DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.01	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will there be real-time disclosure of existing issues discovered during soil testing or field work?	The actual draft and final soil testing results will be initially shared with property owners. If the property owners wish to disclose the information prior to publication of the geotechnical report, that information may be provided by the property owners. The geotechnical report will include the results of the soil testing. If any hazardous materials or other environmental hazards are encountered during the field work, property owners will be notified and notification of federal, state and local agencies in accordance with applicable laws and policies will be coordinated with the property owners.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.02	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Are you going to coordinate markers on each soil collection point so levee impacts can be tracked by RD's?	Yes. The exploration locations will be documented with a survey coordinates using current datums and a metallic pin will also be buried in the top of the wet backfill grout at each exploration to allow for future locating with metal detection equipment.	Graham Bradner	1/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.03	1/6/2020	David Gloski	Flow at the intake – At the last meeting someone asked about negative or reverse flow in the river at the intake. There was an instant response of no, never negative, but I sort of wonder what that looks like at high or low tide. That is a big issue out here and I personally would like to understand those flows at the intake during the complete tide cycle. Top, bottom, half tide rising (flooding), half tide falling (ebbing). At full "take" what are the flows just above, just below, and going out of the system? I assume that just below there is always a positive downstream cfs there even when it is peak flooding. Specific numbers like that would help. Probably good to do during the driest drought time, low river flow. If we can get those flows we, I, can put stuff like that to bed when talking with people.	The project would not significantly impact the magnitude of reverse flows that would already occur in the river/Delta system. The project would divert water until the tidal flow in the river approaches a preset minimum outward flow rate (i.e. towards the ocean). The diversion rate would be reduced proportional to the reduction in the outward river flow rate as the tide comes in. At some preset minimum outward river flow rate, diversions would be stopped by closure of the intakes. In summary, the project would only divert at the maximum capacity when the river flow rate exceeds a specific high preset outward flow rate. The diversion rate would be reduced in steps as the outgoing river flow rate declines and stop completely if the outward river flow rate reaches the preset minimum rate prior to a dominant incoming tidal flow rate. Flow histograms illustrating the river and diversion flow rates across tidal cycles will be generated from an extensive modeling process as part of preparation of the EIR.	Phil Ryan	1/22/2020	Responded
2.04	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Can we add to Map 8: Historical sites, cultural resources, Indian Burial grounds?	Public disclosure of the locations of archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources, including human remains, may make those resources vulnerable to theft and vandalism as well as be in violation of both federal and State laws. Because of this, these resources cannot be mapped for, or shared with, the public. Federal regulations include, but are not limited to, Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 United States Code [USC] § 307103) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC § 470h). State regulations include, but are not limited to, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq. and Section 6254 et seq. Other State regulations such as Public Resources Code Section 5097 et seq. and Health and Safety Code Section 7050 et seq. cover the unanticipated discovery and treatment of human remains.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.05	12/11/2019	Phillip Merlo	Is there a map reflecting the history of settlement of Native peoples (Mr. Merlo offered to help coordinate data collection)?	DWR, as the CEQA Lead Agency, will conduct a CEQA analysis on the proposed Delta Conveyance Project that includes analyzing potential impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources, including descriptions of the settlement of Native peoples in the project study area. However, DWR does not have a map of these settlements at this time.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.06	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will you be identifying and protecting native plant species around the Clifton Forebay used for tribal medicinal practices?	DWR, as the CEQA Lead Agency, will conduct a CEQA analysis on the proposed Delta Conveyance Project that includes analyzing potential impacts to biological, cultural, and tribal cultural resources among many other resource areas. To analyze potential impacts to biological resources, an evaluation of the project study area, including Clifton Court Forebay, will be conducted to identify plant communities and determine if existing conditions provide habitat for any special-status plant or wildlife species or is the location of any tribal cultural resources. As part of the cultural and tribal cultural resources review, DWR will be providing Tribes the opportunity, through consultation as required under AB 52 and DWR's own Tribal Engagement Policy, to share information concerning native plant species that are used for tribal medicinal practices and potential measures for avoidance or mitigation. Cultural Resources work will be initiated consistent with release of the Notice of Preparation. DWR has initiated pre-AB 52 discussions with the Tribes with potential ancestral territories in the Delta.	Carrie Buckman	1/22/2020	Responded
2.07	1/3/2020	Jim Wallace	NEPA is the National Environmental Policy Act, not ..."Protection" Act.	Yes, NEPA is an acronym for the National Environmental Policy Act; the glossary has been corrected	Nazli Parvizi	1/22/2020	Responded
2.08	12/27/2019	David Gloski	Directory for DCA employees?	DCA staff directory will be provided to SEC members at the January 22, 2020 meeting.	Nazli Parvizi	1/22/2020	Responded
2.09	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	What is the definition of "temporary" in terms of years?	The term "Temporary" in the CEQA document will be defined based on the resource area and the nature of the activity. As part of the initial EIR preparation, this term will be defined for each resource. Generally, for an EIR, "temporary impacts" range up to 2 years.	Carrie Buckman	Responded	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.10	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Who decides what a reasonable alternative is, what makes an alternative qualify as “reasonable” and to whom is the alternative deemed reasonable?	DWR, as the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), will decide the range of reasonable alternatives for the environmental impact report (EIR). CEQA requires that an EIR include a detailed analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to a proposed project. CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate alternatives to the proposed project that are potentially feasible and would attain most of the basic project objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening the project’s potential impacts. Likewise, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that a range of reasonable alternatives that meet the purpose and need statement of the action be analyzed at an equivalent level of detail in an environmental impact statement (EIS). Generally, a range of reasonable alternatives is analyzed to define the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among the options. CEQA requires that the lead agency consider alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project. However, numerous alternatives that have slight variations are not necessarily required. The lead agency determines the alternatives to be analyzed in detail in an EIR. Section 15126.6[a] of the State CEQA Guidelines provides that: [a]n EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public	Carrie Buckman	1/22/2020	Responded
2.11	12/11/2019	General	Clarification about how DWR will reflect and characterize SEC participation in the EIR?	See attached memo	Carrie Buckman	1/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.12	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Incorrect data on Map 7, cropscape is historically wrong. Will this be corrected?	The data presented in the "Land Use Map" at the December 2019 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting was actually a "Vegetation Map"and not a "Land Use Map." The map was based on 2016 satellite data. The DCA has acquired 2018 crop type data from United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and updated this map. The DCA has compiled land use data from adopted general plans of Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo counties and is developing a Land Use map to be presented in a March Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.13	12/11/2019	General	What constitutes a recreational facility in terms of representing sensitive receptors?	The map presented at the December Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting was prepared with information collected in past studies. The recreational areas shown on that map included fishing marinas, parks, and wildlife viewing areas, that could be affected by noise, light, and air quality emissions. The database used for this map also included support facilities for the recreation areas, such as power poles. The database has been updated using information from Californinia state agencies and the updated map with recreational facilities is being presented at the 2/26/20 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting. The database has been updated and a map including public schools, hospitals, fire stations and local law enforcement was developed to represent sensitive receptors. It is being presented at the 2/26/2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting. A separate map with publicly-available marinas, boat launches, refuges, and habitat preserves has been completed and is being presented at the 2/26/20 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting. This map was also developed in response to Comment 2-15.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.14	12/11/2019	General	Is there a map reflecting existing water infrastructure and facilities such as intakes, diversion works and conveyance facilities?	This map will be presented to the SEC during the February 12 meeting.	Karen Askeland	1/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.15	1/16/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Would it be possible for the upcoming packet to get a map with the alignment for the tunnel that has the following: 1) Highways, railroads -- any major infrastructure that is easy to label. It needs a few more markers for users. 2) A legend for miles. 3) Names of the islands through which it passes and refuges -- public boat launches if time permits. That would be helpful. It will make discussions easier. Across the board, people in the community are frustrated that the NOP map is hard to read. We understand that it may be more conceptual; my request is for readability.	All maps presented since January 2020 at the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings include major highways, railroads, legend in miles and names of the islands. A separate map with publicly-available launches, refuges, and habitat preserves has been completed and is being presented at the 2/26/20 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	1/22/2020	Responded
2.16	12/11/2019	Angelica Whaley	DWR plans for levee maintenance in regards to the intakes and flood protection?	The DCA is working with the US Army Corps of Engineers (levee owner) to ensure that the construction of the intakes poses no additional flood risk. The current plan for keeping the levees intact during intake construction was presented during the January 22, 2020 presentation on intakes. To address this issue, the DCA prepared a construction sequence animation which showed how the levee and flood management protection would be maintained throughout the entire construction period. This material is available online at dcdca.org.	Luke Miner	1/22/2020	Responded
2.17	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	How long the bridges have to be up and when for DCA construction barges?	There are two bridges on one of the potential barge routes (from West Sacramento to either barge landing) including the Rio Vista Bridge and Three Mile Slough Bridge. The operations timing of the bridge would be dependent on the specific bridge, river conditions and barge configuration, and is estimated to be 15 to 30 minutes at each bridge.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.18	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	What are round trip barge calculations?	This would be dependent on the port location, specific route, river conditions (including tide, flow, and wind), and barge configuration. For example, for the route between the Port of Stockton and Bouldin Island (a one-way route of 17 nautical miles), under ideal river conditions, the barge cycle could be completed in approximately 8 hours with 1 hour to load at the port, 2 hours transit to Bouldin Island, 2 hours to return to the port, and 1 hour to moor at the port.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.19	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Do the conveyor belts go across the island?	In order to reduce truck trips and roadway congestion, conveyor belts can be used to transport reusable tunnel material (RTM) from launch shaft sites to storage locations. RTM conveyance will be discussed further at February and March SEC meetings.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded
2.20	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Features that could end up being permanent?				For Future Discussion
2.21	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Fuel stations aesthetics, whether they will be temporary or permanent, if they will be underground or above-ground tanks, their proximity to schools and people and what safety operations are going to be used to ensure against contamination?	As currently proposed, fuel tanks would be located at the larger construction sites, including intakes, larger tunnel shaft sites, and the Southern Complex. During construction, the fuel tanks would be installed within security fences and would be above ground structures surrounded by lined spill-prevention facilities. During operations, fuel tanks would likely need to be located at the intakes and pumping plant for emergency engine generators. These fuel tanks also would be located above-ground within security fencing and lined spill-prevention facilities to protect surface water and groundwater. The fuel tanks would not be located within the high-water mark of any on-site or adjacent drainages. All fuel facilities would require permitting by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.22	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Batch plants effects on air quality?	Dust issues at batch plants primarily occur as the dry ingredients are mixed together prior to the addition of water to make the concrete, slurry, or grout. The batch plants would be required to install the equipment that receives and mixes the dry ingredients within a shelter that includes large fans and air filtration equipment to minimize particulate matter (dust) from leaving the construction site. DWR will complete a full analysis of the potential effects on air quality and potential mitigation measures as part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance effort.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
2.23	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Map that depicts an interaction with the bridges?	Related to barge routes, the only bridges along the potenial barge routes would be the Rio Vista Bridge and Three Mile Slough bridge for goods delivered from the Port of West Sacramento. No bridges would be crossed for goods delivered from the Port of Stockton or Port of Antioch. Goods delivered from ports along San Francisco and San Pablo Bays would need to pass under the Carquinez and Benicia railroad bridges. Related to roadway routes, several bridges could require modification depending upon the final roadway options, as are shown in the map books. No railway bridges would be affected by the construction; however, another bridge would be constructed adjacent to the railway bridge across the California Aqueduct and a roadway overcrossing would be constructed over the railway bridge near Holt, California.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.24	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Pile Drivers: How many sites, are they all at once, how close, duration?	Pile driving could be used at numerous locations of the Delta Conveyance project, including the intakes. The January 22, 2020 presentation on intakes described the potential need for pile driving at intake locations. The presentation included exhibits prepared by an acoustic engineer and quantified potential noise effects due to pile driving at the intake sites, and the potential for noise reduction with several construction methods. This material is available online at dcdca.org and further information on pile driving for other components will be presented at upcoming meetings.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.25	12/11/2019	Anna Swenson	Barges: Size, docking areas, bridges impact, how many barge trips per day, how many docks for barges?	There is currently only one barge landing for the Central Corridor at Bouldin Island and one barge landing for the Eastern Corridor at Lower Roberts Island. Each barge landing would be approximately 1,200 feet long along the bank of the river or slough and would be constructed into the existing levee to minimize extension into the waterway. The number of barge trips per day would depend upon the goods to be barged and the source location (e.g., Port of Stockton, Port of West Sacramento, Port of Antioch).	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.26	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Toxicity from soil strengthening, potential spread and impact on sloughs?	Ground improvement to strengthen the structural foundation of the soils would likely consist of a combination of excavation of unsuitable soils (such as peat soils), placement of compacted suitable and clean fill material to induce consolidation prior to final construction, and mechanically mixing of cement or similar materials to add soil strength. None of these actions would result in introduction of contaminants to the soil or groundwater aquifer.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
2.27	12/11/2019	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Air quality around port of Stockton from increased barge and train traffic?	DWR will analyze potential air quality impacts and mitigation as part of the EIR preparation.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
2.28	12/11/2019	David Gloski	What are the anticipated waterway rules and process when DCA construction barges are on the waterways?	Barge traffic along the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel and Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel would operate in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Port of West Sacramento and Port of Stockton, respectively. In addition, the barges and the associated tugboats would operate in accordance with requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard and the Division of Boating and Waterways of the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Notifications would be provided to the U.S. Coast Guard and local marinas.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.29	12/11/2019	General	How the testing, drying, run-off and on-site management of reusable tunnel material will work?	Covered in June SEC Meeting Materials	Luke Miner		Responded
2.30	12/11/2019	General	Specifics of tunneling process, machinery used, material derived and its treatment?	The February 12, 2020 meeting includes a presentation that describes the specifics of the tunneling process.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
2.31	12/11/2019	General	RTM testing, usage, drying, run-off and on-site management?	Covered in June SEC Meeting Materials	Luke Miner		Responded
2.32	12/11/2019	Gilbert Cosio	Specific discussions about the barge loading locations?	The Central Corridor currently includes a barge landing for Bouldin Island along Potato Slough. The Eastern Corridor currently includes one barge landing for Lower Roberts Island along the San Joaquin River/Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.	Jim Lorenzen		Responded
2.33	12/11/2019	Jim Wallace	Is there siting information available for burrow pits?	SEC Meetings 3-8 break the project up into individual components, each with their individual requirements for imported material. For components where a lot of import is needed, the presentations will include potential import sites and invite committee feedback to provide additional considerations.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded
2.34	12/11/2019	Karen Mann	How barges used by DCA during construction would affect the recreational activities in the waterways?	DWR will evaluate the potential effects of barge traffic and recreational navigation activities in the waterways as part of the EIR preparation.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.35	12/11/2019	Karen Mann	Waterways safety and usage during construction barging?	Barge traffic along the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel and Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel would operate in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Port of West Sacramento and Port of Stockton, respectively. In addition, the barges and the associated tugboats would operate in accordance with requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard and the Division of Boating and Waterways of the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Notifications would be provided to the U.S. Coast Guard and local marinas.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
2.36	12/27/2019	David Gloski	Fishless intake system? Finds it hard to believe there are no fish in there. Can you explain how this would be fishless including tiny fish?	Intake screens would be sized according to current State and Federal regulations which require that they be small enough to screen out juvenile salmonids and Delta Smelt. In accordance with current regulations, an intake water velocity of 0.2 feet per second would be required to ensure the safety of these fish as they swim close to the fish screens. This question from December 2019 was answered in the January 22 meeting in the presentation on intakes. The material is available online at dcdca.org.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.01	1/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Can we have the question tracking packet in a digital format?	We are working on a searchable Q&A database as a feature for our new website. In the meantime, our Q&A is updated online at www.dcdca.org a few days after our meetings and as needed. This can be found listed under the Round Table section link.	Nazli Parvizi	2/12/2020	Responded
3.02	1/22/2020	Karen Mann	Is there any chance we could have the maps which are being provided to SEC and Scope meetings to actually name the waterways and show the location of Marinas?	The DCA includes labels for the names of the waterways on maps produced for SEC meetings unless the additional text in combination with other information on the map would be difficult to read. A map with marinas will be provided at a future SEC meeting. The maps for the scoping meetings are part of the CEQA process; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Karen Askeland	2/12/2020	Responded
3.03	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	What possible impact will the project have on the Park District's several properties in the South-Central Delta that are under irrigation leases?	At this time the corridors shown in the NOP do not appear to include East Bay Regional Park District parks. The Central Corridor does include the land with the Contra Costa Water District intake along Old River; however, the future facilities would not be constructed in that parcel. If the irrigation leases are located on non-park lands, please indicate where those properties are located for further analyses.	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded
3.04	1/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Can members have access to the recent geotechnical data collected?	The geotechnical data currently being evaluated consist of project-specific data collected over the past years by DWR, supplemented by historic data from other agencies. The project data has been compiled and issued as part of the administrative record for prior environmental permitting for the California Waterfix project. The majority of the supplemental agency data are publicly available through Caltrans and the California State Water Resources Control Board. Water well data compiled by DWR is confidential and therefore cannot be shared. There are other limited data provided by specific agencies that are also subject to confidentiality requirements and therefore cannot be shared.	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.05	1/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Can we have the GPS coordinates of the three favorable intake sites?	The approximate GPS coordinates for the intakes described at the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting are provided below. As discussed in the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting, the intake sites are preliminary and sites may shift in location. These coordinates are for informational purposes only and are at the approximate center of the intake sites. Intake Latitude Longitude Intake 2 38.406611 -121.51307 Intake 3 38.380871 -121.518795 Intake 5 38.349012 -121.532294	Karen Askeland	2/12/2020	Responded
3.06	1/22/2020	Jim Wallace	Is there a possibility the geotechnical reports DWR is currently conducting could change where the intakes are located?	It is possible that geotechnical conditions may result in minor adjustments to facility locations within currently identified intake sites; however, major changes are not anticipated at this time.	Andrew Finney	2/12/2020	Responded
3.07	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	How will the new levee effect the other Delta levees?	The modified levees at the intake locations would be limited to a short lengths on either side of the intake, and would be designed to the most-current U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) standards. The modified levees would be designed based upon numerical evaluations of hydraulic and geotechnical effects on other levees upstream and downstream of the new intake, including the levees across the river from the intake. Per the USACE permit requirements under Clean Water Act, Section 408, the modified levees would be designed to not injure the function of the flood control project levees.	Graham Bradner	2/12/2020	Responded
3.08	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What are the calculations on the volume of sediment for these flows and for high water events?	Sediment removal quantity calculations at the intakes would be dependent on total diversion amounts which will be developed as DWR completes operational modeling for the EIR. Therefore, total annual amounts of sediment that could be removed at the intakes are unknown at this time. Based upon previous studies for intakes in this portion of the Sacramento River, sediment quantities removed at the intakes could range up to 10,000 cubic yards in a month with peak diversion flows.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.09	1/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Can you provide the truck trip estimates for operational traffic for hauling away sediment?	The estimated amount of sediment to be removed at the intakes will be calculated following the completion of the EIR operational modeling. When the sediment volumes are calculated, the number and frequency of trucks needed to haul sediment during operations will be calculated.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded
3.10	1/22/2020	Jim Wallace	How will this facility be kept operational once it is constructed considering the amount of dewatering that needs to occur?	The bottom of the sedimentation basins at the intakes would be located below the groundwater elevation. As described at the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting, the intakes, including the sediment basins, would be surrounded by a slurry wall. Slurry walls would serve to isolate the sediment basin volume from the surface water and groundwater to minimize the potential for seepage either into or out of the sedimentation basin. Based upon the geological information available for the intake locations, it appears that there are adequate clay lenses below the bottom of the sedimentation basin to isolate the intakes from surrounding groundwater. Therefore, it is currently not anticipated that the basins would require lining except for placement of riprap along the sides. Additional geotechnical investigations would be completed prior to design. The determination to provide linings for the basin would be based upon the additional geotechnical investigations.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.11	1/22/2020	Jim Wallace	Will the sediment basin be lined, and if not, will the basins be in groundwater from 4 or 5 feet below existing ground level and below? Does DCA expect the slurry walls to keep them out of the groundwater?	After construction, the water level in the facility would be higher than the surrounding groundwater. Also, the site would be surrounded by a slurry cutoff wall. Based upon existing geotechnical information, it is anticipated that the slurry walls would be extended to clay lenses to essentially isolate the site from surrounding surface water and groundwater. Dewatering would be expected to be a more significant issue during the early construction phases than during the operation phases. The DCA is currently evaluating the estimated dewatering needs to maintain groundwater levels suitable for construction. The DCA is also currently evaluating estimates for operational dewatering needs, which will be limited to periodically dewatering the basins for infrequent maintenance. At this time, only limited geotechnical data is available near the intake sites. Additional geotechnical investigations would be completed prior to design. Final determinations for protecting the sites from seepage into or out of the site and to quantify the dewatering needs would be revised following the geotechnical investigations.	Andrew Finney	2/12/2020	Responded
3.12	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	Is there any correlation with outside bends and in-migration and out-migration of fish?	See Attached "A"	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.13	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Can SEC members get answers to questions about the river bends even if it comes from fish biologists, since there is a difference of opinion within the fish biology community?	Consistent with the attached response to Comment 14, DWR intends to consider and document analyses and other relevant biological information supporting the assessment of siting, constructing, and operating intake facilities on the Sacramento River in the EIR. Input from fish biologists, as well as other relevant experts, and evaluation of alternatives using best available science, will be a key component of the environmental planning process going forward.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.14	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will the impact analysis of the fish screen brushing on the food web be performed to a microscopic level?	DWR plans to assess changes to primary and secondary productivity resulting from new operations as part of the analysis in the EIR. Operations and maintenance of the fish screens would be intended to minimize the buildup of biological material on the screen itself. If additional needs or details, with regard to finer-scale food web changes associated with the project, are identified through the scoping process or the effects analysis, those will be considered as well. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.15	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	Is there any consideration given to any type of unexpected wildlife that gets stuck in the sedimentation basin, such as monitoring of eggs?	The DCA intake analyses to date have focused on development of the fish screen configuration. Operational issues, including those related to wildlife management and protection, would be evaluated as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded
