil comparing the baseline material with the RTM material. There was a minor increase in compressibility and a slight decrease in shear strength for conditioned soils, but still workable and not considered problematic. Permeability reduced for the conditioned soils which appears to be related to some of the qualities of the conditioners that break down the clays and silts but is being flagged for further study.

The health, environmental, and ecology data was reviewed by several rounds of environmental specialists and toxicologists. In summary, hydrocarbons and pesticides were either not detected or detected at low levels. Metals and inorganics generally resemble naturally occurring levels in the Delta. Cadmium was detected above typical background, but below environmental screening levels for health or ecological impacts, so this will be paid close attention to as the project moves forward. The RTM Management approach included a holding period of up to four weeks for all of the RTM generated through the project. The material will come out of the ground and sit in quarantine while testing is done before it moves on to the next step. If the material is determined to be unusable, it will be disposed of and hauled offsite. If it is cleared, it will move forward to the drying process to be made suitable for reuse.

Soil moisture content will be the most difficult part of reusing material. Soil strength does vary with water content. The ideal water content is typically between 17 and 23% moisture. The RTM from tunnel operations may be between 30 and 45% water content, depending on the tunneling method, how much conditioner has been added, and how that conditioner is affecting water content. Moisture must be removed to use the RTM for structural fill.

Several drying methods have been evaluated to dry the RTM. For natural drying, after the quarantine process has cleared the soil for reuse, it would be spread in 18-inch lifts and require daily tilling and discing to mix the soil. Hot, dry weather conditions are needed to get the moisture to evaporate in a reasonable timeframe. As a result, a significant wet storage containment will be necessary. It would be a land intensive operation with a lot of equipment running.

The alternative system is mechanical drying, specifically heated drying. This would use thermal dryers to remove the moisture directly from the conveyors. It's a series of heated interlocking paddles that the wet material would be fed into and the moisture would be removed quickly as it moves through. The material comes out as small, dry granular material. This system would require more power at a greater capital cost, with up to 9 dryers per tunnel. It does allow year-round drying, so the process would not be dependent on the weather. Significantly less heavy equipment would be required. It could also be compatible with secondary natural drying method, so a small section could be used for natural drying while using the dryers as well.

The project team sees a great opportunity with RTM as there is a tremendous need for soil fill and the project will produce excess quantities of RTM. The project circumstances are unique to drive creative thinking about use of available resources. The challenge is associated with logistics and access. Based on testing done to date, the pre- and post-conditioned samples meet State and Federal embankment requirements. Additional testing for strength and permeability show RTM to be viable as embankment fill.

Further study is needed on potential dispersive effects of the conditioners; zoned embankments resolve the issue for the time being. An ongoing item of further study will be to continue to analyze and evaluate geotechnical and environmental properties of the RTM. The biggest issue is the moisture content as the material comes out wet, but processes for drying the material before use have been included.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said one of the departments not listed on the presentation was CalEPA's Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Will standards that would be evaluated by a department like that for pollution and soil by CalEPA be used?

Mr. Bradner said yes, DTSC would be one of the considered agencies looking at screening levels and thresholds.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla mentioned that in WaterFix, one of the engineering reports stated there were levels of Chromium-6 found in the soils. That has not been mentioned in this presentation.

Mr. Bradner said there were values of Chromium-6 detected, as well as other metals but the key difference is whether or not they exceeded the various standard thresholds that they are evaluated against. *[Editor's Note: The verbal response provided by Mr. Bradner*

during the meeting was incorrect; Chromium VI was not detected in previous samples analyzed, but rather the laboratory detection limit was above the screening level for the constituent. For the correct information, please refer to question 9.05 on the Question Tracking Master Log.] There are federal and state standards, specifically DTSC. They key question is if they were detected at levels above background levels or levels exceeding threshold values.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked if there is a list of ingredients for the conditioners? Has work been done with any groups like the California Native Plant Society? Everything could be done legally and correctly, but there could be room for harm because the SEC is not aware if conditions are changed further. What will soil conditions be for native plants? Want to ensure that conditions won't cause anyone to get sick.

Mr. Bradner said this question should be answered by a toxicologist. This will require someone with that background to answer effectively.

Mr. Moran asked in regard to the 15 million cubic yards, what accounts for the large difference? Is it evaporation? Is it differences between the two alignments? How confident are you that the cores being used for reference would apply to the actual alignment?

Mr. Bradner said the variation is based on tunnel diameter. There is a range of potential tunnel diameters associated with the range of potential flows. There are differences in tunnel lengths depending on Central and Eastern. The smallest generated quantity would be the smallest diameter tunnel along the Central Alignment.

Mr. Moran said in regard to drying, evaporation is a large percentage of water. What impact does that have on the total resulting RTM? From what comes out of the ground to what is actually reusable later, is there a dramatic difference?

Mr. Bradner said built into the soil balance are the factors associated with bringing that material to the surface, as it will bulk and expand. As the moisture is taken out, it will reduce and shrink. Then it will be taken to a compacted fill where it will shrink again.

Mr. Wallace said it looks like there could be a short fall of material somewhere between 5 and 14 million cubic yards. Where could that come from? Are these new borrow pits or existing? If it's not coming out of the Delta, maybe Eastern San Joaquin County or down by Mount Diablo. Curious as to where borrow material is coming from and if enough has been identified as available.