3.16	1/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	How will this facility be ensured to not kill Delta smelt, as has been reported to be happening at Clifton Forebay?	The proposed intakes will include fish screens specifically designed to exclude Delta smelt from entering the system prior to diversion using state-of-the-art fish screening meeting all regulatory requirements for Delta smelt as developed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Clifton Court Forebay is configured in a manner that fish screens cannot be installed at the existing inflow location to Clifton Court Forebay.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.17	1/22/2020	Sean Wirth	Is it possible to incorporate a riparian zone into the design of an intake facility, and would that be easier with the cylindrical tee screen or vertical flat plate type?	It could be possible to provide some type of vegetation at portions of the intake locations following construction. Riparian habitat disturbed upstream and downstream of the intake during construction could be replaced in accordance with USACE and DWR criteria. Other areas on the intake site could also be considered for habitat plantings. Upland habitat could be considered between the intake structure and the highway at the same elevation as the top of the levee. Irrigation could be provided to help facilitate the diversity of plants. These concepts would be independent of the type of intake screens.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded
3.18	1/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	What is the fish screen noise in decibels?	Specific decibel levels are not known for the screen cleaner mechanism. DCA anticipates further studies and analysis by acousticians.	Phil Ryan	2/12/2020	Responded
3.19	1/26/2020	Karen Mann	It was mentioned that there would be new barge routing and landing “overlay maps”. Do you know if they are available yet for either the proposed eastern route or the westerly (original route)?	The DCA is developing maps that indicate areas along the Delta waterways that could be used by different size barges, areas that may not support barge traffic, and the relative potential for waterways to support construction and operation of barge landings to serve potential construction sites within the NOP corridors (which included the Central and Eastern Corridors). The information will be used by DCA to determine the accessibility of potential tunnel launch shaft sites, as presented in the February 12, 2020 SEC meeting presentation.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded
3.20	1/22/2020	Karen Mann	Would the barge mapping change depending on which corridor is ultimately selected?	The DCA is developing maps that indicate areas along the Delta waterways that could be used by different size barges, areas that may not support barge traffic, and the relative potential for waterways to support construction and operation of barge landings to serve potential construction sites within the NOP corridors. The information will be used by DCA to determine the accessibility of potential tunnel launch shaft sites, as presented in the February 12, 2020 SEC meeting presentation.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.21	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Can you provide an effects comparison chart for SEC members to compare the effects between rail, barges and roads? The chart should include effects on water quality, boating, truck trips, etc.	The DCA is developing comparisons of many factors to identify locations of tunnel shafts, intakes, and forebays. There are numerous factors considered in these comparisons, including availability of road, rail, and barge access to construction locations. Examples of these comparisons will be discussed at the February 12, 2020 SEC meeting and subsequent SEC meetings. However, the environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance, including determination of effects on water quality, boating, traffic, recreation, and other environmental resources will be completed as part of the EIR by DWR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded
3.22	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	Are there yet any proposed locations for tunnel shafts?	Proposed shaft locations will be developed by the DCA and presented to DWR for final selection of alternatives to be evaluated in detail in the EIR. The initial basis of the DCA launch shaft siting analysis will be presented to the SEC during the February 12, 2020 presentation. During the February 26, 2020 SEC meeting, the DCA will ask the SEC for feedback to help finalize the proposed launch site locations.	Luke Miner	2/12/2020	Responded
3.23	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will there be discussion about the flow capacity used and will it be pressurized or not pressurized?	The NOP described the project with a capacity of 6,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) with a possible range in capacities of 3,000 to 7,500 cfs. At this time, the DCA is considering tunnel sizing design criteria for gravity flow from the intakes to the pumping plant near the Southern Forebay. The DCA is not considering design criteria for pressurized flow in the tunnel.	Terry Krause	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.24	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will there be real-time disclosure with water quality issues found during construction?	The State Water Resources Control Board or Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board will issue a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) permit to regulate water quality of stormwater and non-stormwater runoff from the construction sites. It is also possible that these regulatory agencies would issue a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit to regulate non-stormwater runoff from the construction sites. These permits would include monitoring and reporting requirements, such as the collecting and analyzing water samples of runoff from the construction site and in the receiving water body. The results of these analyses would be submitted to the regulatory agencies and could be posted to a publicly-available website.	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded
3.25	1/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Why aren't there more meetings in Antioch and Rio Vista? Concern that the scoping meetings are not broad enough for the project.	Locations, frequency, and times of scoping meetings are determined by DWR as part of preparation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. DWR informed us that four scoping meeting locations are in the Delta to provide multiple options for Delta residents, and that the venues were driven largely by space availability and size. DWR has indicated to us that the DWR staff would be available to attend additional meetings hosted by community groups to share information about the EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP) and to facilitate the submittal of scoping comments. DWR has assigned several staff to Delta Conveyance Project outreach, including staff that are actively reaching out to Disadvantaged / Environmental Justice Communities to schedule these types of meetings in locations convenient to the local groups. Anyone interested in more information about the EIR and associated scoping outreach, including for Disadvantaged / Environmental Justice communities, is encouraged to email the department at DeltaConveyance@water.ca.gov or contact their consultant, AG Innovations, at shelly@aginnovations.org; 707-823-6111 x 290. Please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Janet Barbieri	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.26	1/22/2020	Jesus Tarango	Can additional scoping meetings for Northern, Central and Southern tribes be held?	DWR identified scoping meetings as part of the environmental compliance effort. Based on feedback during initial scoping meetings, DWR is adding a scoping meeting in Redding. DWR is also planning to consult with interested tribes under Assembly Bill 52 and DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.27	1/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	Is the corridor that was proposed through the Deepwater Channel with an intake near Rio Vista still a possibility?	DWR did not identify the corridor through the Deep Water Ship Channel as part of the proposed project in the NOP. However, this approach may be considered as an alternative. These types of alternative concepts should be submitted to DWR through the scoping process for consideration during the alternatives formulation process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.28	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Why all of this for one region?	With these new proposed intake locations, the State Water Project would have greater flexibility to adapt to climate change, manage rising sea levels, function in the event of a natural disaster, and safely move water during high flow events. This project could deliver water to a broad geographic area to State Water Project Contractors and, potentially, Central Valley Project contractors.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.29	1/22/2020	Mike Hardesty	Will there be some information provided to the committee regarding hydraulic impacts such as water surface elevations and velocity?	DWR will perform hydraulic and hydrodynamic modeling for the proposed project and alternatives as part of the CEQA analysis. Modeling will be used to estimate changes in velocity and elevation in the waterways at intake locations and other locations in the Delta under different hydrologic conditions. This information will be presented as part of the CEQA process. DWR is planning a separate public outreach process related to CEQA to discuss this and other issues addressed by the EIR.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.30	1/25/2020	David Gloski	Asking for initial modeling results around intakes per a prior email. Drought in wet years, various tides including the slack tides, min and max take flows. Points of interest include the flows at the downstream end of the intake, and even of there is a stronger take on the upstream end of the intake leading to what is necessary or optimum size along the river.	DWR is modeling the proposed project and alternatives as part of the CEQA environmental analysis. DWR will identify operations criteria so that bypass flows (flows that remain in the Sacramento River immediately downstream of the new intakes) are sufficient to minimize impacts, including conditions that occur on the incoming (or upstream) tides in the river system. DWR is planning a separate public outreach process related to CEQA to discuss this and other issues addressed by the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.31	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Why were Southern California reservoirs full when Northern California reservoirs were empty during the last drought?	See Attached "B"	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.32	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	How much water is being pulled out and from where?	In the Notice of Preparation, DWR identified that the proposed project could divert up to 6,000 cfs with two intake facilities. These intake facilities are indicated on the NOP map along the Sacramento river between Freeport and the confluence with Sutter Slough. DWR would not be seeking new water rights for these diversions, but would apply to the State Water Resources Control Board change in the point of diversion for its existing water right.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.33	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Concerns include water quality, water levels rising and falling and how that will affect fish and plants?	DWR will assess potential impacts to fish and wildlife (including plants) and associated habitat during future environmental compliance activities, including the CEQA environmental review process. This includes potential changes in water quality conditions, as well as potential changes in surface water elevations and associated effects. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.34	1/22/2020	James Cox	Will the pile driving vibration effects on the fisheries be studied?	DWR will assess potential impacts to fish species as a result of pile driving vibration during future environmental compliance activities, including the CEQA environmental review process. In addition, it is expected future studies will be developed to gather more information on pile driving activities and associated effects, including potential alternative pile driving methods to reduce impacts to fish species. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
3.35	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	What effect will restoration plans and mitigation plans have on state parks?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance has not yet started. Mitigation plans have not been developed for the Project and restoration locations have not been identified. Preliminary mitigation and restoration information will be developed during the CEQA environmental analysis process. The environmental analysis is intended to identify potential impacts and, where feasible, potential mitigation for those impacts. DWR will assess potential impacts to State Parks through the CEQA environmental analysis process. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
3.36	1/22/2020	Michael Moran	What is the process in place for any undocumented cultural sites that might be discovered during construction?	DWR routinely includes a set of best management practices in construction contracts to address the potential for unanticipated discovery of archaeological materials. The environmental analysis will discuss the potential for impacts and will define mitigation measures aimed at reducing the potential for cultural resources to be disturbed or destroyed. This includes a measure that addresses the potential for "unanticipated discoveries" during construction, including specific requirements for tribal consultation, pre-construction awareness training, and requirements for stopping work in the vicinity of such discoveries until such time that a professional archaeologist is able to assess the discovery and work with DWR, in coordination with the appropriate regulatory and/or tribal authorities, to develop a plan for appropriate treatment. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded
4.01	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Does the project set up a system where taxpayers are paying for the construction and also for the ramifications of the construction?	As described in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (published January 15, 2020), the proposal is for physical improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) Delta conveyance system, as such project beneficiaries will pay project costs.	Gwen Buchholz	2/12/2020	Responded
4.02	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What construction is going to be happening simultaneously throughout the whole project?	At this point in the project, the sizes and locations of the facilities under the proposed project and the potential alternatives are being developed. As more information becomes defined, the construction schedules for facilities would be developed.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.03	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Is there a cumulative analysis in order to understand the true impact of the project, especially for AB 617 communities in Stockton who commute to Sacramento or the Bay Area for work?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cumulative impact analysis of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will also include air quality impact analysis. These results could be considered in relationship with items included in AB 617. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.04	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	When will members receive information about the cumulative impacts of the project?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cumulative impact analysis of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.05	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	How do you analyze the cumulative effects of existing chemicals combined with new chemicals introduced into the environment by the project?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe existing water quality and evaluate changes in water quality related to construction and operation of the proposed project and the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.06	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Will members be receiving a cumulative analysis of noise, air, water, etc. impacts for all the construction that will be taking place throughout the Delta?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cumulative impact analysis of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions as part of the EIR. The cumulative impact analysis will be completed for each environmental resource considered under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including noise, air quality, water flows, and water quality. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.07	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Has there been outreach done to COG's for traffic analysis, and what are the real economic impacts?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe existing and future traffic conditions without and with implementation of the proposed project or the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.08	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	How will increased barge, rail and truck traffic out of the Port of Stockton affect Stockton's economic recovery?	The EIR will describe existing and future conditions in accordance with adopted city and county plans. The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe existing and future road, rail, and navigation traffic conditions without and with implementation of the proposed project or the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.09	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What is the trade-off analysis between jobs generated by the project and potential jobs losses from small businesses that close due to construction?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will evaluate changes in employment in a range of sectors with implementation of the proposed project or the alternatives as compared to existing and future conditions without the project. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.10	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What kind of outreach is currently being done with the Port of Stockton?	The primary outreach effort to communities and agencies, including the Port of Stockton, will be conducted as part of DWR's EIR process. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.11	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Can you provide information about harmful algal blooms?	DWR will evaluate the potential for harmful algal blooms through a comparison of conditions with and without implementation of the project and alternatives. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.12	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	DWR's boring data should be released to SEC members without a PRA.	The geotechnical data currently being evaluated consist of summary reports, well drilling reports, and/or soil investigations by DWR (including flood projects), Caltrans, and other state agencies. These data files include confidential personal information (e.g., property owner names). Due to the confidential nature of these files, most of the individual well logs and soil borings cannot be released. Soil boring data was provided for several locations in previous conceptual engineering reports for canal alignments in the eastern and western Delta and a central-Delta tunnel alignment. Soil boring data was also summarized in the following reports as part of previous studies: • Draft Phase I Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Isolated Conveyance Facility West, 07-12-2010, DWR. • Draft Phase I Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report –	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.13	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	How far upstream and downstream will new infrastructure such as riprap or levee raises be put in place?	Transitions of the final restored highway location to the existing highway would extend about 1000 to 1500 feet upstream and downstream of the intake structures, depending on the site. The final roadway grade would include small levee raises (about 1-3 feet). Riprap would extend a few hundred feet, or less, upstream and downstream of the intake sheet pile training walls. The exact extent depends on the hydrodynamic modeling that has not yet been conducted.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.14	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	How far upstream and downstream will the levees be affected and what kind of mitigation will be used? How do changes to the East Bank affect the West Bank, and what kind of mitigation will be used?	Hydrodynamic modelng has not yet been conducted. However, it is expected from previous modeling that the intake structures would not materially impact the water levels in the river during high flows. The Project may reduce water levels at some time periods. Water level impacts are expected to be below the USACE threshold for action. Therefore, levee improvements for water level impacts upstream of the structures would not be expected to be necessary. Hydrodynamic modeling is also planned to be conducted to evaluate more localized erosive conditions, which could lead to the need for slope protection on some locations along the levees. Those impacts are expected to be limited to a few hundred feet, or less, upstream and downstream of the intake sheet pile training walls.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.15	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	Where will water pumped in the dewatering process go?	The dewatering water would be tested to determine if on-site treatment would be required prior to reuse or removal from the site. The treatment could range from removal of sediment to removal of other constituents. The treated water would be considered for on-site reuse, including use for dust control or mixing with slurry, grout, or cement materials. At this time, the volume of dewatering flows and water supplies have not been calculated for each construction site. Therefore, the need for off-site disposal of dewatering flows is not known. However, the dewatering flows would not be discharged to local drainages and stormwater facilities in a manner that would reduce capacity for continued use of these existing facilities by local lands or cause a rise in groundwater and seepage problems on lands adjacent to the drainages.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.16	2/12/2020	General	How will dewatering affect subsidence?	As described at the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting, the intake construction site would be surrounded by a slurry wall. Slurry walls would serve to isolate the site from surface water and groundwater to minimize the potential for seepage either into or out of the construction site. The construction activities would require minimum dewatering and would not affect short-term or long-term subsidence. Additionally, based upon the geological information available for the intake locations, it appears that there are adequate clay lenses below the excavations to isolate the site from surrounding groundwater.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.17	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	Why is the Western portion of the Delta not being considered for this project?	DWR did not identify a western corridor as part of the proposed project in the NOP. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.18	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What are the construction impacts of building the infrastructure needed to support the project, such as power lines, additional roads, barge landings, rail terminals, etc.?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe impacts to the physical, biological, and human environment related to construction and operation of the proposed project and the alternatives as part of the EIR. The description of the project and the alternatives prepared by the DCA will include the conveyance facilities and modifications to existing infrastructures, including modifications or new power lines, roads, railroads, and barge landings. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.19	2/12/2020	Mike Hardesty	What are the impacts to the hydrology, water levels and water quality in the areas around Prospect, Briar and Liberty, and how will those impacted be made whole?	Construction in the proposed central or eastern corridors would not occur near Prospect, Briar, or Liberty islands which are located in the western Delta and along the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel and lower Yolo Bypass. The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will describe impacts to hydrology, surface water elevations, and water quality throughout the Delta related to operation of the proposed project and the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.20	2/12/2020	Jim Cox	Why have intakes in the Delta at all?	DWR did not identify locations of intakes outside of the Delta as part of the proposed project in the NOP. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.21	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	How will you overcome the challenge of not disrupting RD routine levee maintenance during periods of high flood? How will we mitigate for the required seasonal and annual inspections to ensure reclamation districts are able to keep the community safe?	Reclamation Districts (RDs) have important requirements for maintenance, monitoring, and flood fighting. These efforts will need to continue during construction and operation of the Delta Conveyance facilities. During design, the DCA will coordinate with potentially affected RDs to understand their typical processes and annual schedules to minimize disruptions. The DCA will also work closely with the RDs to develop strategies and contingencies for high-water conditions to ensure their ability to maintain, monitor, and implement flood-fight activities during construction and operations.	Graham Bradner	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.22	2/12/2020	Isabella Gonzalez-Potter	Is there is a comparison document that compares WaterFix to the new proposed project and highlights the key differences from the administration's perspective and why those changes are being made?	In July 2017, DWR had previously approved a conveyance project in the Delta involving two tunnels referred to as "California WaterFix." In his State of the State address delivered February 12, 2019, Governor Newsom announced that he did not "support WaterFix as currently configured" but does "support a single tunnel." On April 29, 2019, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-10-19, directing several agencies to (among other things), "inventory and assess… [c]urrent planning to modernize conveyance through the Bay Delta with a new single tunnel project." The Governor's announcement and Executive Order led to DWR's withdrawal of all approvals and environmental compliance documentation associated with California WaterFix. The current CEQA process being completed by DWR will, as appropriate, utilize relevant information from the past environmental planning process for California WaterFix but the proposed project will include new alternatives and undergo a new stand-alone environmental analysis leading to issuance of a new EIR. It would be difficult to compare the California WaterFix alternatives to the new EIR alternatives because they are different projects and due to the time lapse, some analysis may be updated. of different assumptions used in the current CEQA process as compared to previous analyses. This comment could be related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.23	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Has there ever been three intakes of a similar size utilizing tee screens within the same proximity on the same river?	Intake fish screens constructed along the Sacramento River near the City of Sacramento or in the Delta were smaller than the intake fish screens being considered for the Delta Conveyance project.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.24	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Will acousticians conduct on-the-ground surveys in the actual Delta?	The DCA may consider on-site acoustical surveys near potential construction sites to develop site-specific noise reduction methods. These types of surveys would not be conducted until specific construction sites and methods have been developed.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.25	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Will the other levees across from the proposed intake sites will need to be raised, widened, etc.?	Since water level impacts would not be expected to require levee modifications, impacts to the bank opposite the intakes would be evaluated using the same river modeling described in a previous response regarding localized erosive conditions. Given the results of similar modeling previously conducted, impacts on the opposite bank would be expected to be minimal.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.26	2/12/2020	Mike Moran	Is there a possibility that the project itself could be used as a flood control mechanism?	DWR did not identify flood management as an objective of the Delta Conveyance project in the NOP. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.27	2/12/2020	Cecille Giacoma	What will be the impact of dewatering and excavation on aquifers?	As described at the January 22, 2020 SEC meeting, the intake construction site would be surrounded by a slurry wall. Slurry walls would serve to isolate the site from surface water and groundwater to minimize the potential for seepage either into or out of the construction site. The construction activities would require minimum dewatering and would not affect short-term or long-term subsidence. Additionally, based upon the geological information available for the intake locations, it appears that there are adequate clay lenses below the excavations to isolate the site from surrounding groundwater.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.28	2/12/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Can members have a detailed map identifying groundwater and aquifers in the Delta?	At this time, DCA does not have knowledge of detailed maps of the groundwater aquifers in the Delta that extend across county boundaries to form a uniform map or dataset. Agencies within Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo counties are currently preparing groundwater management plans in accordance with the California Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. Information from those efforts may be available in the future to prepare n uniform map.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.29	2/12/2020	Jim Cox	Where will water extracted during the dewatering process be disposed?	The dewatering water would be tested to determine if on-site treatment would be required prior to reuse or removal from the site. The treatment could range from removal of sediment to removal of other constituents. The treated water would be considered for on-site reuse, including use for dust control or mixing with slurry, grout, or cement materials. At this time, the volume of dewatering flows and water supplies have not been calculated for each construction site. Therefore, the need for off-site disposal of dewatering flows is not known. However, the dewatering flows would not be discharged to local drainages and stormwater facilities in a manner that would reduce capacity for continued use of these existing facilities by local lands or cause a rise in groundwater and seepage problems on lands adjacent to the drainages.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.30	2/12/2020	Jim Cox	Will the dewatering process create odors?	The largest extent of dewatering flows on the Delta Conveyance project construction sites would probably be from the vertical tunnel shaft locations which would extend less than 200 feet below the ground surface. During design, soil investigations would be conducted which would include observations of groundwater levels and odors from the borings. If odors, especially due to high sulfide constituents, are present during soil investigations, the on-site dewatering treatment process would include methods to minimize noxious odors on adjacent properties.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.31	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What can be done with soil to create habitat projects due to legacy mercury?	All soils excavated during construction, including reuseable tunnel material (RTM), would be tested for the presence of constituents, including mercury. The concentration of these constituents would be compared to criteria developed by the SWRCB, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service prior to use in habitat projects, as well any other disposal proposal. For soils with constituent concentrations higher than allowed criteria, soil treatment could be used to remove specific constituents or other disposal plans would be developed.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.32	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Do soil conditioners aggravate the methylenation of mercury?	The addition of soil conditioners (surfactants) is not anticipated to increase methyl mercury in the RTM.	Andrew Finney	2/26/2020	Responded