Mr. Bradner said there is some borrow material that has to be imported because it cannot be derived on site. This could be AB road base, rip rap or large diameter rock used for erosion protection around the Forebay. There are a variety of materials for different uses. Some are planned to import from around the area, not within the Delta. In other instances, intend to borrow locally, but keeping it within the project like Twin Cities. . The native

material excavated there would provide good reusable fill for either that location or others within the project. Another example is Lower Roberts Island. The Southern Forebay has a lot of material that can be excavated on site through the foundation excavations on that embankment. There are a couple million yards of material at the South Delta Conveyance Facilities.

Mr. Wallace said the presentation says that metals and organics generally resemble naturally occurring levels. Arsenic is very high naturally occurring in the Delta and it is a water quality issue. Although they might be naturally occurring, doesn't mean they meet environmental standards or environmental minimums for soil contamination.

Mr. Bradner said it will take more attention. Arsenic is a problem throughout the Central Valley, as well. It is naturally occurring in the rivers and we do deal with it. What the testing currently shows can be shared and what has been done on similar projects. It will take more analysis to ensure all requirements are met.

Mr. Hsia said at the beginning of SEC meetings in November, there were a lot of questions regarding the usability of RTM. After listening to this presentation, it seems this is no longer an issue. Is this correct?

Mr. Bradner confirmed that is correct. After much study, it appears to meet the geotechnical requirements. The biggest challenge will be getting the moisture out of it. That will take some energy, but it appears to be worth it. The alternative of hauling and importing all of this material in to then dispose of the material elsewhere would have a tremendous effect and environmental impact.

Ms. Mallon added that the hope is that any excess RTM will be made available for the reclamation districts.

Ms. Mann said this is not very good for the environment. Regarding EPA, this seems a lot like mining. The photos on the presentation show a lot of equipment. Where is the energy coming from to transport the RTM? Concerned about the EPA requirements. PG&E has been having a lot of trouble.

Mr. Bradner said it would generally be electrical power. Electrical connections and power would be brought in. At the tunnel launch sites, the TBMs are also electrical. There are other power providers besides PG&E.

Ms. Mann asked if the cost of electric come out of taxpayer money? Who will pay for the cost of electrical use? Why won't generators be used?

Mr. Bradner said it's part of the project so it would be part of project costs. Some of the sites will use backup generators. However, the RTM processing systems, including the conveyors and heaters would be dedicated electrical.

Ms. Mallon added that it is work beyond what a generator could do on site.

Ms. Mann asked if the power companies are aware of this anticipated draw of electricity at the proposed sites? It's shocking considering the hydro-electrical troubles in California.

Mr. Bradner informed that coordination is happening with the power companies.

Mr. Cosio said that this is a big construction project so the power lines, sub stations, etc. are not surprising. It doesn't look like there will be material left over for levees which isn't a bad thing after seeing what the material is made from. A lot of money will be spent getting the water out of the material, then at some point, the water will have to be put back in to compact it. The work it will take to keep the moisture at allowable limits will be tough. A couple of rainstorms could shut down the operations for a while. What are the conditioners made from? What do they do physically or chemically to material? At which process will it be put in?

Mr. Bradner said that the conditioners are introduced at the tunneling operation. This helps moisture stay within the material so it's workable and helps to break it down so that it doesn't clog the operation. It's really just to facilitate the tunneling operation. Once it gets up to service the moisture has to be removed from the material. Depending on timing of when material becomes available, there will be some leftover.

Ms. Giacoma said she is concerned about the toxic metals. Chromium-6 and arsenic will become airborne when they're dried, blowing around the area. The levels of the boring samples were found to be hazardous. Methyl mercury, a threat to rivers in the Delta, was not mentioned in the presentation. These all exceed levels that are hazardous to human health, as well as fish and the rest of nature. It's important to address that. What are the ingredients in the conditioners? What are the hazardous levels of Chromium-6, arsenic, and methyl mercury?

Mr. Bradner said tunnel conditioners are surfactants with properties to break down the tunneling material and separate the bonds. The chemical makeup will depend on the contractors as they all use different blends. The testing that was done took three commonly used conditioners and incorporated them into the soils, then tested them for their effects on the material. More of this testing will happen as time goes on. If present, naturally occurring metals will have to be contended with. Testing done thus far appears to be good. It's one thing for it to be detected and another thing for it to be exceeding health standards. There are a variety of thresholds and they're being used to compare the results. Testing has been done to date and consistent with other water projects in the valley.

Ms. Swenson said the presentation didn't have any exploration on the Eastern alignment. Will that be done? If the conditioners will be put down in the tunnel boring holes, how will ground water be protected? There are proprietary chemicals being put into the ground

with very interconnected systems. Although Chromium-6, arsenic, and methyl mercury are being used at approved levels, cumulatively how will they affect the community? How loud are the dryers? How often will they run? What will the operations be? How much productive farmland will be put out of production to dry tunnel muck?

Ms. Mallon said these items will be put in an agenda for a future meeting.

Mr. Gloski said the water vapor will likely cause a cloud of condensation so it would be good to have a discussion about this so that local people will understand.

Ms. Mallon said the team is considering shrinking the sites and footprints that are required from the land drying and tilling instead of condensing the site with the dryers.

Mr. Robertson said the presentation mentioned spreading the material out to dry on land. How tall will the lifts be? Do you anticipate the dryers to run at night?

Mr. Bradner said to spread the material out, the calculation was 18-inch lifts to dry it quickly. The area is hundreds of acres. The team is working to shrink the footprint which is why the focus is on mechanical dyers. The dryers are quiet compared to other equipment running often. The dryers would be working 20 hours a day.

Ms. Mallon said they will be running with the RTM. Two 9-hour shifts during the day, no RTM production on Saturday, only maintenance, and no work on Sunday.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla asked what is the plan for containment of blowing dust during the natural drying process? She is confused about where peat soils are at the surface. Levels of peat soil will be hit when excavating 150 feet. There is documented history of peat soil causing lung disease in the Delta, particulate number 2.5-10. This is a concern because funding for monitoring of this issue is being cut for COVID-19 budget. By the time the project starts, there could be a different type of budget for monitoring air quality. There would be particulate matter issues whether or not there is peat soil.

Mr. Bradner said the peat is not down at the tunnel excavation depth. The shafts that would provide access to the tunnel would be excavated through the peat. That material is not what's currently being discussed and that will be managed separately. The peat will be contained, compartmentalized, and managed as its own issue. The RTM is what is being discussed to be processed because of the moisture of the material. Dust control would have to be part just like any other construction operation. Water application is used for dust control. For a period of time, the material will be saturated so it won't generate dust but as it dries there would be a process of introducing moisture back in to maintain dust control.

Mr. Hsia asked how many embankments will be built with the RTM?

Ms. Mallon said this is part of the next slides in the presentation.

Dr. Lytle said the analysis done in the 2014 report by DWR showed a list of 16 heavy metals in this material. It's anticipated that that could change if the Eastern alignment is selected. Can the ingredients of the soil conditioners be listed so can the DCA find this out for the committee? At least what was in the 2014 report because one conditioner from EASF called MasterRoc ACP 127's composition on MSDS sheet has glucopyranose and glycosides which are sugar compounds. Because they are sugar compounds, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol is put in which is a fungicide material and could be anticipated to be in the tunnel muck when it's brought to the surface. The materials in that report should be provided to the SEC.

Ms. Mallon said that will be put in the Q&A. We do have some MSDS sheets. Although it is unknown which conditioner will be used ultimately as it's up to contractors, the team will give as much information as possible.

Mr. Bradner continued his presentation with materials balance along both corridors and began with the Eastern alignment. It is an overview identifying all of the various fill material needs within the project and also identifying which materials are flagged for import. Imported quantities would be hauled in.

Mr. Bradner explained that in presenting each of the sites, the site name and an aerial view of the site with a simplified construction footprint will be displayed on the left of the screen with a summary table at the bottom of the screen. The summary table will include logistics details and the Truck Hauling Schedule will show imported sources identified in color.

Starting with Intake 3 at the north end, there is a need for about 1.8 million CCY and all of this material, minus the fine grain core material for the embankment, will be derived at the site. Importing the fine-grained core material would result in about 10 trucks per day over a period of five quarters.

Intake 5 is a similar approach with mostly all material being derived on-site with the exception of fine grain core for levee embankment.

The Twin Cities Complex is a large site that also includes a shaft. This site will first be used as a borrow site to generate the materials needed at this site and other locations within the project. Some excess material from other sites will be brought back to Twin Cities to be reused elsewhere.

The next location is the New Hope Maintenance Shaft that needs 69,000 CCY with most of the material being imported as borrow from Twin Cities and the excess material returning to Twin Cities for reuse.

Canal Ranch Maintenance Shaft needs 107,000 CCY, Terminous Reception Shaft needs 236,000 CCY, and King Maintenance Shaft needs 147,000 mostly imported from Twin Cities.

Lower Roberts Launch Shaft has some levee repairs on the west side of the island to increase their standards and all of the material needed for the work will be produced on-site. No imports will be needed to this site. Lower Roberts would supply material to Upper Jones Maintenance Shaft.

Southern Complex Launch Shafts needs about 404,000 CCY that would all be derived locally.

The Southern Forebay needs a significant amount of material at about 8.5 million CCY, however the trucking hauling schedule shows that the only material that would need to be hauled in is the specialty embankment material. This is the sand, rock, and other material needed to complete the construction of the reservoir. Some excess material from the Upper Jones Shaft would be imported for reuse. 980,000 CCY of material would be brought in from Twin Cities on rail to complete the reservoir. The vast majority of the material for the site will be derived on-site through excavation and RTM.

The South Delta Conveyance Facility is a self-balancing site that will have a lot of excess to send to the Southern Forebay. There will be dedicated routes by Byron Highway for moving material so there will be no truck traffic.

Logistics would be mostly some road repairs with 496,000 CCY of material needed to be spread to 14 sites. The truck trips are the total truck trips that would be feeding all of those sites.

There are some sites that are shared with the Central Alignment. The first that is not shared is the New Hope Maintenance Shaft, it needs about 66,000 CCY with the majority coming from Twin Cities and the excess returning to Twin Cities. Staten Maintenance Shaft needs 156,000 CCY also coming as borrow from Twin Cities and excess being returned.