4.33	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What is seepage when tunnel segments are put together?	We do not expect seepage from connecting tunnel segments due to the construction method. The tunnel segments are put together within the cylindrical steel shield of the TBM and seepage is controlled by multiple wire brush seals as the segments are assembled together. The segments themselves are gasketed at all of the joints, essentially providing a completely sealed system.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.34	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What is air pollution from truck traffic and cement construction?	DWR will be analyzing air quality in the environmental review. This comment could be related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.35	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	How much noise will be produced by shaft boring process?	The shaft construction process would require a large crane or milling machine for the slurry panel excavation or panel excavator for if cutter soil mix panels were used. A second crane would be required to support operations for the panel construction (i.e. lifting the steel rebar reinforcing cages into the panel excavations). Based on current information, the loudest construction noise would generally be related to the motor noise from these two pieces of equipment.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.36	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	How many tons of concrete will be poured on the launch shaft site pads?	At a tunnel launch shaft, a gantry style crane probably would be used for support of the tunneling operations, and a temporary concrete pad would be constructed around the shaft to allow for rails of the crane supports and to provide a work area. The concrete pad would be temporary and would be removed following construction. The concrete pad could be approximately 189,000 square feet and about 6 inches thick, or approximately 3500 cubic yards. This amount of concrete would weigh approximately 7100 tons.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.37	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	How much peat dirt will be displaced in the process of excavating?	Excavated soils, with or without peat, would need to be managed on-site to prevent particulate matter, including dust and peat material, from leaving the construction site boundary. At the tunnel shaft locations, the excavated material (approximately 600 cubic yards from the vertical shaft excavation) would be placed in areas to be managed to allow for testing prior to disposal or reuse. This will be analyzed in the environmental document and any mitigation will be provided there. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Andrew Finney	2/26/2020	Responded
4.38	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	When peat dirt is displaced, what mitigation efforts will be made to make sure the peat doesn't increase the asthma problems in the Delta?	Excavated soils, with or without peat, would need to be managed on-site to prevent particulate matter, including dust and peat material, from leaving the construction site boundary. At the tunnel shaft locations, the excavated material (approximately 600 cubic yards from the vertical shaft excavation) would be placed in areas to be managed to allow for testing prior to disposal or reuse. This will be analyzed in the environmental document and any mitigation will be provided there. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.39	2/12/2020	Philip Merlo	What types of mitigation will be provided to schools in terms of noise, air quality and water quality?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of each environmental resource considered under CEQA, including noise, air quality, and water quality; and development of mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse effects. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.40	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	How many launch shaft pads are being proposed?	The potential tunnel alignments and shaft locations in the central and eastern corridor are still being developed. At this time, it appears that two tunnel launch shafts would be located within the footprint of the Southern Forebay and 2 to 3 tunnel launch shafts per corridor would be located to the north of the Southern Forebay.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.41	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Do soil conditioners need to be removed from the soil before it is reused?	Soil conditioners would only be removed from the RTM if determined to be necessary as part of the testing program. Generally, the expected concentrations of conditioners in the RTM would not affect whether RTM would be available for reuse or disposal.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.42	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	How is the safety of the soil determined?	The soil material coming out of the tunneling or shaft excavations would be conveyed to a Material Classification Area where it would be placed within smaller segregated areas. These areas would be tested to identify critical constituents related to the disposal or reuse of the RTM, including constituents that would identify the RTM for hazardous materials and contamination. Laboratory results would be used to define the appropriate, pre-approved storage, reuse or disposal locations.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.43	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Can the informational materials please represent barge and rail trips as round trips?	All data related to barge and rail trips presented to the Stakeholder Engagement Committee have been described as "round trips." Future presentations will include the specific units.	Luke Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.44	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Has there been anywhere a tunneling project with this magnitude, soil condition, length, etc. has ever been performed?	There are many places in the world where tunnels with similar features referenced have been constructed or are under construction, including tunnels at the Port of Miami, Hong Kong (China), Madrid (Spain), and Turkey.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.45	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	What is done with saltwater that is brought to the surface?	The dewatering water would be tested to determine if on-site treatment would be required prior to reuse or removal from the site. The treatment could range from removal of sediment to removal of other constituents. If the salinity is too high for on-site reuse or discharge to a receiving water body, on-site water treatment could be considered or the water would be discharged to a permitted disposal facility that allowed for discharge of water with the high salinity. During design, soil investigations would be conducted which would include observations of groundwater levels and quality.	Andrew Finney	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.46	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Is RTM subject to waste discharge requirements?	DWR's enviromental review process will evaluate permitting requirements for the proposed project and placement of the RTM at the construction site for either temporary or long-term storage may require compliance with specific measures in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, a type of Waste Discharge Permit issued by the SWRCB and Regional Water Quality Control Boards.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.47	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Do you plan to rehabilitate the levees at launch sites and to what level in order to protect construction operations?	The work areas at the tunnel launch sites would be placed on elevated pads to protect the site from the 200-year flood event, sea level rise, and wind fetch with a specified freeboard height.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.48	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Are there going to be activities such as dewatering, power lines or pipelines between the launch shafts, in addition to construction of the launch shaft sites?	All construction between tunnel shafts is anticipated to be located at the TBM below the ground. Dewatering would not occur along the tunnel alignment between tunnel shafts. No pipelines would be constructed along the tunnel alignment between tunnel shafts. Power line alignments have not been developed at this time.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.49	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Will the SEC members receive information about the soil and water testing program once it has been determined?	Initial soil investigation methods were proposed and are being evaluated through an Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (published in November 20, 2019) by DWR. Water quality testing programs have not been developed at this time.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.50	2/12/2020	Gil Cosio	Has DWR started consulting with tribes?	Tribal consultation is the responsibility of DWR. DWR is planning to consult with interested tribes as required by law.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.51	2/12/2020	Mike Moran	How should committee members treat hand-outs or other information provided by the public, especially when the source is not clear?	Hand-outs or similar information provided by members of the public should be treated as a public comment. Please ask DCA staff regarding the source of any information if it is unclear.	Josh Nelson	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.52	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Who is responsible for the weekly spoils testing reporting during construction?	During construction, testing of excavated soils would occur in compliance with monitoring requirements adopted by DWR in the Final EIR (with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan) and in permits obtained by DWR and the DCA, including Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans for construction programs. While the DCA would likely conduct most of the testing as part of the construction process, compliance with monitoring plans and permits is ulitmately the responsibility of DWR.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.53	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will DWR be publishing soil and water testing data for the public to see?	Initial soil investigation methods were proposed and are being evaluated through an Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (published in November 20, 2019) by DWR. Water quality testing programs have not been developed at this time.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.54	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	How frequently will HAB data be reported and how accessible will it be to the public?	Harmful Algal Blooms (HAB) data currently are not included in most Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan construction permits. Historically, analysis for potential for algal blooms in the Delta rely on operational assumptions, including diversion patterns at the north and south Delta intakes, that will be evaluated in the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.55	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	How many miles are between the Eastern Corridor's Launch Site B to the Port of Stockton?	The potential Launch Site B presented in the February 12, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting was approximately 3 to 4 miles from the Port of Stockton.	Graham Bradner	2/26/2020	Responded
4.56	2/12/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Has there been any analysis on how far away the top end of Launch Site B is from urban housing to the east and north?	The screening process presented in the February 12, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting considered avoidance of construction within adopted city spheres of influence boundaries. The initial launch shaft sites were at least one mile from housing.	Graham Bradner	2/26/2020	Responded
4.57	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Will conveyor belts will be moving RTM across farmland to the drying areas?	Conveyors could be located either within a construction site or parallel to roads to minimize vehicle use. The specific uses for conveyors are currently being developed and will be discussed at future Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.58	2/12/2020	Anna Swenson	Is the build still anticipated to take 13 years?	The preliminary construction schedule is currently estimated at 13 years. More detailed schedules are under development and would depend on identified tunnel drive lengths. Construction schedules will be discussed at future Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.59	2/12/2020	Peter Robertson	What is the anticipated labor load for each shift and the plan for caring and feeding of those individuals?	Labor estimates will be developed on a monthly basis for each construction sites. In addition, use of centralized parking areas, mobile food trucks, and centralized material consolidation centers are being considered as methods to reduce vehicle traffic during construction. These items will be discussed at future Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	Gwen Buchholz	2/26/2020	Responded
4.60	2/12/2020	Jim Cox	How close is this construction to residential areas?	Specific construction sites are still being identified. However, based on the tunnel launch shaft areas presented at the Stakeholder Engagement Meeting on February 12, 2020, the tunnel launch shaft would be at least one mile from residential areas.	Graham Bradner	2/26/2020	Responded
4.61	2/12/2020	Douglas Hsia	Is it feasible to use barges at all, since opening the bridges stops the traffic in both directions?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of road traffic on operable bridges to allow for barge traffic. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.62	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	Is new rail siding needed on existing rail lines if rail is used, or will DCA build a spur to the launch sites?	Currently, the DCA is considering construction of railyards adjacent to the railroad tracks at locations along the Interstate 5 corridor. Materials would be moved on conveyors and/or trucks from the new railyards to and from the tunnel launch sites. At the tunnel launch shafts in the southern Delta, the DCA is considering extension of the new sidings to the tunnel launch shaft sites. Any changes would be subject to environmental review.	Jim Lorenzen	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.63	2/12/2020	Karen Mann	How will pockets of gas and water be avoided during tunneling?	During the design phase, there will be an exploration program to identify and detect buried and/or abandoned water, natural gas and oil wells to allow for removal of the wells prior to tunnel construction. During construction, gas detection methods will be used for flammable gasses. The mechanisms used for tunnel liner construction would provide a sealed work area and protect the boring machine and workers from water intrusions.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.64	2/12/2020	Karen Mann	What effect does that (i.e., pockets of gas) have on the employees underground?	Tunnels would be constructed in accordance with the laws of the Tunnel Safety Orders (TSO) that are administered by Cal/OSHA to protect worker safety.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.65	2/12/2020	Karen Mann	What happens if you accidentally pierce a pocket of gas, oil or water during tunneling?	During construction, gas detection methods will be used for flammable gasses. The potential condition for encountering a gas or oil pocket is covered under the Tunnel Safety Orders administered by Cal/OSHA. These laws dictate the safe working environment as well as the conditions that may require removal of workers from the tunnel until they are mitigated. One of the most typical mitigations required includes increasing the amount of ventilation to the affected area. The mechanisms used for tunnel liner construction would provide a sealed work area and protect the boring machine and workers from water intrusions.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.66	2/12/2020	Mike Moran	How are the tunnels ventilated?	The equipment placed in the tunnel behind the TBM would include ventilation equipment, as will be discussed in upcoming Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.67	2/12/2020	Mike Moran	If the top of the tunnel is about 100 ft below surface, will these depths still be in the range of human habitation considering the deposition of the Delta over the years and sea level rise?	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cultural resources, including potential areas with human habitation. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.68	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	How will first responders be informed of all the construction and be able to respond to emergencies that occur in the tunnel?	Due to the lengths of the tunnel drives and the locations of the potential construction sites, first responders could be required to be located at most of the construction sites to provide response in the required time limits. With or without on-site first responders, all fire, police, ambulance, and hospitals in the area would be notified prior to and during construction of major construction activities and potential traffic considerations along roadways. The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of emergency services. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Phil Ryan	2/26/2020	Responded
4.69	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	How does tunneling operate in regards to potential for seismic issues due to the tunneling and the motion of the drives?	The greatest ground motions in a seismic event would occur near the ground surface. At the depths of the TBM and tunnel, the structure would probably tend to move together with the surrounding ground and not be adversely affected by seismic forces.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.70	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	What is the subsidence potential for hitting various unknowns such as sand lenses?	During the design phase, soil investigations would identify soil types and groundwater pressures by location to allow for planning of adequate soil conditioners and TBM face pressures. Control of the amount of ground loss through the TBM face would be an important factor in controlling the ground surface and reduce the potential of ground surface settlement. Conditioning of excavated soil would help to control movement of material through the screw auger. The TBM operator would coordinate the TBM advance rate with the amount of material moving through the screw auger and onto the transfer conveyor.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.71	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	How does tunneling work in an unconsolidated soil type?	The applied TBM face pressure would be balanced against the soil and groundwater pressure by the TBM operator.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.72	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	What is the seismic vulnerability of the tunnel itself?	The greatest ground motions in a seismic event would occur near the ground surface. At the depths of the TBM and tunnel, the structure would probably tend to move together with the surrounding ground and not be adversely affected by seismic forces.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.73	2/12/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	How is the lining of the tunnel rated on seismic strength?	The tunnel would be designed for seismic ground motions and forces generated using state-of-the-art seismic design modeling. Applicable engineering factors of safety for these dynamic forces would be used in the structural design.	John Caulfield	2/26/2020	Responded
4.74	2/12/2020	Sean Wirth	Can the SEC members provide the criteria they find important and have DCA perform additional studies to determine how that geography might change through refinement or by shifting the priority levels?	The purpose of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee is to create a forum for Delta stakeholders to provide input and feedback on technical/engineering issues. The DCA is interested in considering criteria identified by the Stakeholder Engagement Committee. However, it must be noted that this process is not part of DWR's CEQA process which will determine the impacts and identify necessary mitigation measures of the proposed project and alternatives.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.75	2/12/2020	Karen Mann	Should the committee also be considering different sites for the intakes?	DWR identified the general intake locations as part of the proposed project in the NOP. Alternative intake locations should be submitted to DWR through the scoping process for consideration during the alternatives formulation process. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Responded
4.76	2/12/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Can SEC members please have a copy of the Independent Technical Review Committee assessment results?	The Independent Technical Review Committee assessment is included in the handouts for the February 26, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting.	Luke Miner	2/26/2020	Responded
4.77	2/12/2020	General	Can members tour intake facilities to see examples of flat panel screens and cylindrical screens?	The DCA has scheduled tours of both corridors for up to 8 SEC members at a time, available on a first-come, first-served basis. Emails with dates and further coordination details have been sent to members. Please contact ValerieMartinez@dcdca.org to sign up.	Valerie Martinez	2/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.78	2/12/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Can members have a list of soil conditioners considered for use? What is the composition of soil conditioners?	Many different types and brands of conditioners are used in tunneling based upon soil conditions present along the alignment. Conditioners are generally categorized as foams, polymers and bentonites. On recent projects, DCA consultants have observed the use of Soilax S products (available from the manufacturer Boraid Products) which are surfactants (i.e. detergents) and mixed with clean water as a foaming conditioner. Sometimes, a cellulose product, like Soilax C, is added into the conditioner mix to provide added strength to the soap bubbles, which helps when the conditioner is injected into certain soil formations. Thickening agents, such as polymers and a bentonite (a naturally occurring clay), are also used for different soil conditions. These include such products available from Mapei Products. These are just examples of some products that could be used. The construction specifications would require any conditioners to be inert (chemically inactive).	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
4.79	2/12/2020	Jim Wallace	Is the project subject to the jurisdiction of the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA)?	MSHA has jurisdiction over mines (i.e., places where minerals are extracted) and related facilities. This does not include water conveyance tunnels. (MSHA Program Policy Manual, Section I.4-1) The proposed project would not qualify as a mine.	Josh Nelson	2/26/2020	Responded
3.37	1/22/2020	Malissa Tayaba	Do people in Southern California know that the project is impacting villages in Northern California?	DWR has initiated environmental analysis for Delta Conveyance through issuance of the NOP. The environmental analysis is intended to identify potential impacts and, where feasible, potential mitigation for significant impacts. DWR will notify interested parties, including the public, throughout the State, including areas in southern California, as a part of the CEQA environmental review process. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	2/12/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
4.80	2/13/2020	Gil Cosio	A report from DWR documented their observation of cracking that occurred on the Grand Island Steamboat Slough levee during the last drought. As I mentioned yesterday, my observations, which were confirmed by an independent geotechnical engineer hired by Mr. Knickerbocker, lead to the conclusion that the loss of moisture due to the presence of trees on the levee slope and along the property line near the house caused subsidence and cracking of the ground and levee. This is a common feature on levees where trees exist near the landside levee crown, however, this case is much more severe based on the number of trees. It's my concern that as the water table drops during dewatering, the same will occur on a much larger basis as the porous sands (some borings have even shown gravels) in the soil column settle.	DCA intends to provide a response at a future meeting.	Gwen Buchholz and Carrie Buckman	2/26/2020	Follow Up
5.01	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Where are the alternatives that are being suggested in scoping meetings?	Alternatives are developed by DWR as part of completion the EIR in accordance with CEQA, including consideration of scoping comments. Scoping comments will inform the development of alternatives. At this time, DWR has only asked DCA to evaluate the proposed project corridors specified in the NOP. Because it is more cost-effective to evaluate different flow capacities at one time, DWR also asked DCA to evaluate a flow capacity of 6,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) and three different flow capacities as alternatives (3,000, 4,500, and 7,500 cfs). However, it is not a commitment that the alternate flow capacities will be analyzed in detail as alternatives.	Carrie Buckman		Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.02	2/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Will the alternatives that come out of the CEQA process based off of scoping comments be given the same consideration as the options being presented to the SEC?	All options suggested during the scoping process will be analyzed for their ability to meet the project objectives and/or reduce environmental effects. Based upon the review of the options, DWR will determine which alternatives will move forward for further analysis in the EIR. Many of the scoping comments that have been submitted at this time include a wide range of options to be considered. At the end of the scoping process, the entire range of options will be reviewed, and a final range of alternatives will be identified to be included in the EIR for analysis at a similar level of detail.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.03	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	If the Central Corridor really isn't feasible engineering wise, is it really worth the committee's time?	The ITR report is merely a single data point. As such, it is being considered with the evaluation results of many design, construction, and operations considerations. The ITR report only considered a subset of the engineering and geographical issues relevant to tunnel construction activities as noted by several tunnel construction contractors and tunnel manufacturers, and does not represent detailed conclusions about Central or Eastern Corridor options. Moreover, the ITR expressly did not consider other relevant environmental factors that will be consider through the CEQA process.	Phil Ryan	3/11/2020	Responded
5.04	2/26/2020	General	Inform SEC members immediately when there is a technical report released that may be of concern or interest to the community.	As future ITR reviews are completed, that information will be provided to the SEC. However, consistent with prior DCA Board direction, ITRs will be publicly presented at DCA Board meetings.	Kathryn Mallon	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.05	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	The ITR report also there are no active fault crossings in the Delta conveyance alignment and that seismic demands are not extreme compared to other projects, and the DCA indicated it agreed on that statement. Why are we building tunnels if seismic issues are not a concern?	The ITR report's note reflects the fact that the current tunnel corridors do not contain active faults and tunneling options themselves would not be uniquely affected by seismic considerations. It was not expressing any opinion regarding the need for or benefit of Delta Conveyance for providing increased seismic reliability to the State Water Project. On this point and in 2014, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) estimated that there was a 72 percent probability of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake (a "major event") occurring in the San Francisco Bay Area by 2043. Levees in portions of the Delta could be at risk of failure in the event of a "major event," such as an earthquake of at least magnitude 6.7. If the levee failures occur in portions of the western, central, or southern Delta, the reliability of freshwater SWP diversions at Clifton Court Forebay could be compromised.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.06	2/26/2020	Douglas Hsia	Should add tribal and historic sites to the evaluation matrix for launch shaft siting.	The environmental impact analysis for Delta Conveyance will include evaluation of cultural resources and historic sites.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.07	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	The DCA should first propose a design and then ask the community what benefits DCA could provide to them.	The SEC meetings that started in December 2019 and will continue at this time have sought SEC feedback on siting design of individual features. The March 11 SEC meeting will present the siting and basic design of each feature and will seek SEC feedback on these topics. The reason that this has not been presented earlier is that the siting and design for this project has only recently progressed to this level, and is continuing to be updated for consideration in the EIR.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.08	2/26/2020	Barbara Keegan	How does the community benefits discussion fit into the CEQA process?	The CEQA process will evaluate benefits, as well as adverse effects, of the alternatives. If there are items related to consideration of developing community benefits as part of an option; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.09	2/26/2020	Barbara Keegan	Request for a time frame of the community benefits discussion to be provided at the next meeting.	Opportunities to include community benefits will be discussed at future SEC meetings following presentation of the DCA plans for the initial options. If there are items related to consideration of developing community benefits as part of an option, please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.10	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Could members have a tour of the proposed intake sites in order to better understand where the facilities would be sited?	DCA will add a tour of the proposed intake sites to the list of tours DCA staff is currently arranging.			Responded
5.11	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	At the last meeting, a letter from a member was shared that said the intakes at these locations could not be approved by the Water Resources Control Board and Delta Stewardship Council during the WaterFix project. What has changed since the previous project to make the proposed intake sites viable?	This statement does not accurately reflect the history of the California WaterFix project. During the previous California WaterFix project, the evaluation of the application for Change in Point of Diversion to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the appeal of the Certification of Consistency by the Delta Stewardship Council were not completed because the California WaterFix project was withdrawn. Although there were many questions discussed in hearings conducted through these processes and requests for additional information, the change petition and Certification of Consistency process did not make final findings regarding on the previous project. As the Delta Conveyance Project continues, new water rights applications and Certification of Consistency, as well as many other permit applications, are expected to be prepared for review by the regulatory agencies.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.12	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Heritage would be an important factor to add to the siting ranking criteria. In one of the previous meetings a comment was made about staying out of environmental considerations. How can at least some high-level aspects of environmental considerations be completely disregarded in the ranking of potential sites?	The DCA siting analyses presented at the SEC are focused on design and construction considerations of physical facilities. Environmental considerations will be evaluated as part of CEQA and may require iterative review of sites through the engineering siting studies. The EIR will describe impacts to the physical, biological, and human environment, including considerations for heritage uses, related to construction and operation of the proposed project and the alternatives as part of the EIR. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.13	2/26/2020	Barbara Keegan	It would be important to put the ITR into context, including how the ITR is the opinion of one group of people.	The ITR report is merely a single data point. As such, it is being considered with the evaluation results of many design, construction, and operations considerations. The ITR report only considered a subset of the engineering and geographical issues relevant to tunnel construction activities as noted by several tunnel construction contractors and tunnel manufacturers, and does not represent detailed conclusions about Central or Eastern Corridor options. Moreover, the ITR expressly did not consider other relevant enviromental factors that will be consider through the CEQA process.	Phil Ryan	3/11/2020	Responded