The Bouldin Launch Shaft is similar to Lower Roberts. The center is the launch shaft and RTM area. The dashed lines are all the haul routes to get around the site. There are some sot repairs to get the levees up to standard. 505,000 CCY of material is needed for the shaft pad and another 225,000 CCY is needed for the levee repairs.

Mandeville and Bacon are all import material from Twin Cities.

The Southern Forebay on the Central Alignment doesn't change in need of material but there is a difference in the balance as the need is being made up with RTM. The length of the tunnel drives change between the two corridors. Truck trips and import remain the same. The surplus material will come from Mandeville instead of Upper Jones.

The Central Alignment does require more logistics as the quantity needed is about 842,000 CCY for 15 sites across the project.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said the charts on truck traffic loads are just for the RTM. When will all the sources of truck traffic together be discussed?

Ms. Mallon said that at the last meeting, all the different types of trucks were discussed and all the histograms were shown. This is just for hauling of the RTM or borrow material.

Mr. Bradner said rail will be another way to move the material, but this is just truck trips.

Mr. Wallace said the Twin Cities complex is about 640 acres and it has been identified as a borrow pit. If borrow material wasn't needed, would Twin Cities still be used as a borrow area? Is it specifically identified as a borrow area? If it's identified as a borrow area, does it become subject to SMARA? To what depth are you excavating?

Mr. Bradner said this site is a reduced footprint, closer to about 450 acres total. It was closer to 650 acres in the past, but the team is working to shrink the footprint and the current outline reflects that. The site would be selected based on its logistical advantages, borrow being used or not. Appears to be good useable material according to available data. More geotechnical investigations will be done in the future. Borrow depth could go broader and more shallow or smaller and deeper, looking to optimize space as best as possible. Depends on site constraints and how the facility lays out. The current assumption is to borrow down at about 10 feet. The land would then be restored using RTM material. Post construction treatments is on next month's agenda.

Ms. Giacoma asked what is SMARA?

Mr. Wallace informed that it is the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act. It is a California requirement. In this case it would be administered by Sacramento County.

Ms. Giacoma asked do the levee improvements on Bouldin Island take sea level rise into account?

Mr. Bradner said projections of sea level rise depend on construction phase and timing. The DCA is evaluating them against their commonly used design criteria which is 100-year return period event. Sea level rise hasn't been included in the analysis water surface elevation for evaluation of existing levees, but it was considered. As the project develops over time, it will be something to coordinate with the reclamation districts because it would be inappropriate to assume they haven’t continued to maintain and strengthen their levees.

Ms. Swenson said air quality should be a topic of discussion in the future. What will be done with all the water that comes out of these sites? Will the existing sloughs be used? Who owns the land at Twin Cities? Does DWR own it? If it's privately owned, what is the plan to obtain it?

Ms. Mallon said these topics will be added to future meeting as they're not pertinent to this particular presentation. The questions will be reflected in the Q&A packet.

Dr. Lytle said the location on Twin Cities Road is historically rich in montmorillonite clays. This should be investigated more closely as a preferred site. Those clays extend well into the depths being estimated. At this point, it seems arbitrary to assume the RTM material can be used because of a lack of geotechnical work done on the Eastern alignment. When the analysis is being done, it would be assumed that the calculations would be based on the use of RTM and without the use of RTM, otherwise it's unreliable numbers and estimates. If additional material is being sought after, the South Delta agencies are proposing a large river dredging project to take river spoils from various sections of the San Joaquin to Old River or Middle River because of high sediment. In the future, there may be a supply of dredge materials.

Mr. Bradner said the team will have to evaluate the site conditions and compare them to specifications in the earlier presentation.

Ms. Mallon added if the team was not certain that this material could be used for the embankments then it would not be proposed. The DCA is confident of its use. Validation of that will be done in the upcoming field work. The team is comfortable with the work that has been done and the data collected. There are other drive sites that could be switched to if need be.

Mr. Bradner said the team is very familiar with the general characteristics and properties of those formations. They will yield material very similar to what was tested. Several investigations have been conducted with a range of projects. The consistency found in the Modesto and Riverbank Formations allow for the expectation of useable material.

Ms. Liebig said she is concerned regarding viability of RTM. Regarding Twin Cities, even with a shrunken footprint, a lot of land is still being taken out of production, even if it's not within the highlighted yellow area. The parcels being cut in half will be unfarmable because of water impacts and land disturbances. Although it may not fall into the actual footprint, doesn't mean the land around it will be left in the same capacity. These concerns are with all of the construction sites throughout the project, whether it's on the Central or Eastern alignment. There are many more impacts to farmland than just eminent domain and other areas of the footprint.

Ms. Martinez said that is a good CEQA comment in terms of extended impacts. This will be logged and included in the discussion moving forward.

c. Update on DCA Follow-Up Studies in Response to SEC Comments

Mr. Ryan presented an update on siting changes. The first change is to shift the Glanville Shaft onto the Twin Cities site. The original plan was to have the Glanville shaft located on Dierssen Rd. approximately a mile away from the Twin Cities site. The conveyor system across I-5 required to divert RTM from the launch shaft to the Twin Cities site for processing and off-site transport. There would be heavy truck traffic from Twin Cities to Glanville to deliver tunnel liner segments. The updated plan is to shift the Glanville Shaft ono the Twin Cities site which would increase the total tunneling length by approximately half a mile. There are some benefits to doing this, for example, it eliminates the construction activities associated with the shaft, conveyor, and truck traffic within the Stone Lakes Refuge boundary to reduce the overall impacts. It eliminates the need for a new I-5 bridge and is more efficient with construction logistics with all tunneling operations on a single site. The impact boundaries have been changed on the site due to managing the forebay and the shaft has been moved onto that site.