5.14	2/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	The proposed project is a 40-foot diameter TBM that is tunneling 40 miles. There may be four TBM's, but the process is the same. What happens if the TBM gets stuck? What about safety in the tunnels?	There will be multiple TBM's on the project and they are all expected to utilize a pressurized face method of excavation (Earth Pressure Balance and/or Slurry Shield TBMs). Maintenance shaft spacing would be about every 5 miles and would be sized to allow for major repairs of the TBM at those locations, if necessary. Because the TBM would have major maintenance reviews and repairs approximately every 5 miles, it would not require major repairs between the shafts. The specifications would also require that many of the major TBM parts like the main bearing, seals, and other parts would be replaceable from within the tunnel in case some repairs are necessary between shafts. This approach is actually more conservative than that recommended by the ITR. Worker safety in tunnels is dictated by the regulations provided under Cal/OSHA's Tunnel Safety Orders, which are very prescriptive in terms of the working conditions for such essential items as adequate ventilation, illumination, ingress/egress, and other items to comprehensively address worker safety.	Graham Bradner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.15	2/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Will the ITR's recommended adjustments to the NOP corridors be considered as an alternative?	The ITR team's recommendation will be considered as an option in the scoping process in the same way that other suggested options are considered. DWR will evaluate the options to develop alternatives that will reduce impacts.	Phil Ryan	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.16	2/26/2020	Jesus Tarango	What economics effects will we see if those people reliant on the Delta lose its use?	The EIR will include evaluations of land use, agricultural use, population and housing, aesthetics, public services, recreation, and utilities that could be used by people who rely upon the Delta for their work and homes. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
5.17	2/26/2020	Jesus Tarango	Why are the tribes being forced to sit idly by while they watch the destruction of land that we once called home to our ancestors and remain the final resting place for so many?	The EIR will include evaluation of historic land use and cultural resources associated with people who are presently and historically with the Delta. Tribal consultation is the responsibility of DWR. DWR is planning to consult with interested tribes as required by law. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.18	2/26/2020	Jim Cox	How long would it take a salmon fry to move past ¼ mile of intakes and how many times would that fry have to swim back out of the flow? Is it possible that the outgoing tide at the lower end of the screen will be full of dead fish that didn't have the stamina to continue swimming for the entire length of the intake, and how has that been factored into the design?	The fish passage time across the intakes would depend upon the flow velocity in the Sacramento River, depth of the water, and fish swimming patterns across the river and along the river banks, which varies by fish species. The intake would be designed and permitted in accordance with design criteria established by fish biologists for the National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The permit is likely to include many items, such as requirements for fish refugia along the intake structure to provide a space without fish screens to allow fish to rest. During the permitting process, fisheries biologists will be analyzing the effects of the intake structures and screens on a range of fisheries species, including Delta smelt, salmon, and steelhead. This comment is related to the scope of DWR's EIR and other permitting processes; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.19	2/26/2020	Angelica Whaley	Does the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) undergo the CEQA process in their decision as to where the intakes would go?	The criteria developed by the regulatory agencies, such as California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the federal fishery agencies, have undergone peer review. Application of the criteria are part of description of the alternatives in the EIR and evaluated in the EIR in accordance with CEQA.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.20	2/26/2020	Angelica Whaley	Is there an option to have more intakes with a smaller capacity?	DWR identified three intake locations and a range of capacities to be considered in the NOP, and asked the DCA to develop plans for these options. This comment considering additional options is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Phil Ryan	3/11/2020	Responded
5.21	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Why does the tunnel need to go 40 miles when it looks like there is a straight shot from around Antioch to Clifton Forebay?	DWR identified the proposed project with intakes to be located along the Sacramento River to the north of Walnut Grove and a tunnel that would extend to a Southern Forebay near Clifton Court Forebay. This comment considering additional options is related to the scope of DWR's EIR; please consider submitting this comment through DWR's CEQA scoping process.	Gwen Buchholz	3/11/2020	Responded
5.22	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Would tunnel segments still be lowered into the tunnel from launch shafts even if there was a maintenance shaft available?	As currently propossed, the maintenance shaft sites would only be sized to remove the cutter head. The launch shaft sites would be sized to lift the segments into the tunnel, tunnel boring machine trailing gear, and reusable tunnel material handling and storage. The large launch shaft site would only be required every 12 to 15 miles.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.23	2/26/2020	David Gloski	What is the power source for the tunnel cutter head?	As currently proposeed, a dedicated high-voltage power supply would be connected to the launch shaft sites to power the tunnel boring machine cutter head.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.24	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Do any of the images or videos shared show tunneling through peat soils?	The demonstrations shown likely did not show peat soils. For the Delta Conveyance tunnel, based upon existing available geotechnical information, peat soils would not exist at the depths of the tunnel excavation (approximately greater than 100 feet below the ground surface).	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.25	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	How does the project team know about the soil composition at the depths of the tunnel, which is over 100 feet below the surface?	The geotechnical team has collated data from soil borings conducted not only for the prior project but from other construction projects across the Delta, including design documents for roads, bridges and levee improvements. Based on this data, there is a reasonable understanding of the depth of the competent soils. While there is still some information that needs to be obtained, it appears that the tunnel would not be constructed in peat soils. Additional geotechnical information would be collected prior to the completion of design. If peat soils occurred at depths considered for the tunnel, the design would be modified to lower the tunnel to competent soils below the peat soils.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.26	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	What happens if a levee surrounding a shaft site breaks, since the shafts will be built on islands that are lower than the surrounding levees? How will the shafts not fill with water if a surrounding levee fails?	The Delta Conveyance project facilities, including tunnel shafts that are currently proposed to remain following construction, would be constructed at elevations greater than the 200-year flood event and projected sea level rise at Year 2100 with considerations for freeboard and wind fetch waves.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.27	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	If heavy concrete is put on top of these soils, how will the sites be stable?	As currently proposed, the shaft would be constructed with a diaphragm wall or concrete shell that would extend to the bottom of tunnel where there are structurally competent soils; and therefore, the tunnel shaft would not be expected to settle. The soil on top of the ground at the shaft locations would be treated with ground improvement methods, as necessary to stabilize the site for equipment and the shaft pads.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.28	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Does the project include plans to eliminate critters that eat away at the levees?	Vector control is an ongoing issue for level maintenance. The Delta Conveyance project would not affect the continued levee maintenance activities of the existing reclamation districts and levee agencies, including vector control.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.29	2/26/2020	Douglas Hsia	Are the maintenance and retrieval shafts being kept or filled after construction of the project?	Decisions about the post-construction design have not been completed. There are many considerations currently being discussed, including not removing the shafts to allow for access into the tunnel and minimize truck traffic to remove the soil used to form the tunnel shaft pad. If the shaft pads were removed, concrete or other structures would be used to cap the shaft at the ground surface.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.30	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What flood standard is being used to determine the height of the shaft pads compared to what DWR has analyzed in the fourth climate change assessment for storm surge and downstream flood risk?	Over the lifetime of the Delta Conveyance Project, the facilities would be designed for the 200-year flood event, projected sea level rise for Year 2100, freeboard criteria, and wind fetch waves. The sea level rise would be consider the Ocean Protection Council's guidance. The criteria do not require that the facilities need to be initially designed for the Year 2100 sea level rise; but be designed to be adaptable over time to protect the facilities with sea level rise.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded
5.31	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	It would be helpful if there was a map that could provide where all of the shafts would be located in order to understand how much prime ag land would be taken and rendered useless for the project.	Locations of potential facilities, at this time, will be presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting. However, these locations could change in the future.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.32	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Soil test results have been previously requested and members are still waiting for those results. Members would like the data to see for themselves and not be told that the DCA disagrees with the results because they are from a different contractor than the one DCA wants to use. Borings have been taken for the past 7 years. Can members please have the soil analysis results from those borings?	The geotechnical data currently being evaluated consist of summary reports, well drilling reports, and/or soil investigations by DWR (including flood projects), Caltrans, and other state agencies. These data files include confidential personal information (e.g., property owner names). Due to the confidential nature of these files, most of the individual well logs and soil borings cannot be released. Soil boring data was provided for several locations in previous conceptual engineering reports for canal alignments in the eastern and western Delta and a central-Delta tunnel alignment. Soil boring data was also summarized in the following reports apart of previous studies: • Draft Phase I Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Isolated Conveyance Facility West, 07-12-2010, DWR. • Draft Phase I Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Isolated Conveyance Facility East, 07-12-2010, DWR. • Draft Phase II Geotechnical Investigation – Geotechnical Data Report – Pipeline/Tunnel Option, 08-22-2011, DWR.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.33	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Can members also have a map with approximate locations of all the project components along the NOP corridors as well as the alignment suggested by the ITR team?	Locations of potential facilities, at this time, will be presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting. DWR will review the options suggested by the ITR to formulate the alternatives to be considered in detail in the EIR. Any additional locations or considerations for facilities will be evaluated by the DCA based upon requests from DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.34	2/26/2020	Mike Moran	Does the slide showing truck trips per day reflect the number for one shaft or for multiple shafts? Are all of the shafts constructed simultaneously or is their construction staggered?	The data in the presentation was shown for one launch, maintenance, or reception shaft site. The launch shafts would be located approximately 15 miles from the reception shaft with maintenance shafts located approximately every 5 miles between the launch and reception shafts. Several tunnel boring machines could be operating at launch shafts simultaneously; however, the schedules have not been completed at this time.	Gwen Buchholz	3/11/2020	Responded
5.35	2/26/2020	Mike Moran	Would construction of the maintenance and reception shafts utilize the same staging areas (parking lots, roads, etc.) as the launch shafts?	The locations of the maintenance, reception and launch shafts would be in separate locations so access, support and staging facilities would also be separate.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.36	2/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Are the safe haven shafts included as part of the planned components or if they are only created in case of emergency?	In the previous project, "safe haven" shafts were identified to allow for maintenance and repair of the tunnel boring machine outside of the tunnel. These shafts are referred to as "maintenance shafts" in the Delta Conveyance Project.		3/11/2020	Responded
5.37	2/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	The ITR report sought to determine if CEQA could have an approach for the unknowns. How can that comment be assimilated? The Big Bertha TBM used on the Alaska Way Viaduct got stuck 1,000ft. into the tunnel drive. How is that type of possibility going to be addressed from the engineering point of view?	During the ITR team review, it was discussed that use of maintenance shafts approximately every 5 miles with full maintenance procedures at those shafts would substantially reduce the probability of failure between shafts. In addition, it is understood that tunnel boring machine technology is continually evolving and many of the maintenance procedures can be completed from within the tunnel. The ITR team documented one case study which included a main bearing being replaced from inside the tunnel. Technology will continue to change significantly five years from now when the Delta Conveyance Project is projected to be under construction. During the design phase, additional ITR reviews will be conducted to incorporate new technologies. DCA is being conservative in planning full maintenance shafts every five miles in order to avoid the need for an emergency shaft.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.38	2/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	In order to provide adequate comments on any questionnaires or proposed siting, we need actual maps and coordinates. Stakeholders primarily want to know if it the project comes through their property.	Locations of potential facilities, at this time, will be presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting. However, these locations could change in the future.	Andrew Finney	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.39	2/26/2020	Douglas Hsia	Request for the compensation calculations for landowners displaced due to shaft construction or underground tunneling.	DWR has not initiated any considerations for compensation programs at this time. DWR will initiate these considerations following development and analyses of the alternatives.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
5.40	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Was the road access quality rating based on the quality for Delta residents or for the construction vehicles?	The rankings of roads presented at the February 26, 2020 SEC meeting were primarily based upon driving conditions for construction vehicles, including the presence of tight bends and turns and other factors.	Andrew	3/11/2020	Responded
5.41	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Where did the road quality data come from?	The DCA team members drove along the routes, reviewed pavement ratings published by potentially affected cities and counties, and information compiled for previous projects in the area.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
5.42	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	What are Mr. Bradner's qualifications to accurately survey roads?	Mr. Bradner used the information compiled by other DCA team members to identify potential sites for shaft locations. The DCA team includes transportation engineers who are familiar with road and pavement evaluations, railroads, and barges.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.43	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Should verify the schools in all areas are reflected on the map.	The DCA has reviewed the maps with school locations. There are three schools in Clarksburg in the GIS metadata; however, the school "markers" on the map are not discernable due to the scale of the maps presented at the SEC meeting.	Carrie Buckman	3/11/2020	Responded
5.44	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	Are the railroads just being considering for siding to off-load equipment and take muck south, or is the DCA still considering spurs? The purpose of the question is that the railroad parallels Franklin Blvd and the rail beds are about 8 or 9 feet higher than the road. It seems like it would take maybe a 2-mile spur to get off and get back on the main line.	Rail-served material depots with rail sidings for unit or manifest trains are being considered near Franklin Boulevard and Twin Cities Road and near Byron Highway and Southern Forebay location for both the Central and Eastern corridors; and on King Island for the Eastern Corridor.	Graham Bradner	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.45	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	There will need to be a drive route along both corridor options that her group can evaluate independently. SEC members need their own checklists for what to see and evaluate that is independent from the DCA, but there will be issues accessing certain places like Bouldin and Rindge Tract. Perhaps a bus tour or a led tour with a caravan is the answer, but it is essential to try to put the pieces together and would enable a better response.	DCA will add a tour of the proposed intake and launch shaft sites to the list of tours DCA staff is currently arranging.	Graham Bradner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.46	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Recommended Rose Marie charter boat currently docked at Tower Park Marina to tour both corridor options.	DCA will consider this transportation option for future tours.	Graham Bradner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.47	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Having accessors' parcel numbers on printed maps during the tour available would be helpful.	Locations of potential facilities, at this time, will be presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting. However, these locations could change in the future. The maps include parcel lines. Specific assessor parcel numbers have not been included on the map for readability. The DCA does have a list of the assessor parcel numbers for the facilities shown on the maps presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	3/11/2020	Responded
5.48	2/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Are the launch shafts about 100 acres?	The size of the tunnel launch shaft construction area would be based upon the drive length between the launch shaft and the reception shaft because the launch shaft location would include area for tunnel segment storage, RTM testing, RTM dewatering and treatment, and RTM storage. The longer drives would need more area for tunnel segment storage and RTM handling and storage. For each launch shaft, the area could range from 250 to over 400 acres.	Jim Lorenzen	3/11/2020	Responded
5.49	2/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Are the maintenance and retrieval shafts about 10 acres?	The maintenance and reception shaft construction areas would be approximately 10 acres in size.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
5.50	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Has DCA determined if these trestle bridges would be a hazard for either the trains or the workers in the dig areas? Will the TBM be tunneling under the bridges?	The tunnel alignment would be constructed over 120 feet below the ground surface, including foundations of trestle bridges. Prior to the completion of design, geotechnical field investigations would identify the soil types/location as well as the groundwater pressures along the entire alignment, including areas of concern such as levees and bridge foundations. Based upon the results of the geotechnical information, the TBM operator would control the rate of boring to minimize changes in the soil structure above and below the tunnel boring machine.	Luke Miner	3/11/2020	Responded
5.51	2/26/2020	Karen Mann	Where would barges be parked at nights and on weekends?	As currently proposed, barges would only be used to place riprap at the intake sites at the completion of the construction. This would take up to two days at each intake and may result in the barge being anchored overnight. The barges would be marked with lights to protect other water vessels and the Coast Guard would be notified concerning all barge routes and anchorages.	Gwen Buchholz	11/5/2020	Responded
5.52	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Asked about the timing of the scoping meetings. A ton more scoping letters would have been received by residents from Locke and Walnut Grove if they were aware of not only the intakes but about all the other project components that are required. It feels like the scoping meetings are ill-timed compared with the information that is being given to people who are going to be directly affected.	The NOP that initiated the scoping process included a map with three intakes and two options for tunnel alignment corridors. The NOP also included a preliminary description of the facilities, including intake facilities on the Sacramento River, tunnel reaches, tunnel shafts, forebays, pumping plant, and South Delta conveyance facilities.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded
5.53	2/26/2020	Anna Swenson	There was no mention of launch shafts, maintenance shafts or retrieval shafts at scoping meetings. How can you do this process right if you are not disclosing this information to the public up front?	The NOP describes the use of tunnel launch and reception shafts. The primary purpose of scoping meetings is to provide an opportunity for attendees to inform DWR of their concerns and issues that could be evaluated in the EIR. DWR also discussed at the SEC meetings in January and February that if there were concerns raised during the SEC meeting related to the proposed project options, those comments should be submitted to DWR through the scoping process.	John Caulfield	3/11/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.01	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	Intake 2 should be eliminated due to logistics; Intake 5 could affect/take Hemley properties. Can't offer a preference since all would impact friends and neighbors. The intakes are more than a left river bank intrusion. They encroach into the river and effect flood flows which would likely require west bank improvements - maybe even moving the levee right bank levee westward means moving River Road in Yolo County. Levee improvements will be required up and down stream of each intake - which probably means some significant barge traffic. Intake 5, at the north end of Randall Island, may encroach into the abandoned river channel along Highway 160 which created Randall Island- not sure if this is a geotechnical issue, but it might be. Because the intakes would be located within the National Heritage Area and if there are lights located on or around the intakes, I recommend that all project lighting conform to the 2018 International Dark Sky Park Program Guidelines; this should be incorporated into all design elements and specifications.	Artificial outdoor lighting at all sites would be limited to basic safety and security requirements, and shielded to direct light only downwards towards objects requiring illumination to minimize halo and spillover effects outside of the property boundaries. The lights would be downcast, cut-off type fixtures with non-glare finishes, and controlled by photocells. Lights would provide good color with natural light qualities with minimum intensity with adequate strength for security, safety, and personnel access. The lights would comply with the Illuminating Engineering Society industry standards for light source and luminaire measurements and testing methods and the 2018 International Dark Sky Park Program Guidelines.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.02	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	Existing east-west surface routes from 1-5 to the intakes are significantly impaired. All three roads shown on Page 1 are primarily constructed on levees and all are near or adjacent to designated wildlife areas. These levee roads were never intended to carry the type or numbers of trucks that will be used during the project. Additionally, all three roads are "commuter'' routes for Delta workers and are impacted by redirected traffic from 1-5 - Google maps have made it worse. Linear project features, such as roads, always pose special problems and in the Delta road construction, maintenance and use problems are usually exacerbated by poor ground conditions, high groundwater, flooding, slow moving farm equipment, uncontrolled intersections, sight-limited vertical curves on bridges, agricultural operations (particularly during grape harvest when truck traffic is very heavy at night into the early morning), slough crossings, wetlands and variable speed limits - which are often ignored.	The DCA is aware of the limitations of the existing Delta roads, and is analyzing multiple routes with a range of modifications to move materials and people to and from the construction sites. The range of routes currently being considered will be discussed in more detail at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.03	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	I endorse the concept of pooled bus service, be it electric or diesel. The parking location for employees should be at the designated project staging areas - not new parking lots. I don't think food service trucks at the job sites are necessary. There are many mine and construction sites where construction personnel are shuttled to the work site and bring their food - it's a lunch-pail approach. Set up food concessionaires in the parking lot at the beginning of each shift. I think that DCA should advise SEC that even though employee traffic will try to be minimized there will still be significant traffic on the roads from project superintendents, specialty contractors, state inspectors, and emergency vehicles and I am sure interested professionals and vendors who will want to visit the site. It may be that project employees represent the smallest number of daily round trips.	As currently planned, the project would utilize park-and-ride lots at Consolidation Centers developed for the Delta Conveyance Project to consolidate vehicles delivering materials and people to smaller construction sites. Details related to the Consolidation Centers are still being developed; however, use of these areas for centralized food trucks have been considered. It is recognized that in addition to construction material deliveries and employees, the traffic would also include vehicles for regulatory agency and utility company staff. Access to the construction for non-construction visitors (e.g., university classes) would be regulated by the construction managers who could schedule these visits during non-peak traffic times.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.04	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	Under "Condition of Existing Levees", is this category intended to identify areas of potential inundation? I ask because large areas in the Delta will be inundated during wet winters without suffering any levee breach. Under "Future Development", please also consider designated "Special Planning Areas" which may scattered throughout the project area, i.e., Courtland Special Planning Area. Under "Existing Water Supply Wells" please consider the effects of the drawdown (extent of drawdown curve) on the extensive dewatering at all shafts. It is likely that drawdown caused by dewatering will extend a significant distance from the shafts and may impact existing wells. Additionally it is likely, given the geology and history of subsidence in the Valley, that dewatering the shafts (and the intakes) will cause subsidence outside of the project area. I recommend that DCA establish a series of monitoring wells around the shafts which could be used to determine the extent of the drawdown curve and when accurately surveyed, would provide references for potential subsidence.	The assessment of potential tunnel shaft locations considered the relative condition of the existing levees that protect the interior land as a factor related to the potential for deep flooding, not for ponding of water or poor drainage. "Special Planning Areas" appear to be located in or near Courtland, Locke, and Walnut Grove within Sacramento County which are areas not considered in the shaft siting studies based upon the corridor locations. Existing water supply wells were considered as an existing feature. Prior to construction of the intakes, tunnel shafts, pumping plant, and Southern Forebay, slurry walls or diaphragm walls would be constructed around each facility to isolate the construction site from adjacent groundwater and surface water. Groundwater and surface water monitoring programs would be implemented to identify any water elevation changes due to the Delta Conveyance Project.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.05	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	It is not clear if DCA proposes rail spurs to each launch site or just a new siding near Lambert Road which would be served by surface transportation. Rail spurs would be very difficult since the only appropriate existing 1-5 undercrossing is at Lambert Road and constructing a sustainable spur system through the Delta would be extremely difficult and expensive to maintain. A rail siding near Lambert and Franklin Roads would probably be at least 2-miles long, require at least one at grade road crossing and would probably be part of a larger staging area. It is likely that surface disturbance would exceed 300 to 400 acres. Although I agree with rail transport, I am slow to endorse significant surface disturbance which is likely to become a permanent feature.	As currently planned, the Rail-Served Materials Depot would be located parallel to Franklin Boulevard between Twin Cities Road and a location north of Dierssen Road. The rail siding area would be part of the Consolidation Center which would also include RTM and tunnel segment storage. These facilities would be removed following construction. RTM would be moved from the tunnel launch shaft on Glanville Tract (to the west of Interstate 5) to the Consolidation Center with a conveyor belt.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.06	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	Throughout the history of through-Delta conveyance projects - BDCP, WaterFix - the project proponents have tried to sell Delta farmers, reclamation districts, water agencies and communities on the benefits of the RTM. I wish DWR/DCA would quit insulting us and just call it what is it - muck, tunnel spoils, waste material. OK, having said that, my guess is that material extracted from the shafts and the tunnel will have limited value as an economically viable reusable material. If the material is to be used in the construction of the intermediate and/or southern forebays, it will have to meet spec for a 30-foot (+/-) high earthen structure, containing more than 5 AF, and is subject to California Division of Dam Safety design and construction standards. As confident as DCA appears to be in the quality of the material I doubt that they would say with certainty that they could design and build qualified structures with what they know now. I find it hard to understand how DCA, or DWR, can assess the viability of a homogenized waste material as being a structurally acceptable construction material. Likewise, assessing the engineering qualities of variable geologic material deposited through a 30-mile estuary deposit tunnel horizon seems overly optimistic. I recommend a serious inferential analysis to determine an alternative use or off-site destination for the tunnel material and as a favor to all of us drop the term RTM and call it what it is.	The embankments at the Southern Forebay would be constructed in the same manner as other Delta levees with a clay core. The clay material would not be planned to be RTM, but would be excavated from onsite deposits or purchased from existing commercial local quarries. The RTM which is anticipated to consist of sands, silts, and clays and would be placed on the waterside and landside of the forebay embankments. Additional analyses will be conducted as new geotechnical information becomes available.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.07	2/26/2020	Jim Wallace	I would like a discussion regarding the shaft site dewatering. The dewatering process will create a significant about of water that may have to be pumped into temporary detention facilities before it is discharged into the appropriate waterway. I'd like to know what pumping rate DCA anticipates, this would help inform what other construction-related infrastructure will be needed at each shaft site. I'd also like a discussion about current NOPES water quality requirements and where the discharged water is likely to flow given such low surface water channel gradients.	Water storage tanks would be located at the intake, tunnel shaft, pumping plant, and Southern Forebay sites to reuse most of the dewatering flows for dust control and concrete, slurry, or grout production at the construction site. This would require on-site water treatment facilities to treat the dewatering flows prior to conveyance into the storage tanks. Flows that cannot be stored for reuse due to dewatering flow production schedules would need to be discharged to adjacent waterways. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit would be required for all discharges and would regulate flows and water quality. It is anticipated that some level of water treatment would be required, including sediment removal.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.08	2/26/2020	David Gloski	I would defer to the locals. However I would like one more thing considered. I believe one of the intake areas should be left as a park/picnic/marina/education center. With that in mind for the end, would one site be better that the other? Would it be better to be close to Hood for Hood to benefit for weekend vendors or held with other business?	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits and site reuse as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits and how the DCA can be a part of the vision,and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in the Delta.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.09	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Would these busses keep workers from engaging with Hood businesses? Is that good or bad?	At this time, the potential for effect of workers on local businesses in Hood has not been identified at this time. In previous studies, local Delta businesses provided comments that additional business from construction workers could be beneficial. However, if the additional business resulted in loss of existing patrons due to traffic and business congestion, the effects may not be beneficial especially after the construction activities. Changes in local and regional economics due to implementation of the alternatives will be analyzed in the EIR.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.10	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Highly recommend developing a way to leverage the river and use these facilties in a recreational way later.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits and site reuse as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits and how the DCA can be a part of the vision,and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in the Delta.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.11	2/26/2020	David Gloski	The final site needs to be part of a park/recreational area. Consider benefits to people and wildlife at the end.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community collatoral/benefits as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community collatoral and how the DCA can be a part of the vision,and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in the Delta.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.12	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Make sure you have the flow studies to explain operations in low flow years. Minimize weekend tie-ups of the river. Build structures to accommodate good uses at the end.	DWR will be developing the operational patterns, including during low flow years, as part of the EIR. The DCA continues to look for opportunites for co-benefit on all structures and is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits as part of the project which will be discussed with the communities.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.13	2/26/2020	David Gloski	I question whether you want construction considerations to be more than twice as important as 2 of the other three categories and nearly twice as important for the third! If the four categories are of equal importance, your ranking system is flawed. I believe a high-level environmental complexity grade should be added. DWR does CEQA but DCA cannot just make believe environmental doesn't exist in site ranking. Should Geotech have aquifer effects in the ranking?	"Each sub-category should be considered as a separate factor. The four broad categories used in the tunnel shaft siting were generalized groupings, and are not intended to be equally represented in the siting study. At this stage of project, construction considerations are extremely important as they relate the constructability and viability of various sites. Consideration of environmental impacts is addressed through the CEQA process, whereas, the DCA shaft siting studies are focused on the engineering considerations. Shaft locations will be re-evaluated based on input from the CEQA review as part of an iterative process during preparation of the EIR, if needed. Geotechnical considerations are based on publically-available Delta-wide datasets. Aquifer impacts would be site-specific and should be considered using site-specific data collected during monitoring programs. Prior to construction of the tunnel shafts, slurry walls or diaphragm walls would be constructed around the shafts to isolate the construction from the surface water and groundwater.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.14	2/26/2020	David Gloski	For East Corridor Launch Site B, this is near Highway 4. Need to not impede Hwy 4 during commute times. Stick with rail along Highway 4 as barges and bridges could be a problem. Also, with Discovery Bay boating, the sloughs in that area are already congested with boats. Do the intake sites have launch sites with them? You said tables will be updated with refined #'s. Please date tables so we can track them. I think the public question on funding risk is important. What if this project stopped midway?	The proposed barge landing to serve the tunnel launch shaft Lower Roberts Island would be located along the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel. Therefore, barges could access the barge landing without affecting the State Route 4 bridge. Due to shallow or narrow reaches along the Sacramento River between Rio Vista and Walnut Grove, barge landings would not be included for intake construction.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.15	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Could be valuable to Reclamation Districts. Consider an RTM bank to allow Delta Agencies to access low cost RTM for levee work.	The DCA would like to work with the reclamation districts to establish an approach to provide RTM for future levee work.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.16	2/26/2020	David Gloski	Do the segments change in shape depending on tunnel diameter? How are underground corners handled with the segments?	Each segment ring would be tapered. Segment pieces that would form the ring would be rotated into various configurations to form a curve in the tunnel.	John Caulfield	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.17	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Tribal recommendation take precedence because the Delta contains the remains of their ancestors and is a place of spiritual significance. California tribes are connected for cultural & economic reasons to healthy salmon runs, which will do worse with any of the three intakes. In regard to protection of communities, Delta engineers can make the best land/levee assessment as to the viability of placeing intakes on these sites & the increased flood threat to communities. In addition, economic productivity of each site for the region should also be evaluated in any final decision. We see site 5 as the least objectionable (following the recommendation of the tribes); however, we see destroying seven generation farms equally tragic to the destruction of spiritual places of importance to California tribes.	The DCA considered potential interferences with existing development, including farms, in the identification of intake locations. As discussed at the December 2019 and January 2020 SEC meetings, Intakes 2, 3, and 5 would impact fewer existing developments.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.18	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	It is our understanding that where or how to build a road in the Delta will require Army Corps of Engineer permits for wetlands. In addition, landowners may not be willing to sell. Our recommendation would be to pick the closest route to the chosen intake, ensure that permits will be approved, and work with neighbors first before starting eminent domain processes to see if a satisfactory route can be established for the majority of parties. As we said intake #5 is the least objectionable, then the process would be about running the most direct route to that intake site. Our question: would the DCA be better buying out farms for the corridor and intake site and making people financially whole for the loss of buisnesses, homes, future revenues, etc. and figuring out a way to honor their legacy in the Delta so that their families are remembered? Making people live through 15 plus years of construction impacts while impeding farming causing revenue losses, and taking away pieces of land feels cruel. We believe impacted farms will fail. The community will see each day of work as an assualt on their lives, and the tension between parties and the possibility of conflict will be extreme. Perhaps it is better for offers of a buyout that will let people rebuild their lives well? We don't know the answer to that question, and would not engage in such a conversation with community members. It is not our place; it would be presumptuous. Such discussion would need to happen between the DCA and landowners.	DWR (and potentially the DCA as DWR's agent) will negotirate with landowners regarding land acquisition activities at a future time in the project implementation process. The DCA will continue to work with potentially affected landowners to minimize impacts and respect the Delta. DWR will analyzye potential construction-related impacts due to implementation of the alternatives as part of preparation of the EIR.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.19	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Whether electric buses are used or not with a "park and ride" scenario, the DCA will have to bring food, medical, emergency, and other employee services to these sites because: 1) Employees won't be able to get in and out fast enough with a car or bus for a normal meal (even fast food); 2) Construction hazards, regular farming traffic etc., will require on site emergency services. It is not an either/or. It is both to mitigate construction traffic levels (on top of farm traffic) AND to protect workers and to reduce pollution.	The DCA has considered methods to provide food trucks to consolidation centers or construction sites to reduce employee vehicle trips. The DCA is aware of the limitations of the Delta roadways, and emergency response facilities and crews would be required to be provided by the Delta Conveyance Project in accordance with the requirements of California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) at the tunnel launch shaft sites and near the intake sites. Methods to reduce traffic congestion due to the project will be discussed in detail at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.20	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	The barge landing would make the most sense in Hood as it was a barge site until the railroad came into the area. However, having been up and down the Sacramento River during droughts on a pleasure boat, be advised that we hit sandbars regularly. Surveys for water depth need to be completed and enough water will need to be coming down the Sac River during dry months and dry years for barging to work.	Due to shallow or narrow reaches along the Sacramento River between Rio Vista and Walnut Grove, barge landings would not be included for intake construction. Smaller deliveries of riprap or other materials to complete the levee modifications could be transported on small barges. However, the use of barges for these facilities would not require a barge landing.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.21	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	We need to learn about the alternative to sheet piling. Regardless of noise reduction efforts/ buffers etc., Greater Sandhill Cranes would be driven out of the area and would further decline in number with such extreme noise. So we look forward to learning about what construction noise would be like using new construction techniques. We want to know about real time reporting for water quality testing during the process. We also want to know how construction will be operated when an endangered species makes itself present. Incorporating as many wildlife corridors and bike/kayaking/wildlife viewing opportunities as possible into completed design throughout the project could enhance public access while protecting species.	The DCA is continuing to evaluate methods to reduce the need for pile driving at the intake sites, and will provide information to the SEC when these analyses continue. Water quality monitoring would be conducted in the Sacramento River upstream and downstream of the construction locations as is generally required for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for construction projects. The National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife will issue permits to DWR for the operations of the facilities which will include specific actions related to protection of threatened and endangered species regulated by each of these agencies.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.22	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	As with the intakes, we maintain that consultation should take place with California Indian Tribes regarding the cultural, spiritual significance of each site first before asking for input from general members of the SEC to pick a site. After such consultation, it would then make the most sense to consult with Delta levee engineers to understand floodplain/levee needs and to gain further understanding of soils (in addition to recommendations made by geologists) to ensure best public and worker safety outcomes. After that an evaluation should be made of impacts to protected species, and then an economic evaluation should be made as to which site would result in the greatest reduction of revenue for a county or loss of jobs. In other words, we see community ranking following this rubric. To that end, the rubric for picking sites by the DCA is an adequate ranking system but does not answer the questions listed in what we describe as a community rubric. We do see an effort being made to reduce pollution by choosing sites that	The DCA studies to select intake and shaft sites were focused on engineering considerations, including geotechnical conditions based upon available information and information provided by local reclamation districts. DWR will analyze potential changes due to implementation of the alternatives in the EIR, including potential changes to biological resoures and economic resources. DWR also will conduct Tribal Consultations. As the EIR progresses, it is possible that shaft locations may be re-evaluated and modified.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.23	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	In order to construct train spurs, we believe the same type of permitting will be required as for the construction of new roads. Yes, trains are a good method for transporting materials in order to reduce pollution, but as with roads, evaluation of wetlands needs to be completed, as well as species impacts, and possibility of land acquisition from farmers. Can this be completed in time for construction. Also, the Iron Triangle in Stockton is one of the most impacted train transfer points in the west. Can it handle addition train traffic from the Port of Stockton. Waiting to talk with the Port and train authorities will add years to the project driving up costs and delays. Barging is a possible solution, but see earlier question. Water depth surveys would need to be completed to ensure feasibility of sites. We could not possibly determine best sites without that data. Last, there needs to be a full comparison of pollution estimates from trucks vs. trains vs. barges – with an understanding of what will be electric and what won't. Our greatest concern is that the combination of increased barge,	The DCA is currently evaluating a coordinated effort between roads, rails, and barges to deliver materials to the construction sites. As discussed at previous SEC meetings, each of these transit modes would have constraints and opportunities and would need to be implemented in a combination of activities. DWR will analyze changes in local and regional air quality due to implementation of the alternatives and develop mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse impacts as part of the EIR preparation.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.24	2/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	We strongly disagree with the assertion that RTM will be usable. The supplemental engineering report warns the DCA to not count using the materials The Delta is filled with legacy Mercury which will methylize when it comes into contact with water filled with nitrates from agriculture – particularly on the San Joaquin side of the Delta which receives ag discharge from upstream. How can such soil be used for levee reinforcement or at an expanded forebay at Clifton Court? The State Water Resources Control Board has strict standards regarding levee materials, dredging and spoils in the Delta. Moreover, as RTM is transported, how will the spoils be kept from becoming airborne? Prior testing under WaterFix indicated Chromium 6 and arsenic present in soil samples. We simply must see the alternative data that indicates that the RTM is safe, and how much of it the DCA believes is reusable. And for the portions that are not reusable, the engineering report suggested dumping the spoils in quarries. Our question is what quarries? Where? And what will the impacts be on those groundwater systems? We simply cannot recommend dumping polluted soil somewhere else without adequate, transparent data as to content and volume.	Potential reuse of RTM was evaluated by collecting soil samples from within an approximate tunnel horizon and including various additives typical of tunneling operations. These samples were then laboratory tested for geotechnical properties and environmental consituents. Based on the testing performed to date, the RTM appears to meet the geotechnical specifications for embankment fill surrounding a clay core within the embankment. Environmental testing found that metal concentrations were generally consistent with background naturally occuring levels in surface soils and would not mobilize into adjacent soil or water bodies, including the Southern Forebay. The DCA intends to continue evaluations of potential reuse of RTM and will perform additional sampling, testing, and evaluation in the future to confirm appropriate applications. Material reuse or disposal will be in compliance with all State and federal standards. Transport of the RTM or any other soil material would be conducted in a manner to avoid dust issues, including the use of covered rail cars or trucks	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.25	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The northern most intake is problematic given its proximity to the sandhill crane roost sites in north Stone Lakes. This roosting site is the most constrained by development in our region and as such the most problematic if it is abandoned due the construction of the intakes.	DWR will evaluate changes in aquatic and terrestrial resources due to construction and operations of the intakes in the EIR. As this analysis continues, it is possible that the intake locations or plans could be modified.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.26	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	All of the proposed haul roads look like they will be very impactful to terrestrial species, particularly roosting and foraging sandhill cranes. All roads within the jurisdictional boundary of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge should be avoided. The haul road choices are indicative of how destructive and disruptive this project will be for terrestrial species.	Due to the location of the intakes along the Sacramento River between the confluences of the American River and Sutter Slough, it is difficult to access these sites without traveling along Hood-Franklin, Lambert, or Twin Cities Roads. The DCA is considering methods to minimize traffic congestion on these roads and will discuss roadway modifications at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.26	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	The actual effects of boring such large launch shafts in largely unknown soils to the depths proposed is not supported by sufficient study and data. More research and data is needed in order to address this question.	Additional geotechnical investigations are planned for the next several years to further understand conditions along the tunnel alignment and at the tunnel shaft locations. Engineering design criteria would be modified as the geotechnical conditions became more fully understood.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.27	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	A continuous ripirian zone is an extremely important goal, and it would appear to be very achievable.	The DCA would be interested in exploring improvements to the riparian corridor along the Sacramento River near the intakes.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.28	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	We should revisit the placement of the intakes utilizing the same input process that is being used for the launch site placement. The current placement for the intakes work for the engineering side of things, but they are disastrous for aquatic and terrestrial species.	DWR will evaluate changes in aquatic and terrestrial resources due to construction and operations of the intakes in the EIR. As this analysis continues, it is possible that the intake locations or plans could be modified.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.29	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The most important criteria to include would be diversity and density of terrestrial species with a focus on listed species, but not to the exclusion of other species. However, it would be a mistake to simply add a couple of new criteria items to the engineering rubric currently being utilized to identify "acceptable" siting locations. Doing so would likely result in an outcome similar to the intake locations, where the engineering was the primary driver for the selection of placements that worked well mechanically, but were/are extremely destructive to both aquatic and terrestrial species. We recommend that a far more comprehensive approach be utilized for siting the launching shafts and their extensive infrastructure, one that exhibits sensitivity to the important issues and concerns represented by the stakeholders in the SEC. So, beyond comments and suggestions about how to integrate terrestrial species concerns into the decision process, we will also be discussing more broadly how the decision process should work.	The DCA shaft siting studies did consider properties that are owned by agencies and entities to protect habitat, including Cosumnes River Preserve. DWR will evaluate changes in aquatic and terrestrial resources on all types of lands due to construction and operations of the intakes in the EIR. As the EIR analysis continues, it is possible that the intake locations or plans could be modified.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.30	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The approach utilized in the launching shaft selection process presented to the stakeholders at the last meeting represents a reasonable foundation for a framework that could be robust enough to incorporate addition of criteria addressing stakeholder concerns. But, it would be a potentially large mistake to just add a bunch of new criteria suggested by stakeholders, weight them, and then generate a new map. With all of the new criteria, the underlying decision process of balancing all of the additional factors becomes extremely complicated, and a single new map that attempts to incorporate all of the new criteria into one depiction representing more refined siting possibilities would seem to be nothing short of magic to all but the most informed GIS experts and modelers. Therefore, we recommend that a series of additional maps be generated for informational and illustrative purposes. The first series of maps would depict sitting possibilities based on the ten to fifteen mile spacing between launching shafts coupled with the criteria specific to one stakeholder category, excluding engineering concerns. This would provide an understanding of shaft placements in the absence of the engineering concerns. The second series of maps would depict the stakeholder category considered along with engineering concerns. The third would be a single map depicting the engineering concerns along with all of the stakeholder category concerns. This approach would allow a non-expert modeler to see the compromises and tradeoffs that were made in a visual format and would allow each stakeholder to see how their concerns fit into the larger	The DCA shaft siting studies were limited to engineering considerations, access routes, avoidance of lands owned by agencies and entities for the protection of habitat, existing development, and existing infrastructure. Information provided by the SEC was used to modify factors related to existing development and land uses. The EIR will evaluate potential changes to the physical, biological, and human environment due to implemetation of the alternatives. As the EIR analysis continues, it is possible that the shaft locations could be modified.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.31	2/26/2020	Sean Wirth	A program like ESRI GIS hotspot analysis should be used to identify hotspots and then a decision making tool, like MARXAN, should be used to run a huge number of permutations to expose possible efficiencies - this should be done for all three classes of additional maps that we are suggesting. The stakeholders should be provided all information used for weighting criteria, the decision-making software utilized, and what specific data/GIS layers were used. (see his multi-page response for more info)	The GIS was actually used to identify different types of land uses, understand access routes, and determine distances between shaft locations. The comparison of the options was conducted in an Excel-based tool. The results of the shaft siting studies will be compiled in the Engineering Project Report in a manner that will help understand how the different factors were analyzed with the associated weighting criteria.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.31	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	The external conveyance of water from the Delta instead of through the estuary, will destroy native species habitat, Delta farms and communities and the cultural heritage therein, as well as surrounding natural resources. Thus, the three proposed sites, as components of the external conveyance project, are unacceptable because they will result in unnecessary destruction to the Delta estuary and surrounding areas.	DWR is responsible for development of the overall Delta Conveyance concept and development of the operational plan. The DCA is preparing engineering information related to construction of the facility options. The EIR will evaluate potential changes in the Delta estuarine conditions, Delta habitat, Delta farms and communities, and cultural resources related to implementation of the alternatives. That information will be considered by the DCA during finalization of engineering plans.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.32	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Impacts of trucking would be substantially destructive to the farms, private properties and wildlife habitat of the sites. More research and actual data concerning this issue is needed before decisions governing trucking on this scale can be considered.	Potential truck routes and road modifications will be discussed in more detail at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.33	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Because trucks moving material, equipment, etc. will create the greatest impact, it is doubtful that carpooling employees to and from the site will effectively mitigate this.	The construction traffic plans involves both movement of materials and employees. Almost 200 employees could be present at some construction sites, such as the intakes. Therefore, carpooling would be necessary to reduce traffic on access roads and because adequate space for parking would require larger construction sites.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.34	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Barge traffic of this frequency and magnitude will substantially clog and pollute the Sacramento River rendering it unsafe for other craft and the species existing there.	Barge traffic would be focused on moving goods and materials either to Bouldin Island under the Central Corridor option or Lower Roberts Island under the Eastern Corridor option. Access to Bouldin Island from the Port of West Sacramento, Port of Antioch, or ports on San Francisco or San Pablo bays would use portions of the lower Sacramento River. Access to Bouldin Island from the Port of Stockton or access to Lower Roberts Island from any of these ports would use the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel/San Joaquin River.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.35	2/26/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Layout needs to be entirely redesigned to accommodate through-Delta estuary conveyance, eliminating the need for grading of the final site. This will preserve, intact, the existing wildlife corridor and habitat as well as the cultural heritage and Delta communities. The most viable way to convey water with the least destructive effects is through the estuary. There is ample data to this effect, supported by independent scientific studies previously completed.	This comment is suggesting an alternative to the Proposed Project that DWR identified in the Notice of Preparation. DWR is considering alternatives to the Proposed Project as part of the development of the EIR, and will identify a range of reasonable alternatives that meet the project objectives and could reduce the significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project. The DCA will then design facilities related to these alternatives. Alternative concepts should be submitted to DWR through the CEQA process.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.37	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Preferred: CE5 2+ miles from Courtland, 1+mile from Hood, 1+ mile from Stone Lakes NWR (National Wildlife Refuge). Most flexible access. All vehicles can be divided onto different roads or redirected to most nimbly dilute/reduce impacts and address local conditions. Possible to avoid Hood altogether. Least Preferred: CE2 Though distant from Hood (positive), single access minimizes flexibility to address impacts. Closest to Stone Lakes NWR, requires all traffic to run along edge of NWR. Requires access/routing through edge of Hood. Place second access road. Middle: CE3 Less impactful on Stone Lakes and shorter route than CE2, shares negative traits of CE2. Place second access road.	The DCA appreciates this information and will include it in the ongoing analysis.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.38	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Establish truck routes as far away as possible from Stone Lakes NWR & off levee.	The DCA access routes were developed to minimize the use of levee roads and avoid land use changes to refuges, preserves, and conservation areas.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.39	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	This is a great opportunity to provide, model and support green transportation, as well as local food and service providers. CE5 provides most flexibility to divide and dilute local impacts. Provide communities (and/or post) work, bus and service vehicle schedules. If electric bus charging stations are located at staging areas, work to convert to public use to meet state charging station goals. If electric bus charging stations are located at staging areas, work to convert to public use to meet state charging station goals.	