The second change is a Final Logistics Plan for the intakes. The original plan as discussed at past meetings was to split construction and worker traffic between Hood-Franklin Rd. and Lambert Rd. to get to the intake sites. It would improve the I-5 interchange at Hood-Franklin Rd. with a new interchange at Lambert Rd. and expand both roads to 12-ft lanes with 6-ft to 8-ft shoulders. The updated plan is to utilize Hood Franklin Rd. for only worker buses and light trucks/vehicles to keep traffic very light. There is a Park-and-Ride for workers to use there. Some big trucks would utilize the Twin Cities exit, Franklin Blvd. and Lambert Rd. to access haul roads to intake sites. Only ready-mix trucks would come into the site as needed. A section of Franklin would be relocated, and Lambert Rd. would be expanded to 12-ft wide lanes with 6-ft shoulders. The benefits with this change are that it minimizes construction within the Stone Lakes Refuge boundary and eliminates the expansion of Hood Franklin Rd, which would help with traffic. It also eliminates the new interchange that was going to be put on I-5 at Lambert Rd. and utilizes a route with less existing traffic (Lambert Rd.)

The third change is to eliminate the barge landing on Bouldin Island. The original plan was to have a barge landing located on Potato Slough for transport of tunnel liner segments to the Bouldin Island Launch shaft by barge. The updated plan eliminates the barge landing, so tunnel liners would be trucked in. It also widens Hwy 12 from a 2-lane to a 4-lane from the I-5 Interchange to the Bouldin Island construction exit, including the expansion of Potato Slough Bridge. The benefits of this change include congestion for widening Hwy 12, as the expansion to a 4-lane brings it to a good Level of Service. It provides a permanent infrastructure asset for the region and avoids river traffic affecting “The Bedrooms.”

The fourth change is to shift the Brack Tract Maintenance Shaft north to the Canal Ranch Tract. The original plan was to have the Brack Tract shaft located about half a mile radius of the South and North Units of the Woodbridge Ecological Reserve. The updated plan is to move the shaft about a mile north of the northern boundary of Woodbridge Reserve, for

the terrestrial species between the two sites. The benefits are that the shaft will be further away from the Reserve and truck traffic will be shifted further from the influence area of the Reserve. There will also be easier access to the site from I-5 along W Peltier Rd.

The fifth change is to eliminate the barge landing at Lower Roberts. The original plan was for the Lower Roberts launch shaft site to include rail spur and barge landing on the San Joaquin River for transport of tunnel liners. The updated plan is to eliminate the barge landing and the associated haul roads and to transport the tunnel liners to the site via a proposed rail spur connection. The benefits include eliminating the aquatic and terrestrial effects of barge construction along the San Joaquin River and reduced construction impact area on the island. A more detailed map will be shared in the future.

Changes six through eight are all interconnected. The sixth change is to shift the Southern Complex launch shaft north. The original plan was for the Southern Complex to include two launch shafts adjacent to each other to isolate tunnel construction from the pump station construction and start-up activities. This was going to have the contractor tunneling for several years. The updated plan is to shift the second Southern Complex launch shaft approximately a mile north to be able to eliminate the Byron Tract Shaft on the Central Alignment and the Victoria Island Shaft on the Eastern Alignment. This will reduce construction traffic on Hwy 4 and eliminate construction truck traffic on the Victoria Island bridges.

The seventh change is to eliminate the Byron Tract Shaft on the Central Alignment. The slight shifts made along the alignment between shafts still remains in that 4-mile to 6-mile reach between maintenance shafts. The extra distance is what allowed for the removal of a shaft. There is no need to cross Hwy 4 into Victoria Island across the bridge on the Central Alignment. The tunnel is not too far away from Discovery Bay.

The eighth change is to eliminate the Victoria Island shaft on the Eastern Alignment. This is a significant change as it eliminates all the previous work that was going to need to take place between the Old and Middle River bridges. No heavy construction traffic will be necessary on that part of Hwy 4 anymore.

Ms. Mallon clarified that although the bridge is eliminated on the Eastern Alignment, it will still need to be used to access Bacon on the Central Alignment.

Mr. Robertson said the maps are still missing some aids to navigation on the waterways. Boaters are going to come up on construction and a lot will look different to them. Even with electronic charting and mapping, it's different. He requested that those aids to navigation be properly plotted on the land maps by comparison on the water areas. Also, some coordination will be needed with the Coast Guard, with notice to mariners. They are very good about putting out notices when there are going to be changes in the river, such as when bridges aren't running, ferries aren't running, etc. The proposed project will be going on for a long period of time and this information is needed.

Mr. Wallace said it appears that this will be the first time that tunnels will go under I-5 if the Twin Cities Glanville Shaft is moved to the east. Where is the tunnel going to cross under I-5? What is the height of the crane going to be at that location? Now Caltrans and federal highways will probably have to be included.