Electric charging stations, possibly powered by solar panels, would be considered for the consolidation centers where materials and people would be transferred to hybrid or electric vehicles for consolidated transport to the construction sites.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.40	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	I favor a barge option on-site of intake construction. Since in-river alterations are already happening, this minimizes the footprint. I do not favor using one in Hood as it would require truck traffic in the town, something to avoid.	Due to shallow or narrow reaches along the Sacramento River between Rio Vista and Walnut Grove, barge landings would not be included for intake construction. Smaller deliveries of riprap or other materials to complete the levee modifications could be transported on small barges. However, the use of barges for these facilities would not require a barge landing. There are no active railroads near the intake sites. The DCA considered re-activating the abandoned railroad adjacent to the intake sites. However in	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.41	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	- Wildlife friendly landscaping (butterfly gardening, planting trees of varying maturities/sizes/purposes). - Portable mature trees (& other plants) in planters brought to site and moved as appropriate during project. Planted sequentially as project components are completed. - Rooftop planting/living roof - Minimize hardscapes - Bat, bird boxes - Restore function of riparian corridor lost to construction on nearby lowland to mimic corridor. Though not wildlife related, consider art on tall structures	As DCA continues to develop the facility plans, these ideas could be included in the final landscape design plans for constructed facilities.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.42	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Overall, I like the exhibition of the siting methodology. It shows nothing is perfect, but prioritization of factors can produce clarity and preferred site/s. Can DCA confirm comprehensive consideration of significant (state recognized and other) sites of Native Peoples? Such sites may be assumed to be included in the matrix within the cultural feature grouping including houses, cemeteries, etc. I realize it is not a best practice to draw attention to such sites, even (especially?) in a project document. Though the state has listings of archeological sites, they are not public (State Historic Preservation Office- SHPO) and these, among other culturally significant sites in the Delta are thought by some to be under reported.	DWR is conducting the Tribal Consultation activities and will evaluate potential changes to cultual and historical resources due to implementation of the alternatives as part of the EIR.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.43	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Central Alignment- not preferred Launch Site A Consider keeping site north of Twin Cities Road to keep significant buffer for Delta Meadows State Park. Coordinate with State Parks re park-sponsored canoe trips in the Meadows. Launch Site B The traffic on, and condition of, Highway 12 makes me question its capacity to accommodate added project traffic. Access to the San Joaquin River on the west side of Bouldin makes barging attractive, but that river reach is a funnel point for boating traffic from Bethel Island and Frank's Tract (and elsewhere). CA State Dept of Parks and Recreation is currently working with citizens and other stakeholders in a process very similar to the DCA SEC called Franks Tract Futures. Though the FTF project may be a good fill (RTM) candidate, adding barge traffic to that area, even if the barge station is on Little Potato Slough, requires coordination with FTF for effectiveness and to address public perception concerns. Southern Forebay- no comment Eastern Alignment- preferred (Please note spelling: Rindge Tract) Launch Site A Keep footprint as far south as possible minimizing impact on Cosumnes River Preserve	These comments will be added to the considerations in the ongoing development of the Central and Eastern corridors.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.44	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Barges- schedule as in-river conditions- tides, fisheries, recreation, flow permit. Publicize barge schedules (as possible).	Barge operations would be subject to changes in river conditions, tides, wind, and recreational and commercial navigation traffic. Barge traffic along the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel and Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel would operate in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Port of West Sacramento and Port of Stockton, respectively. In addition, the barges and the associated tugboats would operate in accordance with requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard and the Division of Boating and Waterways of the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Notifications would be provided to the U.S. Coast Guard and local marinas.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
S1.45	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Jersey Island, Franks Tract Futures, ACOE proposal for Big Break wetland creation, MWD islands	Future use of RTM and other excavated soil materials for habitat restoration will be considered as the project concepts are developed by DCA and analyzed in the EIR.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
S1.46	2/26/2020	Michael Moran	Assess existing traffic, seasonal, event & other patterns (car counters?). Divide traffic, employee parking into multiple access points to minimize impact on each road. Assign vendors/ contractors/ service vehicles which road which day to minimize impacts. Cut additional road(s) as necessary to accommodate targeted traffic & ensure at least 2 access routes. Provide Delta and project interpretation at all facilities and in between (wayside), incorporate controversy. Ensure adequate parking. Work with Delta Protection Commission to assist their ongoing efforts of signage, Heritage Area. Art/murals on facilities ala West Sacramento and Oakley water tanks. Possible to remove roads post-project as appropriate? For worksites near Delta attractions leave (or build) project picnic, parking, lighting, infrastructure- work with local communities for best converted facility use Turn employee lots to park & ride, interpretive stops Project roads gated & staffed to control/minimize traffic	DCA was scheduled to conduct traffic counts. However, with the implementation of "shelter in place," it was decided to delay traffic counts. At this time, DCA is analyzing traffic patterns using existing information and will discuss this information at the May 2020 SEC meeting. The DCA did create a calendar of recurring events to be considered related to community traffic conditions. During construction, cooperative meetings with the communities could be implemented to reduce construction activities during weekend events, including Friday night activities. The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community collatoral/benefits as part of the project. When the DCA is compiles this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community collatoral including the community's vision , and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in the Delta. The DCA and DWR has been and will continue to coordinate with the Delta Protection Commission. Many of facilities at the construction sites, including barge landings, would be removed following construction and the site would be restored, potentially for community uses or habitat.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
6.48	3/11/2020	Mike Moran	Is the New Hope Maintenance Tract at the same latitude on both corridors but closer to I-5 on the Eastern Corridor?	The information presented at the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting related to the New Hope Tunnel Maintenance Shafts was incorrect. Updated material was provided at dcdca.org with the correct locations of the New Hope Maintenance Shafts for Central and Eastern corridors. The New Hope Maintenance Shaft for the Central Corridor is located to the northwest of the New Hope Maintenance Shaft for the Eastern Corridor.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.49	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	How will the new access road on Rough and Ready Island be connected to I-5?	In the conceptual facilities plan, access to the Lower Roberts Island Tunnel Reception and Launch Shafts would be from existing roads on Rough and Ready Island. New access roads would extend from Fyffe Street on the western side of the Port of Stockton lands to a new bridge over Burns Cut and continuing on Lower Roberts Island.	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.50	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Can maps be revised to show how the roads connect to I-5?	An overall project logistics presentation will be provided in a future SEC meeting, including detailed truck and employee vehicle corridors to access each proposed construction site.	Gwen Buchholz		Responded
6.51	3/11/2020	Cecille Giacoma	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.	Page 38 of the response packet issued at the Feb 26 meeting and online at https://www.dcdca.org/pdf/2020-02-26-4a-FollowUpRoundtableonFebruary122020SECMeeting.pdf says: Many different types and brands of conditioners are used in tunneling based upon soil conditions present along the alignment. Conditioners are generally categorized as foams, polymers and bentonites. On recent projects, DCA consultants have observed the use of Soilax S products (available from the manufacturer Boraid Products) which are surfactants (i.e. detergents) and mixed with clean water as a foaming conditioner. Sometimes, a cellulose product, like Soilax C, is added into the conditioner mix to provide added strength to the soap bubbles, which helps when the conditioner is injected into certain soil formations. Thickening agents, such as polymers and a bentonite (a naturally occurring clay), are also used for different soil conditions. These include such products available from Mapei Products. These are just examples of some products that could be used. The construction specifications would require any conditioners to be inert (chemically inactive).	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.52	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Get BASF to provide material safety data sheets on soil conditioners	Material Safety Data Sheets for 2 of the conditioners previously evaluated have been included in the upcoming SEC materials.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.53	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	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.	The DCA and DWR are collaborating with the DPC and the other organizations and stakeholders within the Delta. Kathryn Mallon of DCA and Carrie Buckman of DWR have been coordinating with the Delta Protection Commission (DPC).	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.54	3/11/2020	David Gloski	The question tracking packet numbering was changed and it was difficult to find his earlier questions. Can members have an Excel version of the table so questions and status can be filtered? 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.	The DCA requests that SEC members identify questions that appear to continue to need further discussion or additional information to respond to the comment or question.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.55	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Can SEC members invite guests to attend the tours?	The DCA cannot provide public access to the tours due to logistics of the tours with the owner of the facility, liability concerns, and other constraints. Tours are intended to be an educational opportunity for SEC members and individual tours cannot include a quorum of SEC members due to Brown Act requirements.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.56	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	Can members of the public follow the tour vehicles?	This question appears to be related to a tour of the facilities and other areas of the Delta. All tours, including the Delta Tour, have been postponed at this time. Once rescheduled, DCA will determine if non-SEC members could follow the SEC member tours in the Delta or if an itinerary or similar accommodation could be provided.	Andrew Finney	4/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.57	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	In a perfect world, what's the start date for construction year 1? Are we talking 2024? 2025? When will the project be started?	As described by DWR in the Scoping Process, the CEQA and permitting process would not be complete until at least the end of 2022. Design efforts could be completed in phases; to allow for initial early design projects, such as development of access roads or habitat mitigation areas. However, even the early design projects would not be initiated until after 2022. A schedule for design, land acquisition, final permitting, and construction have not been developed at this time.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.58	3/11/2020	Jim Wallace	Are we talking about a start date of 2027?	As described by DWR in the Scoping Process, the CEQA and permitting process would not be complete until at least the end of 2022. Design efforts could be completed in phases; to allow for initial early design projects, such as development of access roads or habitat mitigation areas. However, even the early design projects would not be initiated until after 2022. A schedule for design, land acquisition, final permitting, and construction have not been developed at this time.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.59	3/11/2020	Philip Merlo	What types of goodwill campaigns are you considering?		Josh Nelson	4/22/2020	For Future Discussion
6.60	3/11/2020	Gil Cosio	What's the estimated cubic yards needed for the new forebay levees?	Based on the conceptual facilities plan presented to the DCA, there would be approximately 10 to 12 million cubic yards of RTM depending upon the corridor and capacity of the Project. Approximately 60 to 70 percent of the RTM would be used in constructing the Southern Forebay.	Josh Nelson	4/22/2020	Responded
6.61	3/11/2020	Gil Cosio	What will go along the pipeline itself at the surface? Will those properties be impacted at all? The last plan included dewatering along pipeline. Is that going to happen this time?	As currently proposed, tunnel construction activities the tunnel alignment would occur at the tunnel shaft locations and tunnel shaft auxiliary areas, and along the modified or new corridors to connect the shaft locations to existing roadways. There would be no other construction activities within the tunnel alignment, including dewatering, at the ground surface between the tunnel shaft locations,	Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.62	3/11/2020	Michael Moran	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. Talking to county's HCP and other jurisdictions that might be eager to look at mitigation funding and projects where this takes place and have that up front.		Gwen Buchholz	4/22/2020	For Future Discussion
6.63	3/11/2020	David Gloski	It sounded like you mentioned the Eastern one is easier to do, yet, the schedule looks like it's the same number of years. Is it the same cost? Does the "easiness" have anything to do with time and money?	The schedules for the Central and Eastern Corridor conceptual facilities plans presented at the previous SEC meetings were similar. The schedules are being further developed with more detailed analyses. Access to the tunnel shafts from major roadways would be more flexible under the Eastern Corridor as compared to the Central Corridor which could increase production rate of construction.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.64	3/11/2020	Douglas Hsai	If it takes longer to build the Eastern alignment, is there any other reason not to go for the Eastern alignment?	The CEQA process will analyze construction and operational changes to the physical, biological, and human environment as compared to existing conditions; and then, compare the results between the alternatives to identify the proposed project.	Graham Bradner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.65	3/11/2020	Gil Cosio	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?	DWR continues to evaluate and develop programs to improve levees throughout the Delta. These programs are separate projects and will be implemented with or without the Delta Conveyance Project.	Andrew Finney	4/22/2020	Responded
6.66	3/11/2020	Cecille Giacoma	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?	Potential use of RTM from the Delta Conveyance Project on agricultural lands has not been developed at this time. This type of opportunities to work together with the communities will be discussed at future SEC meetings. With respect to changes in water resources, the CEQA process will evaluate changes to water resources under construction and operation of the alternatives as compared to existing conditions.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.67	3/11/2020	Anna Swenson	When will members see the 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?		Phil Ryan		For Future Discussion
6.68	3/11/2020	Sean Wirth	Since 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?	Based on the current conceptual facilities plan, the tunnel reception shaft locations can be moved if the tunnel drive length from the tunnel launch shaft remains within 15 miles. The tunnel maintenance shaft locations can be moved if the lengths between the adjacent shafts are within 4 to 5 miles. As noted in previous SEC meetings, the DCA has moved the shaft locations as new information becomes available. For example, following the March 11, 2020 SEC meeting, the tunnel maintenance shaft locations were slightly moved based upon information related to Staten Island.	Phil Ryan	4/22/2020	Responded
6.69	3/11/2020	Michael Moran	Where the barges are coming from and where are they going to? If you're so close to rail, why would you have barges?	Barges are anticipated to be launched at existing ports near the Delta, including Port of Stockton, Port of Pittsburg, and Port of West Sacramento as well as commercial mooring facilities (e.g., facility in Rio Vista used to load barges with rock). Tunnel launch shaft sites were identified in the conceptual facilities plan to provide at least two forms of transportation from the options of roadways, barges, and/or rail. For example, tunnel launch shafts at Glanville Tract and Southern Forebay would be accessed by roadways and rail-served materials depots. However, because it would be difficult to access Bouldin Island by rail, the tunnel launch shaft site would be accessed by roadways and barges.	Graham Bradner	4/22/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.7	3/11/2020	Philip Merlo	Regarding the rail possibility, to be clear, the RTM would go to Stockton for companies interested in using it for concrete?	Reuse of RTM by others has been discussed; however, detailed plans have not been developed at this time. The RTM is currently anticipated to be stored at the tunnel launch shaft sites and could be moved by barge or rail if those facilities remain following construction.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.71	3/11/2020	Douglas Hsai	In Santa Clara muck was being shipped to Tracy. Does anyone know where in Tracy they're shipping to?	The DCA has requested information from the Silicon Valley Clean Water Program related to reuse of the RTM.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.72	3/11/2020	Michael Moran	Does material coming out of Lower Roberts site need to go to the Southern Forebay?	As set forth in the conceptual facilities plan, RTM for construction of the Southern Forebay embankments would primarily be from the tunnel launch shafts located near the Southern Forebay and delivered by rail from the Glanville Tract tunnel launch shafts to reduce RTM storage.	Phil Ryan	4/22/2020	Responded
6.73	3/10/2020	David Gloski	I think it was said that the standard regulation is 27% open area but I think it was also said that in California the reg is 50% open area. Can someone explain this and explain why California allows twice the open area?	Land use planning is completed by local agencies, generally by cities and counties. The State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research issue General Plan Guidelines which include guidance for local agencies to establish open space goals for the regional plans. These open space goals could be included in local community development plans.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.74	3/10/2020	David Gloski	I'd like to hear a discussion about the risk of overruns and loss of budget. How can the project be structured so that everyone in the Delta can be assured that the project is not stopped half way due to budget problems and the land, facilities and everything is just left in some limbo state?	Delta Conveyance would be funded by the water users that would use the project, not the State of California. Specific financial plans have not been developed at this time; however, those plans will need to be complete prior to initiation of construction.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.75	3/10/2020	David Gloski	Regarding the tables associated with estimates of trucks, barges, trains, etc. At one point it was said that these tables will be constantly updated. Can we get dates on the tables then so we know what version we have when we have one in front of us or two and we don't know which one is the latest.	Dates will be provided on future copies of the logistics tables.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.76	3/13/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Can you tell me how much RTM there will be?	The actual amount of RTM would depend upon length and diameter of the tunnel. Based on the conceptual facilities plan, RTM would range from 10 to 12 million cubic yards.	Jim Lorenzen	4/22/2020	Responded
6.77	3/11/2020	Philip Merlo	What types of archaeological studies are going to take place?	DWR's CEQA process would include archaeological evaluation of potential changes due to the construction and operation of the Delta Conveyance alternatives as compared to the existing conditions. DWR is leading the AB 52 and DWR's tribal engagement policy. DWR will consider information discussed in those consultations during the CEQA process.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.78	3/11/2020	Peter Robertson	Had the DCA been able to produce an overlay for the maps with channel markers?	Potential barge routes evaluated by the DCA did consider channel widths and depths as provided by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Nautical Charts and DWR bathymetric data and based upon discussions with Delta maritime contractors. This information, as well as information related to bridges, was used to identify waterway reaches in the Delta that could and could not support barge operations.	Gwen Buccholz	4/22/2020	Responded
6.79	3/30/2020	Peter Robertson	Who is going to communicate with boaters about in-water work? Coast Guard or DCA?	During construction, frequent notifications would be sent by DCA to the Coast Guard and California Division of Boating and Waterways of on-going in-water construction activities, and these agencies would post these notifications. In addition, signs would be posted alerting boaters of on-going in-water construction activities. Approvals of in-water construction activities would be obtained from the Coast Guard during the permitting process.	Luke Miner	4/22/2020	Responded
6.80	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will we have a session where we can review and discuss DWR's HABs data and the SCCWRP HABs Impacts Study that was discussed on the Region 5 Water Board HABs Committee update Monday? What I am looking for is how alignment choice will impact development of HABS and if there is an opportunity to use the project to increase water circulation in hotspots to mitigate HABs early on/and in later years of project operation.	Water quality and HABs will be part of the environmental analysis that DWR will conduct in the EIR.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
6.81	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Observation: 10 feet perimeter levee seems too low to protect RTM with flood at Twin Cities Rd.	The proposed ring berm at the Twin Cities Complex is intended to protect against a 100-year flood elevation of 19.0 feet with 1.5 foot of freeboard. The height of the levee would vary depending on the existing ground	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
6.82	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	New Hope Maintenance Tract: Walnut Grove Rd. is loaded with farm trucks. What will impacts be on Greater Sandhill Cranes on Staten Island with road extension and truck traffic?	DWR will evaluate potential impacts to terrestrial species (including Greater Sandhill Cranes) from project construction and operations in the EIR.	Gwen Buccholz	11/5/2020	Responded
6.83	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Bouldin Island -- the bedrooms are impossible around the first 8 days of July for barge traffic; same for other holiday weekends.	During construction, frequent notifications would be sent by DCA to the Coast Guard and California Division of Boating and Waterways of on-going in-water construction activities, and these agencies would post these notifications. In addition, signs would be posted alerting boaters of on-going in-water construction activities. Approvals of in-water construction activities would be obtained from the Coast Guard during the permitting process.	Carrie Buckman		Responded
6.84	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Byron Tract -- Is there RTM? containment of soil for schools in Byron is a concern	Covered in June SEC Meeting Materials			Responded
6.85	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Will RTM at South Forebay cover plants essential to Native American practices found in that area? And burial grounds? (I don't need answer; tribes do)				For Future Discussion

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.01	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	In WaterFix, it was known there was a tremendous amount of diesel emissions for construction for this part of the project. Looking at a concrete batch down there. Conversations have been had with Ms. Mallon about moving everything to electric. Is there a commitment by the exporters to fund and will we really get to 100% because those emissions, for health and safety reasons, would require complete relocation for the town of Byron and it would be really dangerous diesel emissions for the kids that go to school nearby. I am not worried about the operation of managing water and flow creating a flood condition. I am sure that will be worked out. Is this being built to a 200-year standard?	DWR will analyze potential air quality impacts and mitigation as part of the EIR preparation. However, currently available technology includes a range of options to reduce air quality emissions. For example, dust issues at batch plants primarily occur as the dry ingredients are mixed together prior to the addition of water to make the concrete, slurry, or grout. The batch plants would be required to install the equipment that receives and mixes the dry ingredients within a shelter that includes large fans and air filtration equipment to minimize particulate matter (dust) from leaving the construction site. The maximum amount of dust leaving the construction site would be regulated by the Regional Air Quality Management District. In addition, many earthwork types of earthwork equipment are currently being provide as hybrid diesel-electric engines to reduce emissions. Electric engines would be used for generator sets, air compressors, and other equipment to the extent practical.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.02	4/22/2020	David Gloski	A career barge operator on the San Joaquin said it isn't logical to go into the winding waterways of Little Potato Slough depending on the size of barges. Barges should be out on deeper water on the San Joaquin. Perhaps the Tidal Marsh area should be across the southern end of the island so that an avenue for barge landing access could be out on the main river. There has to be a way to move this around to make it work. Could the shaft be moved to the west a bit to make it closer to a barge on that side?	Little Potato Slough is shallower than Potato Slough. The proposed barge landing along Bouldin Island would be located in Potato Slough with nearby access to the San Joaquin River.	Jiim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.03	4/22/2020	Sean Wirth	It would be much better to locate it in a wider area of the island. Based on this feedback, the shaft was moved further north and placed it right along the road to keep the impact closer to the road. The benefit of this location is that it is located close to a house that has power lines. It would be the least evil place to put it on the island in terms of impacts to cranes.	If this comment is associated with Staten Island maintenance shaft site, the proposed shaft site was moved north of the previously identified site.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.04	4/22/2020	David Gloski	It may be a good idea to add this area [Bouldin Island Barge Landing] to a tour so that there is a clearer understanding of what is out there.	This area would be considered as part of future tours of potential DCA facility locations.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.05	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Asked for an explanation for some of the terms used in the map legends, including “Regenerative Ag” on the Bouldin Island slide and the terms used on the intakes slide.	The term "Regenerative Ag" on Bouldin Island was included in a presentation to the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. The term generally means a combination of farming based on a combination of biodiversity, watershed improvements, agroforestry, and enhanced ecosystems that includes capture of carbon in soils and associated biomass (including covering peat soils) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.06	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	The waterway of the proposed barge landing is known as Little Potato Slough and it has been used for anchorage, fishing and other water sports by Delta families for several decades. What happens on the landside of the barge landing?	The proposed barge landing along Bouldin Island would be located in Potato Slough with nearby access to the San Joaquin River. The barge landing would be approximately 1,200 feet long along the bank of the river or slough and would be constructed into the existing levee to minimize extension into the waterway. The barge landing would extend approximately 600 feet to the landside of the existing levee. Trucks would drive on the landside of the levee and move materials from barges to the launch shaft site.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.07	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	How exactly would barges go around Sherman Island?	Barges from the Port of West Sacramento would enter the Sacramento River and navigate under the Rio Vista Bridge and Three Mile Slough Bridge to the proposed barge landing on Bouldin Island. Barges from the Port of Stockton would navigate the San Joaquin River to Potato Slough without crossing under any bridges.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.08	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	Would a noise factor be involved? Noise is amplified on water. The residents of Korth’s Pirate Lair Mobile Home Park would be subject to that noise. There are also homes along the San Joaquin river that will be affected by the noise. The area is referred to as The Bedrooms by recreational boaters and is used as anchorage by boaters who don’t want to harm the environment. There is concern also about trucks driving on the levees.	DWR will evaluate the potential effects of barge traffic on noise in the waterways as part of the EIR preparation.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.09	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	Would the barge stay there until another barge comes and picks it up?	The tugboat would remain with the barge until it would be unloaded, and then the tugboat would return the barge to the main port.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.10	4/22/2020	James Cox	Going around Sherman Island would require crossing Sherman Lake, which is very shallow. Dredging would be required if barges went through on a regular basis.	Under the current options, the barge routes would remain in the San Joaquin River/Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel and would not enter Sherman Lake and the Lower Sherman Island Wildlife Area.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.11	4/22/2020	Michael Moran	Going down the Sacramento River through 3-Mile Slough would mean going right by Brannan State Recreation Area which is a choke point for a lot of motorized and non-motorized recreation traffic. There would also be people on the beaches at 7-Mile Slough. Beyond that point is Sherman Lake State Wildlife Area. It seems like the next feasible area would be Broad Slough.	Under the current options, barges would travel Three-Mile Slough only if the goods were being transported from the Port of West Sacramento. All other barges would remain the San Joaquin River/Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.12	4/22/2020	James Cox	There are barges that go through Broad Slough but it is uncertain what their drafts are. There isn't an actual channel there, but it is possible to go through there. However, it adds a lot of distance onto the route.	Under the current options, barges would not enter Broad Slough or the Lower Sherman Island Wildlife Area, and would remain the San Joaquin River/Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.13	4/22/2020	Michael Moran	Keep in mind the drought barrier that is going in at False River and how that changes the flows and tidal actions coming down from 3-Mile Slough pretty dramatically. It's unknown when it will actually go in, but it is something to keep in consideration.	It is recognized that the proposed barge route between the Port of West Sacramento and the proposed barge landings at either Bouldin Island or Lower Roberts Island would include several reaches that could cause delays due to shallow and or narrow waterways and schedules for two operable bridges.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.14	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	There are a couple of areas that Ms. Mann provided to the DCA staff that would be affected by the Central Route, but those don't appear to be reflected on the map. The Mildred Anchorage Area is not noted and neither is Byron Elementary School.	The map discussed at the April 2020 SEC meeting did not include all of the features presented on other DCA maps.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.15	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	The barge depth will need to be compared to the channel depth if you intend to go around Sherman Island.	It is recognized that the proposed barge routes outside of the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel would include several reaches that could cause delays due to shallow and or narrow waterways where navigation would be required to wait until appropriate tide levels and that smaller barges would be required.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