Mr. Ryan said the tunnel comes in north of Dierssen Rd. and crosses I-5 then swings down and heads back in a straight line. Curves right before the shaft and will come out of the launch shaft. When the process of replotting is taking place, drawings will be provided.

Ms. Mallon said next month's presentation includes the final yellow and red boundaries with the final alignment dotted in. There are two I-5 crossings now which is predicted to be easier than getting the conveyor crossing over I-5. Participated in a call with the Director of Caltrans this week.

Mr. Ryan said Caltrans and federal highways would have to be engaged with regardless. The team is engaged with Caltrans. Unclear how high shaft will be during construction. The finished shaft will be at elevation 31. The crane would be about another 20 feet above that but will get an answer from the tunnel team.

Mr. Moran asked will moving the Glanville Shaft over to Twin Cities depot extend the footprint, or will it remain the same?

Mr. Ryan said the footprint has been reduced due to other issues. If shaft wasn't there, it would be able to be reduced further but it's more important to reduce on the west side in the reserve boundary and the footprint associated with the bridge and conveyor on Pearson Rd. It has consolidated the project functions into one spot.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said to expand on impacts to the Cosumnes Preserve, the farmland around the Preserve is a place for feeding and roosting for Greater Sandhill Cranes. It's a concern if this is getting bigger near the Preserve.

d. SEC Questions or Comments on May 27th Presentation

Ms. Swenson said folks across from the intake are interested to see the potential impacts of traffic and noise on their side of the river, so will impacts of raising levees be addressed? When can that be expected? To confirm, there will be no construction impacts on the Clarksburg side? Will noise impacts on that side of the river also be studied?

Ms. Mallon said this is a CEQA question. Traffic near Clarksburg is not anticipated. Access to these sites will come off of I-5.

Mr. Ryan said there is no plan to work on the Clarksburg side of the river. The flood impacts analysis has been done to date and that will be enhanced to better modeling. There are insignificant impacts the intakes are making to the flood levels of the river so there is no

need for levee work upstream of the river. There is no reason for construction traffic to go to other side. Perhaps there would be unexpected traffic for emergency access.

Ms. Mallon said there will be no construction traffic allowed in Yolo County to the site. It will come from I-5. Next meeting will be to discuss work done at the intake locations.

Mr. Ryan said noise impacts are part of the environmental analysis.

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla said she is confused about the sourcing of truck materials. If there are x amount of trucks and there are all these different projects, trying to figure out the total number comprehensively for the communities where we are pursuing the correct funding and measures for mitigation on this end of the Delta. Even if a range could be given, that would be helpful.

Ms. Mallon said it would be helpful to look at Mr. Hubbard's presentation from the last meeting. He presented a model of where traffic is coming from and how it's loading the highways. That question will be recorded and then Don could help with a model run for a specific location. The team cannot yet share how much will be coming out of the Port since nothing has been purchased. Certain deliveries for certain sites will need to get to Hwy-4 or Byron Highway. A conference call with Mr. Hubbard could be helpful to walk through the model at different points in time.

Mr. Wirth said it's a great idea moving to the other side of I-5 because for years there has been an effort trying to connect Stone Lakes crane population, with the cranes at the Preserve and points further south. Not having the shaft there would help to do that but the new position of the shaft is a problem.

e. Public Comment on Item 5

Ms. Des Jardin commented that sea level rise is expected to be median 1 foot by 2050 with the high projection being up to 2 feet. It's shocking to hear that where levy improvements are being done, this isn't being taken into consideration. No analysis has been shown on the performance of the tunnel shaft mound of shaft on Bouldin Island. If levees are overtopped, it's an average of 17 feet below sea level. There would be quite a bit of wave wash on that mound over time. Riprap would be needed on the outside and those kinds of consideration are not shown in the design for the Central Corridor. The project can see delays so it should be done with sea level rise considered. There is no state funding for providing upgrades to the levees for sea level rise. Property owners will be responsible for their levee maintenance and improvements. The design should take care of flooding due to sea level rise.

Ms. Meserve expressed concern about Mr. Nelson advising folks not to communicate. It's troubling that this body is subject to the Brown Act, yet not empowered to make decisions or make formal advisory recommendations because nothing is voted on. Continuing during the pandemic wasn't even voted on. It seems that limiting communication between the

members is not being done for an adequate reason. It's great that this process is open and may allow members of the public to be a part of it but the members not being allowed to have their own communication when they have nothing to vote on doesn't make sense. Public comments should not have to be submitted at the start of the meeting. It's a big commitment to sit through a three-hour meeting to wait to comment at the very end. A cut-off so early in the meeting is restrictive and makes it difficult for the public to weigh in.

Ms. Mallon asked for a specific recommendation to improve the process.

Ms. Meserve suggested allowing for public comment further into the meeting, as has been done in the past at in-person meetings.

Ms. Palmer reminded that comments can be sent in via email and they will be considered.

Ms. Moreno expressed concern about the new hauling road areas going through the back of Hood. This is something the community just recently learned about. Homes and property will have to be removed. The SMUD facility that is the main access to electricity for the entire town might be removed and if it is, what accommodations will be made for this? It's concerning that Hood has been disregarded in this process and doesn't have much information. There are intakes on either side of Hood. It's a community of low income, elderly, and marginalized people. It's been said that all that will be there is a park-and-ride for workers, but how many workers are there? How many trucks and cars will go through?

Ms. Martinez clarified that DWR is going through the CEQA process.

Ms. Buckman said the project is still in the beginning phases of the CEQA process and EIR. The NOP was released in January with about three months of scoping. The work now is to compile and publish those scoping comments. From there, the Draft EIR will be worked on and analysis of the types of impacts mentioned will be included.

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

a. SEC Tour Updates

Ms. Parvizi said the virtual tour will be finished in about two weeks. The DCA is implementing new sites on the tour based on conversations had in the previous meeting. They're making these virtual tours as a template so that as conversations are had, sites can be added, removed, or updated easily. This might mean for the tours to be offline while they make these changes. The SEC member requested tour of the T-screen factory, so they were emailed about the date of July 16th for a possible tour in the morning. The interested members can email her to let her know they're interested. If many members want to participate, she can figure out a second date for a tour so that they don't run into Brown Act issues. She will send out protocols because this is an in-person, outdoor tour. The T-screen manufactures are going to stop production during the tour to make sure visitors are safe.

b. July 22nd SEC Meeting Topics

Ms. Mallon mentioned that Ms. Buckman wanted to do an update on the scoping process since the DWR is hoping to have a draft report in July. Ms. Buckman wanted to do a report of the results of the draft report. The DCA wants to talk about the work that has been done on how to rehabilitate the construction impacted land to return it back to original land use designations. To show the final, temporary, and permanent boundaries for sites from the map book with yellow boundaries. The DCA has gone through all of the sites and are trying to limit the space of land needed since there has been concern from the members regarding this. Mr. Bradner showed how much material that has to be hauled in between sites to build the pads. They will come back with final calculations for the amount of soil needed. Mr. Ryan and his team have spent a lot of time trying to reduce the footprint and the noise impacts around the pile driving near the river. The DCA hopes to have an updated map book to the members prior to the next meeting which will have both the red and yellow line boundaries and the updated locations that were in this presentation today. A new map book will be produced because of the shifting and re-sizing of sites.

Ms. Swenson asked if the members would drive themselves to the locations rather than driving together.

Ms. Parvizi responded that you could drive yourself to the location to do the self-guided tour or do the virtual tour option. For the T-screen tour everyone is responsible for getting themselves to the factory if they want to join.

Mr. Gloski asked for a report back from the members who are communicating with the DCA board and what was presented. What are the members taking away from the from the committee meetings? He wants the opinions of the members on this meeting and if they felt like they were listened to or if they got any take-aways.

Ms. Parvizi said she could send a video out to everyone of the meeting since the responses were so long and she doesn't want to take time away from these SEC meetings.
Ms. Runquist noted she drafts minutes a few weeks after the meeting so once she finalizes them, she can send them to whoever wants them. It says what each speaker said.

Ms. Parvizi asked if Mr. Gloski wants more of the opinions of the SEC members on the board meeting.

Mr. Gloski said that is important and wants to know if the speakers felt like they were listened to and if anything was taken away from them.

Mr. Nelson said that the board has flexibility with the next report and is willing to talk to Chair Palmer about what did and what didn't work well with past participants.

Ms. Palmer suggested that during item 6c, they can talk about what worked for the past participants. Would participants want to provide their own written report and a follow up of what they wanted to say so that their true views would be represented?

Ms. Keegan announced that a webinar starting tomorrow at 11, is happening for two weeks on the topic of history of the tribes in the Delta and communities of color and their relationship with the Delta. A lot of the research is primary sources that haven't been told before, you can find information on Twitter and their website, where videos will be put up. This might help clarify what drives some of their primary concerns.

Ms. Parvizi commented that she thinks this is important and is looking forward to it tomorrow.

Ms. Mallon said David should have some SEC members comment on what they thought and gathered from the last meeting. They could comment on the effectiveness of their participation from the last meeting was.

c. July 18th SEC Report to DCA Board

Ms. Palmer noted that in item 6c, they are going to identify members who are going to representatives to the DCA board and hear from past presenters and get their notes on what they thought did and did not go well last time.

Ms. Martinez said the DCA is going to have a report out on members who spoke and have them speak to the process and how it can be improved, if they feel heard and if they have comments from the last meeting. Anna, Sean, and Gil are going to report.

Mr. Cosio said he introduced himself, brought up history concerns with regard to COVID in the process. Brought up different examples of environmental impacts. The hall roads in the northern part of Stone Lakes and moving the shaft. Can't tell if people were listening due to the video format but there weren't a lot of questions. It wasn't a waste of time, however.

Ms. Swenson talked a lot about the community and the aspects that will be forever lost due to this project, no matter how well it is planned. The relationship with the farmers and the land is unique and highlighted all the things they're going to lose that will be detrimental to the community. After their presentation, they did a presentation on consultants on intakes from people all outside the Delta. Tried to gage body language but it's hard to do. She didn't feel heard because if they felt the way she and the community felt about this project they couldn't go through with it. However, she didn't feel it was a waste of time because good will eventually overcome bad. It's my duty to tell the truth about what will be lost in these communities. I want to know why they didn't do the roundtable because she found it beneficial.

Ms. Martinez said that's item 7.

Mr. Cosio wanted the DCA to hear Ms. Swenson and Mr. Wirth because of their passion because the committee is filled with passion and diversity throughout the Delta. The people he represents have been through this for a lot of years and they don't need a lot of information, but they want to know what the impacts are. The ability to explain that is interesting because it's not known what is done in the Delta. Anytime you get up and explain what you do to the DCA is helpful.

Ms. Palmer noted that she listened to the board members speak and noted that if people go over the time limit due to passion, she doesn't mind. I don't think the board members minded this. Listening to what is going on, like Mr. Wirth providing real changes, was excellent. Hearing Ms. Mallon give some of the reduction of impacts due to the changes is nice to hear. These changes come from the SEC members which is crucial to this process. The SEC members are definitely listened to and extra time due to passion isn't a bother.

Ms. Keegan thinks that all presenters were accurate of what she heard at the meeting. A lot of the presentations had to do with global concepts, history, and values. I had expected that more feedback on presentations would be given, like if traffic analysis was useful or if providing input on this process is useful to the project. There may be a need to express these big picture concepts in a way that's value driven.

Ms. Martinez noted that there really wasn't a time limit during the last meeting and that people needed to express themselves. There needs to be 2 or 3 volunteers for the next meeting. Mr. Gloski volunteered for the next meeting. If anyone else wants to present at the next board meeting, chat with Nazli to gather thoughts and visuals. The DCA doesn't out together presentations so that they don't filter what is being presented.

Ms. Palmer noted that Mr. Wirth used some slides given from the DCA.

Ms. Mallon said a public comment noted that Hood is being affected and it's true that a lot of construction is near Hood. Wondered if Ms. Whaley, who is in and familiar with Hood is available for the July board meeting.

Ms. Whaley said she would check her schedule and get back to them.

There was no public comment on item 6.

7. NON-AGENDIZED SEC QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla opened item 7 to the members.

Mr. Hsia shared that he compiled 2 reports since the lockdown and the link is posted on the Delta news and the Facebook pages of the Delta News and Water Grove. He recommended for people to go and look at them.

Ms. Parvizi said she can get the link from Douglas and send it to everyone.

Ms. Swenson said she's gotten a lot of public comment from members of Hood. There is a large amount of people who aren't fully informed about this project and need individualized information due to the deep impact happening there. Is there some way to hold a forum or something that would be helpful to disperse this information to them? COVID has limited her in-person abilities to inform them. Since they are getting affected so much, they have a right to know in order to prepare.

Ms. Parvizi asked if the DCA could work with Angelica and Anna to gather folks from Hood since Angelica works with small businesses and is a resident of Hood.

Ms. Swenson noted that she isn't a resident of Hood and she has left the meeting.

Ms. Parvizi would be happy to work with residents and Angelica and wants to create an update on effects on Hood to open discussion and do it in a webinar format.

Ms. Swenson said it would be humane to do that.

Mr. Hsia would like to also work with them.

Ms. Parvizi said she would love to work with anyone who is interested.

Ms. Mallon said that an open call and presentation would be great so that anyone from Hood can join.

Ms. Swenson noted they may need to setup a hotspot because Hood is an internet blackhole, which is why Hood residents aren't engaging in this conversation.

Mr. Robertson noted that infrastructure of bridges and ferries cannot handle all of the new traffic that is going to happen. Big construction and repair is happening but most of the infrastructure are one lane roads and I don't think people are questioning the fact that we need to look at those things. Every time I present, the number one discussion topics are the bridges and ferries and how people are going to get from point A to B.

Ms. Tabaya said that there was a tribal engagement meeting yesterday and they remained concerned about destruction of cultural and natural resources. The DCA are aware the tribes are paying a higher price and had a lot of questions for the DWR and are still waiting for responses. They had a meeting with the DWR and reconnected, there was discussion on what they want to do, like having the DWR report directly to the tribal group and the DCA. We were hoping that they could meet the Thursday before the SEC meeting. The reason for that is because the materials are hard to obtain. It's hard to understand engineering items and DCA would explain better. A lot of the materials I'm going to end up hand carrying to the tribes, we can see the ones who need extra help. Trying to determine where people are at having visitors in their areas. I stand behind the conversation regarding Hood because the intakes are on tribal boundaries. Their next meeting is on July 15th at 10 a.m.

Ms. Parvizi said that is the board meeting date so they will try to be flexible and find a date but the DCA will continue to try to coordinate with Melissa to get her the materials.

Ms. Martinez asked for more of the new map books to be printed and delivered to the tribes.

Ms. Parvizi said she would work on that.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS

No public comment.

9. NEXT MEETING

Ms. Keegan said the next meeting will be on July 22nd, 2020 from 3-6 PM. The topics include a scoping update on the DWR, the rehabilitation of construction impacted land, final temporary and permanent boundaries, and intakes updates. At that point we will have heard from the next group at the DCA board so if you're giving a presentation you will be giving your thoughts on how that went.

Ms. Giacoma asked if she could get a hard copy of the meeting materials as you did in the past.

Ms. Parvizi said she would do that and asked that if anyone else wants this to please email her.

Ms. Swenson asked how many more meetings are expected and if there is an end date that has been chosen.

Ms. Mallon said these meetings are budgeted for the next fiscal year, through June of 2021. There will come a time when we can scale the time back to 2 hours.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Keegan adjourned at 6:49 PM.