7.16	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Where does the borrow come from? Referring to the clay to mix with the fines.	Under the current proposal, soils for constructing embankments and other fills would be provided from several locations. On many sites, fine-grained clayey material needed for construction would be excavated at the construction site, including at the intake sites. The RTM would be used to construct the Southern Forebay embankments and the elevated structures at the tunnel shaft sites. Soils purchased from existing commercial businesses also would be used, including clay materials to form the center of the Southern Forebay embankments and structures at the tunnel launch shaft sites prior to generation of RTM.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
7.17	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	There is a lot of subsidence on Bouldin Island and a there's a lot of weight in the launch shaft area. There will need to be more details about flooding and how the land will hold up as the project planning progresses.	Ground improvement would occur at areas on Bouldin Island to strengthen the soils beneath the proposed structures and areas to be filled, including the tunnel shaft site, tunnel segment storage areas, and barge landing.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
7.18	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	When will the biological surveys be completed for Bouldin Island and where will the burrow fill for the tunnel shaft be acquired?	DWR will evaluate biological characteristics of project sites for the selected alternatives as part of the EIR preparation. The proposed tunnel shaft would be constructed from material transported from the tunnel shaft construction site at Glanville Tract.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
7.19	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Is the team aware that Bouldin Island is -17 feet elevation? The levees on the south side are very fragile.	The subsidence and levee conditions at Bouldin Island have been considered. Ground improvement and levee strengthening on the interior landside of the levees would need to occur prior to construction of a tunnel shaft.	Andrew Finney	5/27/2020	Responded
7.20	4/22/2020	Gil Cosio	The DCA might want to check on the volume of material that will be needed to raise the ground to reach the Tidal Marsh elevation. Likely several million yards of material will be needed. If seven million yards is needed for the forebay, there may not be enough material.	The graphic presented at the April 2020 SEC meeting was developed several years ago for another project. As part of the EIR preparation, DWR will identify necessary mitigation and consider methods (and sites) to implement the mitigation needs.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.21	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	DWR sent out guidelines for their participation with the project and it clearly stated how they intend to participate with the Delta. I do not see how that is possible with the current state. I will email it for the record. There is a specific section talking about how they will engage with the communities and there is no way to legally do what it states. They need to either change their guidelines to say that they will be able to participate with anyone who has computer and internet access.	DWR has acknowledged the need to find creative ways to ensure continued access to public information and participation as it continues important work, and has generated some possible ideas for doing so while also following public health protocols. These ideas are a mix of electronic and non-electronic means, among other strategies. From the blog post: "Public engagement in government-led processes is critical and we need to find ways to enable every member of the community to have access."	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded
7.22	4/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	I am also interested in the fish screen because I read that Clifton Forebay has a nonperforming fish screen getting all the smelt. I am more interested in why that cannot be fixed.	The Delta Conveyance Project does not include any improvements to Clifton Court Forebay or the existing fish facilities in the South Delta. The DCP objective is to improve water supply reliability for the State Water Project. The new intake facilities and conveyance system are physically separated from the existing South Delta facilities for this purpose. The existing SWP (and CVP) fish facilities in the South Delta use louvered screening and fish collection systems that behaviorally separate fish from the diverted flow and draw the fish into large collection tanks. These fish are then routinely transported to fish release sites in the western Delta, well away from the South Delta diversion's hydraulic influence. While these systems are not as efficient as new facilities, DWR continues to maintain and improve the fish collection systems so they perform as intended. All fish losses are monitored and mitigated per existing agreements and permitting requirements with the fish agencies. Fish losses due to high predation rates across Clifton Court Forebay, located just upstream of the SWP fish facility, are probably more significant than the facility fish losses. DWR is currently engaged in significant predator removal programs within the CCF to reduce these potential losses. DWR is investigating long term strategies and solutions in the South Delta to reduce these losses, in collaboration with the fish agencies. DWR operates to reduce diversions in the South Delta, when sensitive species are most vulnerable to losses, in accordance with our Incidental Take Permit for Long-Term Operations. DWR is also evaluating long term operational strategies using the DCP diversions to allow flexible water withdraws between North and South Delta facilities to reduce overall fish losses in the Delta. Unlike the South Delta fish facilities, the new fish screens proposed for the	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.23	4/22/2020	James Cox	This should be incorporated into the project, not a separate project. It has been delayed and stalled for years. Fishermen have gotten to the point where we don't believe anything that is said about this because there have been so many promises in the past. He urged to keep in mind that Clifton Court is the biggest fish killing location in the Delta. Once fish get in, they do not get out. It really needs to be addressed. There is a project that demands an improvement of habitat, this would be the biggest habitat that could be improved in the Delta.	See response to above comment.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.24	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Is that from the fourth climate change analysis? I would strongly urge a comparison be done to the report from the fourth climate change analysis because my concern is not just the combination of sea level rise hurting facility coming up the San Joaquin but storm events coming down the San Joaquin. The two together seem like the perfect storm for catastrophe.	The climate change and sea level rise projections were prepared by DWR based upon the recent published analyses completed by the State of California. The climate change projections for river flows include consideration of changes in hydrologic conditions in the upper watersheds of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. Flood protection of project facilities and operations to address climate change and sea level rise is one of the primary goals of the project team. Climate Change and Sea Level Rise assumptions for design and operations analysis of the Delta Conveyance Project are consistent with the projections that were part of California's 4th Climate Change Assessment. Design of the new facilities will be based extreme sea level rise projection for 2100 along with late century 200-year Climate Change hydrology. DWR is also using the latest available dataset of Global Climate Models (GCMs) to develop future hydrology scenarios. We are using most current science and climate change data for conceptual design with a recognition that Climate Change and Sea Level Rise projections are evolving and further analysis using updated data and tools may be necessary for final design and construction. As part of the water resiliency portfolio approach, State and local efforts will be needed to address levee integrity and general Delta inundation with changing climate and sea level rise.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.25	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	The only way in and out of Discovery Bay is on the river that this goes right under, and that is an issue.	New map books will be provided for the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.26	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	The maintenance shaft looks very close to the water treatment plant and sewage plant that serve the residents of Discovery Bay and Byron. That is the only drinking water for as many as 20,000 people.	The proposed Byron Tract Tunnel Maintenance Shaft is located on property to the east of the Discovery Bay community. The water and wastewater facilities that serve Discovery Bay and that are located to the north of State Route 4 are located within the Discovery Bay community. The tunnel shaft construction would include installation of a slurry wall or diaphragm wall around the shaft to isolate the construction site from adjacent groundwater and surface water.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.27	4/22/2020	David Gloski	Is there any gateway to the Delta on the I-5, like a visitor's center? That is an idea of what could be done there.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits and site reuse as part of the proposed project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits including the community's vision for a visitor's center, and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in a visitor's center for the Delta.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.28	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	It would be great if there were smaller, satellite centers that could work in conjunction with the centers Mr. Shiedigger is planning. With many entry points to the Delta, there should be many points of access for visiting the Delta. Land cannot be returned to productive agricultural use, and that has to be accounted for in regards to lost revenue and property taxes to the county's tax base. As much of the land as possible should be turned back into habitat that is compatible with the natural Delta. Opportunities for biking and trails with that type of restoration would be a good feature to have at a visitor's center.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits and site reuse as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits including the community's vision for a visitor's center and recreational opportunities, and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in a visitor's center for the Delta.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.29	4/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	The entry point for the Delta should be Freeport at the Cosumnes.	The DCA is in the process of collecting suggestions and ideas on community benefits as part of the project. When the DCA has compiled this information, we look forward to discussions with the communities about community benefits including the community's vision for a visitor's center and recreational opportunities at several locations throughout the Delta, and how the DCA can be a part of the vision, and avoid duplication of efforts while working with other groups and individuals also interested in a visitor's center for the Delta.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.30	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	There should be collaboration with the Delta Protection Commission to ensure any visitor center plan isn't a duplicated effort.	The DCA and DWR have been meeting with the Delta Protection Commission, and will continue to meet with this agency as the project progresses.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.31	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	Ken Shiedigger is trying to put a visitor center together at the corner of Hwy. 160 and Hwy. 12. Will the affected property owners get an easement or reimbursement for the land taken for construction and operations?	The DCA and DWR have been meeting with the Delta Protection Commission, and will continue to meet with this agency as the project progresses.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.32	4/22/2020	Peter Robertson	It is necessary to change how outreach is conducted because it is not possible right now to address large groups. If DCA can provide speakers to small meetings, how quickly can a speaker task force be assembled? What will their availability be? Can they have materials available in both electronic and printed format? A lot of the facilities used up until six weeks ago have now been locked down. It is difficult to find a space where you can have even a small group of people. Even when restrictions are lifted, people will be gun shy about getting together.	As a general rule, any land and/or easements utilized for the Delta Conveyance Project would be acquired by DWR (potentially with the DCA acting as DWR's agent).	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded
7.33	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	It is questionable that the Governor wants DCA to move forward at this time, and a direct order from him is requested.	The DCA team would be happy to work with any interested stakeholder groups who would like presentations of our materials. The DCA will make staff available at mutually suitable times and will follow the latest health and safety guidelines put forth by the state to keep themselves and members of the public safe. In the near future, the DCA can help organize online presentations as needed and move towards in person meetings if/when those are allowed and desired. Materials are always available on our website, printed materials distribution is not guaranteed at this time.	Nazli Parvizi	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.34	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	While DCA is incorporating feedback and once restrictions start to ease, SEC members could participate in self-guided (rather than bus) tours. Walkie-talkies could be used to communicate while maintaining proper social distancing. The visual visits are critically important to think things through, understand the conditions on the ground and go back to groups SEC members work with to envision the best option. Ms. Mallon said at the DCA Board meeting that comments could be taken any time later. Rather than conducting another meeting in one month, consider holding it in maybe six or eight weeks. After SEC members can participate in tours, DCA should provide them 6-7 weeks to safely conduct small group outreach in light of limited capacities and social distancing orders. SEC members will need to be creative in how to get information to the DCA, which can be done, but additional time will be needed.	Please refer to https://covid19.ca.gov/img/Executive-Order-N-33-20.pdf for more information on EXECUTIVE ORDER N-33-20 on the Governor's State of Emergency declaration and Memorandum on Identification of Essential Critical Infrastructure. Please note that Director Nemeth, as the Governor's representative, has directed DWR to continue its work on the Delta Conveyance Project.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
7.35	4/22/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Has the DCA been able to determine flood control risk for the proposed site along Twin Cities Rd. and to the west of I-5? In the flood of 1986, the I-5 flooded at that location.	Due to historic floods within and near Glanville Tract, a ring levee would be constructed around the proposed Twin Cities Consolidation Center and other parts of the tunnel launch shaft site during construction. The ring levee would be removed following removal of the construction equipment.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.36	4/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	Only intakes 2, 3 and 5 are shown. What happened to intakes 1 and 4?	Due to historic floods within and near Glanville Tract, a ring levee would be constructed around the proposed Twin Cities Consolidation Center and other parts of the tunnel launch shaft site during construction. The ring levee would be removed following removal of the construction equipment.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
7.38	4/22/2020	Michael Moran	How much peat is going to be moved out? How much is going to be put in storage? Why is it being covered up and not being used elsewhere for restoration projects?	Potential modification of traffic corridors will be discussed at the May 2020 SEC meeting to obtain further information.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.39	4/22/2020	Sean Wirth	The situation is that either the local residents are affected, or the wildlife species are affected. Anything to reduce the length of the roads would help, and splitting it would be better than nothing.	Potential modification of traffic corridors will be discussed at the May 2020 SEC meeting to obtain further information.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.40	4/22/2020	Sean Wirth	I spoke to the Friends of Stone Lakes and the Stone Lakes managers. The north/south road are very environmentally damaging for the refuge. There are birds foraging on both sides of the entire length of that haul road. These roads would dramatically affect the ecosystem services of that preserve for listed species. The Hood-Franklin Road usage is not great but there is already an existing road. Having a dirt tract with lots of use inside the preserve is very damaging. It is already a very constrained refuge with other existing issues, and it would not be good to impact it any further.	The DCA team is still working on the RTM balance to provide adequate soils to tunnel shaft sites, Southern Forebay, and potential mitigation sites to be considered by DWR. The RTM also could be considered for reuse by other entities in the Delta which have not been identified at this time.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.41	4/22/2020	David Gloski	Where is the RTM going generated by the Bouldin Island Launch Shaft?	The DCA team is still working on the RTM balance to provide adequate soils to tunnel shaft sites, Southern Forebay, and potential mitigation sites to be considered by DWR. The RTM also could be considered for reuse by other entities in the Delta which have not been identified at this time.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded
7.42	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	How many Reclamation Districts have signed up to take the RTM?	The DCA team is still working on the RTM balance to determine the volume of RTM that would be available for non-project uses. At this point in time, the DCA team has not contacted reclamation districts to determine the future demand for RTM.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded
7.43	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Perhaps the RTM could be provided to RD's for free.	As currently planned, the surplus soil material could be made available to reclamation districts without charge. However, loading, transporting, logistics, and determination of the suitability of the soil material for the reclamation districts' purposes would be the responsibility of the reclamation districts.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.44	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	The ITR stated the RTM was not reusable?	The analysis of the RTM characteristics was not available to the Independent Technical Review (ITR) that reviewed the Tunnel options. The ITR based their comments on their past experiences on other projects that were not located in the Delta. There will be additional work conducted to demonstrate that the RTM can be reused. DCA engineers are confident that the material is appropriate to use for embankments with proper drying of the material and construction with a clay core in the embankment in the same manner as other levees throughout the Delta.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded
7.45	4/22/2020	James Wallace	The DCA has a high-level of confidence that the RTM will meet specifications for constructing all the embankments, but he is confused because the material is homogenized as it comes out as RTM. Will the material be sorted? Or do you just anticipate the homogenized material will meet spec? I assume this has to be an engineered fill. It says “fine-grain” which has a pretty geotechnical definition. How will the RTM be managed? A lot of it is being used to build some important structures.	The RTM material would be homogenized at the tunnel launch sites and at the construction sites. The embankment material would need to include at least 20 to 30 percent fine material. Based upon current geotechnical information, it appears that the tunnel would be bored in areas that would generate material that would produce appropriate soils. RTM materials that would not meet the embankment design criteria would be placed in a separate location at the RTM storage area.	Steve Dubnewych	5/27/2020	Responded
7.46	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	A major concern regarding emergency medical assistance is that eastern Contra Costa County was reduced from nine fire stations down to one. It is located on Bixler Road. There is no longer a fire station on Bethel Island or in Byron, which is where this is pretty much at. As it is, there is only one engine unit to support all the homes that have been built out on Discovery Bay and Byron area.	The DCA is aware of the limitations of existing first responder agencies throughout the Delta. Emergency response facilities and crews would be required to be provided by the Delta Conveyance Project in accordance with the requirements of California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) at the tunnel launch shaft sites and near the intake sites. DCA would like to work with the communities to identify methods to help supplement community emergency services.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.47	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	If the water goes over the freeboard and into the river, would the water level then increase and be dispersed to the north and the south?	As proposed, the Southern Forebay would include an Emergency Spillway in accordance with the Division of Safety of Dams requirements in case the water levels rise above the freeboard elevation (probably due to extensive rainfall at the Southern Forebay). The water would flow through the bypass into Italian Slough where the water would flow into Old River and the Delta.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.48	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	Would this occasion hypothetically would happen more towards the wintertime, summertime, or spring? The reason is because many, maybe 4,000 homes are actually waterfront sites and when the dams were released about 10 years ago, they all experienced incredible flooding in their homes. So, is this something they will need to be aware of for their own personal homes and businesses?	The Southern Forebay emergency spillway would be designed for flows that would occur when the forebay would be full with excessive rainfall on the forebay water surface with the unlikely occurrence of a malfunction of controls such as failure of fail safe devices, power outages, and/or gate malfunctions that would not reduce flows from the intakes. Although these conditions are highly unlikely to occur, the emergency spillway must be designed to consider these potentially rare events which could release up to 6,000 cubic feet/second into Italian Slough with flows into Old River and other south Delta channels. However, without the emergency spillway to control releases of overflows under this highly unlikely event. The overtopping and loss of the embankment cause flooding of Byron Tract and surrounding areas.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.49	4/22/2020	Karen Mann	The odds of this flooding our properties are becoming more likely.	The Southern Forebay emergency spillway would be designed for flows that would occur when the forebay would be full with excessive rainfall on the forebay water surface with the unlikely occurrence of a malfunction of controls such as failure of fail safe devices, power outages, and/or gate malfunctions that would not reduce flows from the intakes. Although these conditions are highly unlikely to occur, the emergency spillway must be designed to consider these potentially rare events which could release up to 6,000 cubic feet/second into Italian Slough with flows into Old River and other south Delta channels. However, without the emergency spillway to control releases of overflows under this highly unlikely event. The overtopping and loss of the embankment cause flooding of Byron Tract and surrounding areas.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.50	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	What will be the ongoing noise from the operation on the surrounding communities? I would like to see a map in detail of what the houses would look like and where they are in relation to this.	Regarding work in the Southern Complex Area discussed at the April 22 SEC Meeting: Noise should be minimal from the facilities to the nearby homes at most construction sites. DWR will analyze potential for noise effects at sensitive receptors during construction and operations as part of preparation of the EIR.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.51	4/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Why would the tunnel ever need to be dewatered? What scenario would make that relevant?	The tunnel would need to be dewatered for inspection on a periodic basis. The inspection interval has not been determined. However, inspection once every 10 years could occur. To dewater the tunnel, water would pumped at the Pumping Plant and discharged into the forebay in a manner similar to normal operations.	Phil Ryan	5/27/2020	Responded
7.52	4/22/2020	Cecille Giacoma	Are the trucks hauling borrow fill are included in the truck traffic graphic?	Most of the RTM and soil material would be moved to the Southern Forebay by rail. Trucks would be used to move this material between tunnel shaft locations and other construction sites. The projected truck trips are being developed and will be discussed further at the May 2020 SEC meeting.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded
7.53	4/22/2020	David Gloski	I'm glad to see Italian Slough will be utilized. Would like to promote this as a dual benefit facility. With the issues going on with algae and health with the water down in the South Delta, there is a benefit to be able to take some of this water and flush it back into the Delta during times when there are problems. Have you thought about other plumbing? There might be other options than over a spillway. Could there be a flow control device needed on one of the forebays into Italian Slough? Asked Carrie if there are plans to look at this as part of the CEQA process.	The Emergency Spillway into Italian Slough would only be used for an extremely rare emergency situation. Currently, there are no plans to discharge flows from the Southern Forebay into Italian Slough or other surface waters. DWR will be analyzing the effects to water quality (including algae) as part of the preparation of the EIR. At that time, they will assess the potential mitigation measures, including an option to use water from the forebay to improve quality in the south Delta.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.54	4/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	In WaterFix, it was estimated that the existing pumps would be used without tunnel operation 52% of the time. Isn't this the time to go back to Cal Fed and fix the fish screens for when the existing pumps are used? It seems like it should be engineered in because there is so much opportunity there to improve that set of conditions at the same time for fisheries. Does that mean it would be incorporated into construction at this time or would it be run separately?	The Delta Conveyance Project does not include any improvements to Clifton Court Forebay or the existing fish facilities in the South Delta. The DCP objective is to improve water supply reliability for the State Water Project. The new intake facilities and conveyance system are physically separated from the existing South Delta facilities for this purpose. The existing SWP (and CVP) fish facilities in the South Delta use louvered screening and fish collection systems that behaviorally separate fish from the diverted flow and draw the fish into large collection tanks. These fish are then routinely transported to fish release sites in the western Delta, well away from the South Delta diversion's hydraulic influence. While these systems are not as efficient as new facilities, DWR continues to maintain and improve the fish collection systems so they perform as intended. All fish losses are monitored and mitigated per existing agreements and permitting requirements with the fish agencies. Fish losses due to high predation rates across Clifton Court Forebay, located just upstream of the SWP fish facility, are probably more significant than the facility fish losses. DWR is currently engaged in significant predator removal programs within the CCF to reduce these potential losses. DWR is investigating long term strategies and solutions in the South Delta to reduce these losses, in collaboration with the fish agencies. DWR operates to reduce diversions in the South Delta, when sensitive species are most vulnerable to losses, in accordance with our Incidental Take Permit for Long-Term Operations. DWR is also evaluating long term operational strategies using the DCP diversions to allow flexible water withdraws between North and South Delta facilities to reduce overall fish losses in the Delta. Unlike the South Delta fish facilities, the new fish screens proposed for the	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded
7.56	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Air quality: We need to see some strong documentation that shows that we are moving to electric construction equipment etc. to eliminate the diesel emissions. And will air quality impacts require green planting around the community of Byron for air filtration? Indoor air monitors and extra air filtration equipment for area schools?	The DCA has identified the current availability of electric equipment, hybrid diesel construction equipment and transit trucks, compressed natural gas trucks and other equipment, Tier 4 construction equipment and transit trucks, Tier 4 locomotives, and hybrid and electric vehicles to move employees and materials between sites. It is anticipated that over the next 15 years as the project is designed and constructed, the availability of electric and hybrid equipment and vehicles will increase including for tugboats. The EIR will analyze potential changes in air quality and identify potential mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse impacts.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.57	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	I am guessing that the truck trips, railroad deliveries etc to this significant construction zone are coming from the Port of Stockton. I believe the area from the Port of Stockton to Clifton Court needs to be treated as an air pollution corridor during construction. Air filtration, green plantings around schools and houses, indoor air monitors, noise barriers for schools need to be targeted around Boggs Trac, Conway Homes, Weston Ranch, and other areas in South Stockton adjacent to this traffic corridor. South Stockton is one of the most tree barren areas in the State, temperatures from climate change in the summer are already 10 degrees higher than in North Stockton, death rates fall 18 years younger in age, and this area experiences the 4th highest rate of asthma in the country. Truck traffic, needed Port expansion, concrete batching, train and barge traffic, will make these conditions all worse. Can mitigation include a major tree planting effort within these communities and funding for local NGOs to hire local workers to do the planting and tree maintenance? We need to transform these communities into green corridors during construction to offset impacts. The goal should be to leave the community better than you found it.	As part of the EIR preparation, DWR will analyze potential changes in air quality due to implementation of the alternatives and identify potential mitigation measures to reduce significant adverse impacts, including public health impacts. The air quality analysis will be conducted for each construction site and within each air basin. Potential air quality considerations will be discussed at future SEC meetings.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.58	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	We have difficulties in the Iron Triangle, center of railroad traffic in South Stockton presently. It is an overly crowded train traffic area, and we have problems with trains idling engines for long periods of time. We need the power of the State of California and the DCA to improve this situation with construction so that idling/air pollution is reduced at that site as well.		Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	For Future Discussion

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.59	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	For the Port of Stockton, if the DCA is going to use electric barges etc., we need to work together to push the Port to being a clean Port. We need the jobs in SJ County, and many fine people are part of Port leadership. They are community oriented, but they do things oddly, like not publish or notify the public about EIRs for Port expansion. If this project comes to pass, community benefits to offset construction impacts should focus on modernizing the Port of Stockton and making it a model, clean Port. I will again address Port concerns with this project when I discuss water quality and HABs in a later point.		Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	For Future Discussion
7.60	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	There are studies of the impact of blowing peat soils on communities of color and lung disese in South Stockton from the mid-20th century. Blowing peat causes lung disease and soils with Chromium 6 are a double threat. I know in a prior meeting Kathryn, you said, that we should assume that you will follow best practices. What would be helpful would be a good description of what containment looks like. Explain it to us -- the plans for that -- so that we can train groups to be active citizen monitors. The project could very well outlive some of us. Let's make sure that Delta residents can watch and know that things are being done right, and can report properly and factually if things go wrong. The more the public knows the better. This has been a big lesson of COVID19. More information alleviates fear because the public can monitor what is happening in a factual way.	Excavated peat soils would be placed in previously excavated holes on the construction site and covered with non-peat soil material present on the construction site, including RTM or topsoil. This method would reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the peat soils and minimize the peat dust from leaving the construction site.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.61	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Neighbors -- There are some longtime farming families living on each side of the proposed South Delta pumping operations. I cannot imagine how any of them could handle living and farming anywhere around that construction zone, even if they are on the opposite side of the proposed construction sites. Please work with care with them. Do right by them. All the air quality comments above apply to them, as they are mostly elderly people,and need protection as well. Also will their water wells for home and farming operations be dewatered? How will you take care of their water needs?	Use of construction methods to reduce dust from leaving the construction site would be implemented at all construction areas. Slurry walls or diaphragm walls would be constructed at the intake, tunnel shaft, pumping plant, and forebay construction sites prior to major excavations to isolate the construction site from the adjacent surface water and groundwater. These methods would protect wells used by homes and farming operations during dewatering activities. Groundwater and surface water monitoring also would occur.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.62	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	The existing South Delta pumping area was built on top of a Yokuts village. Testimony by tribal experts as part of the CWIN case at the SWRCB for WaterFix covered how they return to this area for native plants that are part of cultural practices to this day. I have heard criticism from some of our tribal reps at recent meetings about the consultation process with DWR. While RTD cannot speak for tribes, we have great empathy for their historical losses in California and advocate for protection of their cultural practices and protection of the natural world on their behalf. If this project advances, please do not just disregard these concerns. Are there ways for these native plants to be moved, replanted and protected? Is there a way to honor their history and culture near new facilities? I don't think such offers make up for the losses endured -- in a way my white person suggestion feels like offering a Disneyland version, or whitewashing, of nature in place of real nature. However, somehow, something needs to happen to recognize the true history, the loss, and reconciliation/inclusion of California tribes if this project moves forward so they can gain strength spiritually, culturally, and economically in California. What would water reparations look like for the water rights to the Delta that they were stripped of by the genocide? This is between you and the tribes, but how this is handled can either show real generosity of spirit from the water contractors and the State of California, or not. Again, we believe that the most impacted parties must somehow see benefits. We see tribes as the most impacted parties historically.	DWR is engaging with tribes through consultation under AB 52 and DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy. To initiate this process, DWR reached out through letters and emails to 121 tribes throughout the study area. DWR has reached out to all tribes that responded. Due to the COVID-19 public health situation, some tribes want to delay discussions regarding this project. DWR has met virtually with interested tribes, and communicated with remaining tribes that they will be available to meet when the tribe is ready. DWR will work with these tribes to identify potential effects to tribal cultural resources and consider potential mitigation measures.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.63	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Part A. How much total electricity will be used for operations at the new South Delta Pumping Facilities? Current pumping requires roughly 15% of the state's electricity (somewhere around there, I would have to dig for the exact number). Are we looking at solar operations to reduce energy use? Part B. One of our critiques of WaterFix and other state plans is that energy/greenhouse mitigation is too often based on buying credits elsewhere in the world. This means we live with construction, water, and air pollution impacts without receiving the benefits of mitigation. If electricity consumption is going to remain the same or increase from new pumping operations, can mitigation in energy consumption be directed toward the Delta environmental justice communities? For instance, how many low income Stockton, Iselton, Antioch, North Delta residents can be provided with solar panels/systems to mitigate a set percentage of decrease in energy consumption? Or can struggling cities and towns, and school districts be the beneficiary of provided solar systems as well to offset increases or lack of reduction in energy use. We would really like to see a switch where community benefits mitigate pollution and climate change impacts related to creation of the project within the Delta first. The project is Delta-centric; make the offsets into community benefits; and make them Delta-centric. The people who live with the impacts should receive the lion's share of benefits.		Part A. Jacqueline Todak; Part B. Carrie Buckman		For Future Discussion

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.64	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Carrie, you said that you would apply the 4th Climate Change analysis to flood protection analysis of the new South Delta facilities. Our concern is not just sea level rise, but storm surge, along with SJ River inundation. This is one of our primary concerns regarding Delta management with or without the tunnel. French Camp slough and the SJ River is the site of the greatest potential for overtopping, and area adjacent to the large Conway Homes public housing community, but everything downstream from that point is at risk, including new Delta pumping facilities. I am glad to hear that you are using sea level rise data for the year 2100. Phil had told me 200-year Army Corps standards at a prior meeting without mentioning this additional standard. Comparing it to DWR's own analysis is essential. Share the answer with us. And please, please, please update design to match flood analysis with climate change modeling up until the time construction begins. You need to be constant consumers of climate change literature and adjust levee protection accordingly. You cannot rely on data from 2010. It seems to me to be a very expensive project for roughly a 50 year life-span. While we may not support the project as the best solution for water management with climate change, we also don't want it to fail if it goes forward. Failure with climate change is not an option. Failure will result in deaths and catastrophic economic loss in our region and for water supply for others. Our sincere critique here is for you all to be nimble and to get it right.	DWR is using the future projections of San Joaquin River inflow (and 10.2 feet of sea level rise) as part of the modeling effort to identify flood levels that must be considered within the new facilities design. Please see earlier comment response regarding the 4th Climate Change Analysis.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.65	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	HABs -- I am writing these comments while watching the CA Water Boards' Region V workshop on HABs. Restore the Delta is pursuing funding to become a HABs testing and tracking site with an emphasis on citizen science conducted by area youth. Our goal is to provide lots of data so that we and the Water Boards can understand how HABs are proliferating and work toward elimination of causes. I am particularly concerned about how South Delta Facility construction could increase HABs proliferation? We have seen increased HABs incidents related to barrier installation during the drought around Bradford Island. What are plans for HABS mitigation during South Delta Facility construction? Are floating wetlands a possibility to absorb nutrient loads released during dredging and construction in surrounding rivers and sloughs?	DWR will analyze changes in water quality due to implementation of the alternatives in the EIR, including construction-related water quality concerns.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.66	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Opportunities for restoring Mormon Slough with flows off of the Stockton East diverting canal -- similar to the Truckee Creek in Reno. Such flows could help to recirculate water into the Stockton waterfront and reduce HABs. The restoration of Mormon Slough would be a new source of water and riparian restoration. It could also work as an urban renewal program for South Stockton, providing new recreation opportunities, tree planting, and urban walkways. (A San Antonio/Reno river walkway with pocket parks to honor the cultural history of the Delta).	DWR will be analyzing the effects to water quality (including HABs) as part of the preparation of the EIR. At that time, they will assess the potential mitigation measures, including opportunities at Mormon Slough.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded
7.67	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Increased aeration systems installed by the Port of Stockton, State, and local government entities around the Stockton waterfront and near marinas across the South Delta. We also believe that we need in addition to a pipe for the Stockton drinking water plant, some small pipes of water to get freshwater into the Stockton waterfront to prevent HABs.	DWR will be analyzing the effects to water quality and water supply as part of the preparation of the EIR. At that time, they will assess the potential mitigation measures.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.68	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	An aggressive state effort to reduce nitrate loads by the Port, upstream dischargers, and local industry so as to reduce HABs proliferation.	DWR will be analyzing the effects to water quality as part of the preparation of the EIR. At that time, they will assess the potential mitigation measures.	Gwen Buchholz	5/27/2020	Responded
7.69	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Fish screens. I asked my question about the installation of new fish screens for exiting pumps that will be used maybe half the time with the new tunnel facility. Carrie, DWR maintains it is a separate project. This is not right. If we are rebuilding the South Delta facility, let's fix all of its elements. Not doing so would be akin to remodeling a new home and failing to replace the failing electrical system because it is a "separate" project. Frankly, we have given up on the idea at RTD that beneficiaries will ever pay for screen replacement on existing pumps. We would support state financing of such a repair and would work to bring the public along to supporting that idea. In a post-Covid world, it would be a waste of a good opportunity to do the job the right way and reduce the kill of endangered fish.	The Delta Conveyance Project does not include any improvements to Clifton Court Forebay or the existing fish facilities in the South Delta. The DCP objective is to improve water supply reliability for the State Water Project. The new intake facilities and conveyance system are physically separated from the existing South Delta facilities for this purpose. The existing SWP (and CVP) fish facilities in the South Delta use louvered screening and fish collection systems that behaviorally separate fish from the diverted flow and draw the fish into large collection tanks. These fish are then routinely transported to fish release sites in the western Delta, well away from the South Delta diversion's hydraulic influence. While these systems are not as efficient as new facilities, DWR continues to maintain and improve the fish collection systems so they perform as intended. All fish losses are monitored and mitigated per existing agreements and permitting requirements with the fish agencies. Fish losses due to high predation rates across Clifton Court Forebay, located just upstream of the SWP fish facility, are probably more significant than the facility fish losses. DWR is currently engaged in significant predator removal programs within the CCF to reduce these potential losses. DWR is investigating long term strategies and solutions in the South Delta to reduce these losses, in collaboration with the fish agencies. DWR operates to reduce diversions in the South Delta, when sensitive species are most vulnerable to losses, in accordance with our Incidental Take Permit for Long-Term Operations. DWR is also evaluating long term operational strategies using the DCP diversions to allow flexible water withdraws between North and South Delta facilities to reduce overall fish losses in the Delta. Unlike the South Delta fish facilities, the new fish screens proposed for the	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.70	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Restore the Delta seeks to create a citizen science program that will move youth from some of our more challenged communities into becoming water scientists, engineers, historians, advocates etc via HABs monitoring and testing. Other groups we work with are developing citizen science and employment opportunities around climate change mitigation and air quality monitoring and mitigation. We want to see workforce development for all the tunnel activity between the Port of Stockton and Clifton Court Forebay to include green jobs for environmental justice communities for mitigation, not just construction. While temporary construction jobs are helpful, they are temporary and do not negate poor environmental outcomes that exist presently on the ground. We would like to see such a strategy around all points of construction for the tunnel -- pulling residents from Isleton, Walnut Grove and Antioch to share in job development opportunities near their communities. Again, to fully offset construction impacts from 23 years of tunnel construction, the goal should be to leave challenged communities better off than you found them. That would build equity into the State Water Project.	The DCA is interested in methods to include local residents in the project implementation. Additionally, DWR is working on outreach related to ideas about Environmental Justice concepts to incorporate in the EIR, and these ideas will be helpful for that effort.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.71	4/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Yesterday, we asked several times what was the deadline we had to meet, and a process outline had been provided at one of the recent DCA meetings also covering a timing outline. Kern County Water Agency, however, is using a different outline which I have attached. Kern also reported that, "The DCA delivered its "footprint" for engineering to DWR on April 1, 2020. The "footprint" for engineering serves as the starting point for the environmental analysis necessary for the EIR." So what does it mean that we are still offering input. What is the footprint if it is predetermined? Isn't that what we are working on? What does our work on siting really mean? And how does the SEC fold into this timeline? While I would prefer an answer relatively soon, can you also please explain this at next month's meeting? Committee members should be aware of where the process is really at.	Thank you for your follow-up on the schedule. I was hoping we would get to talk about it on Wednesday, but we didn't have a chance to focus on this topic. I've tried to provide more detailed information about the schedule here. As we've discussed during SEC meetings, DWR was directed by the Governor to start the planning and environmental review process for a proposal for a single tunnel Delta conveyance project with an overall schedule goal of completing the environmental review within 2-3 years. DCA is working under DWR's direction pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act Agreement (JEPA). Based on this direction, the DCA is developing "Engineering Project Reports" that document the preliminary design work on the alternatives to support DWR's environmental review. In parallel to the development of this information, the DCA organized the SEC to get input regarding specific design and construction activities from Delta stakeholders. During January's SEC meeting, Kathryn Mallon indicated that drafts of the Engineering Project Reports would be delivered to DWR in July. As a part of this, the DCA and DWR planned a two-month period for review and revision of the drafts of the reports, with the final reports originally expected in September. Based on the delay in scoping, we will be delayed in providing the DCA with additional alternatives to work on. I am hoping that we will still be able to have the final product in September, but the draft deadline in July will likely slip. Consistent with the schedule outlined at the November SEC meeting, in early April, the DCA gave DWR initial engineering information on the proposed project to help begin its review. This information is consistent with the material that the DCA has been sharing with the SEC. At the same time, the SEC is reviewing this information, DWR's engineering and	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
7.72	5/8/2020	Jim Cox	At the last stakeholders committee meeting the southern facilities were discussed Many questions were asked regarding Clifton Ct. facility and changes to be made there. The answer was far from sufficient. We were told that Clifton Ct. would be a separate project. Why a separate project? As the fishing representative on the committee I find that answer totally unacceptable. To the fisherman of the delta this sounds just like what we have heard before. Twenty five years ago water contractors committed to installing "state of the art screens" on Clifton Ct...it never happened. Those same water contractors did get the additional water they wanted! There is not a single wildlife professional that does not agree that Clifton Ct. is the worst "hot spot" in the delta for fish mortality. The annual fish loss totals in the millions. With the loss of those spawning fish to the fishery the future losses go into the billions. The Delta Improvement act of 2009 called for the co-equal goals of water reliability, and delta habitat restoration. Chapter 2, section 85020, line c, (c) Restore the Delta ecosystem, including its fisheries and wildlife, as the heart of a healthy estuary and wetland ecosystem. To the fisherman of the delta this is the critical part of this act. Yet we have heard nothing about habitat improvement. When we were told this is a separate project, I ask by whom. Is this a DWR project? Or is this being done by some one else, and if so	DWR's project objectives for the Delta Conveyance Project include adding operational flexibility to the State Water Project to improve operations for aquatic species, but unlike past efforts (like the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan), they do not include a specific objective to restore habitat. DWR has many other efforts (such as EcoRestore) that are focused on habitat restoration. In addition, as a part of the DCP impact assessment, DWR expects that habitat restoration will likely be proposed to mitigate potential impacts to certain biological resources.	Carrie Buckman	5/27/2020	Responded
7.73	2/13/2020	James Sarmiento	Requesting GIS Shapefiles for the Drive Shaft Siting Study.	The drive shaft siting studies are still being finalized. The final GIS files can be provided.	Graham Bradner	5/27/2020	Responded
7.74	5/12/2020	Douglas Hsia	Re Glanville Tract Launch Shaft: I would like to share with you one of my constituent coming up with the idea of using Dierssen Rd as the haul road plus added facilities to minimize disruption to the existing road. The difference between his and DCA's plan is the freeway interchange. Having the interchange connected from Dierssen Rd would cause less disruption to the Twin Cities Road. The constituent's family has a long farming history in the Delta.	The potential for haul roads with and without new interchanges is being considered for Hood-Franklin Road, Dierssen Road, Lambert Road, and Twin Cities Road. The selection of haul roads will be discussed in more detail at the May 2020 SEC.	Jim Lorenzen	5/27/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.01	5/21/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Concerned about the topics that arise in the SEC meetings as being narrow and limited where they can't explore at a greater compacity and would like more open Q&A discussions.	We are happy to work with the Stakeholder Engagement Committee to create space for more reflection and more time for Questions/Answers if that is something the Stakeholder Engagement Committee feels is missing.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded
8.02	5/21/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Biggest concern is the potential loss of permanent crops such as orchards and vineyards and the way this will affect the agricultural economy.	We will be working with Stakeholder Engagement Committee Member Liebig to reach out to the agricultural community to further discuss issues around reuse of agricultural land.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded
8.03	5/21/2020	Karen Mann	Emphasized that the Central Corridor route is not a preferred option. It was noted that the Independent Technical Review (ITR) team hired by the DCA said that the Central Corridor was not feasible and that there are no benefits to the East Contra Costa County. This route will affect the wells, the Sandhill cranes, and will go through the a heavily used recreation area and the National Heritage area.	The December ITR stated that compared to the Eastern Corridor, the Central Corridor more impractical due to limited accessibility of the tunnel shaft sites using existing roads. The Shaft Siting Analyses presented at the February 12 and February 26, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings indicated that potential tunnel shaft sites along the Central Corridor were determined to have a higher potential for conflicts with wells and Greater Sandhill Cranes habitat than the Eastern Corridor. Water-based recreational opportunities presented at the February 26, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting indicated similar occurrences along the Central and Eastern corridors. This information was only at a screening level; DWR will complete an assessment of potential impacts within the Environmental Impact Report.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.04	5/21/2020	Karen Mann	Concerned about the layout of the Byron maintenance shaft being within only 1000 feet of residences.	The currently proposed Byron Tract Tunnel Maintenance Shaft would be over 4,100 feet (0.75 miles) from the eastern boundary of Discovery Bay development. The tunnel crosses under State Route 4 at approximately 120 feet below the ground surface and about 750 feet from the southeastern corner of Discovery Bay development.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.05	5/27/2020	Angelica Whaley	As part of the CEQA process, is a current traffic study being conducted using data that is more recent than 2018?	We used data from Caltrans' Freeway Performance Monitoring System (PeMS). PeMS has imbedded loops that continuously collect information that helps their traffic management center react to different instances on the road, so that is quite recent. For other places, we have updated the traffic counts done in previous years to current (pre-COVID) volumes using the growth projections from Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) and San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG). We did anticipate there would be some growth, and again used the regional traffic models to forecast this growth. We noted some anomalies, such as some of the traffic before the recession was actually higher than more recently. But in any case we are using the best available data. The 2018 data considered by our analysis was based on data published in the 2019 report, which is the most recent SJCOG congested management program's Monitoring and Performance Report.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.06	5/27/2020	Angelica Whaley	Has there been an analysis of the agricultural traffic separate from day to day traffic along the Delta?	The original plan was to do traffic counts for certain locations at 4 different times during the year in order to get the seasonal differences. It's not currently advisable given current traffic patterns. If ithis changes, I recommend doing that. We do have information for the Caltrans facilities from their embedded loops that are continuously collecting information. We can compare data from different months to get some information on seasonality.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.07	5/27/2020	Angelica Whaley	Grape harvesting trucks take up the whole road.	The original plan was to do traffic counts for certain locations at 4 different times during the year in order to get the seasonal differences. It's not currently advisable given current traffic patterns. If this changes, I recommend doing that. We do have information for the Caltrans facilities from their embedded loops that are continuously collecting information. We can compare data from different months to get some information on seasonality.	Neil Paynter	6/24/2020	Responded
8.08	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	Clarify the statement "DWR is not subject to local regulations." 6-ft shoulder going through Stones Lake is worrisome because it will take up valuable habitat with big trucks. Since new census surveys were just filled out, does this mean you will be using old census information? Caltrans isn't the best model about how to approach traffic in the Delta as they can share inaccuracies with road closures and signage. They are not the best model for signage or communication.	DWR is a state agency, so as a general rule it is not subject to local regulation. Regarding Stone Lake and the bike lane, it is just one of three alternative paths to get between Interstate 5 and the potential haul roads to the intakes, including 1) Hood-Franklin Rd, 2) Lambert Road, and 3) Twin Cities Road. All three routes have low volumes of traffic compared to their capacities and so could accommodate project traffic while maintaining the target LOS. The choice of route(s) can be made using non-traffic criteria, or a combination of routes could be used. The U.S. Census is done once every 10 years; however, the American Community Survey is completed more frequently and was used in the	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.09	5/27/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	Concern with data from 2018 because traffic has increased extremely each year. Is there 2019 data that you can access from Caltrans?	We used data from Caltrans' Freeway Performance Monitoring System (PeMS). PeMS has imbedded loops that continuously collect information that helps their traffic management center react to different instances on the road, so that is quite recent. For other places, we have updated the traffic counts done in previous years to current (pre-COVID) volumes using the growth projections from SACOG and SJCOG. We did anticipate there would be some growth, and again used the regional traffic models to forecast this growth. We noted some anomalies, such as some of the traffic before the recession was actually higher than more recently. But in any case we are using the best available data. The 2018 data considered by our analysis was based on data published in the 2019 report, which is the most recent SJCOG congested management program's Monitoring and Performance Report.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.10	5/27/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Regardless of COVID, agricultural traffic will be the same with the same capacity and you should be able to do those studies calculated appropriately because there is no impact to agriculture right now and work is at the same speed. This is important because there is concern about grade trucks which can be looked at easily. Caltrans can be difficult to work with.	Based on the prior WaterFix project, we anticipate that seasonality may be an area of interest. We therefore planned to count the same locations at different times of the year to learn more about that. Hopefully when traffic patterns more closely reflect normal conditions, we can do that. We do have information for the Caltrans facilities from their embedded loops that are continuously collecting information. We can compare data from different months to get some information on seasonality.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.11	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	Noticed that San Joaquin County and Sacramento County data were used. Why wasn't Eastern Contra Costa County data used? They have good data to look at for Highway 4. Contra Costa County is going to be adversely affected significantly, we are in the DNF category on your charts.	We did look at a number of other studies with data from other counties; for example, a study on improvements to Byron Highway. But for the purposes of this presentation we wanted to focus on San Joaquin and Sacramento counties. In doing so we found that the situations in the north, middle, and south areas are all quite different. The south area, which is the focus of this question, definitely has existing traffic conditions that are challenging and that accounted for in the analysis.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.12	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	On Highway 4 there are 3 bridges between Stockton and Discovery Bay and a proposed maintenance shaft Semi trucks take two lanes to get on bridge because it is narrow. How do you work around old bridges with no shoulder and how are you going to go about historical bridges?	At this time, it is anticipated that most construction material would be transported from Interstate 5 in a westward direction, and, depending on the alignment selected, may not need to cross some of the State Route 4 bridges. On State Route 12, the Central Alignment would include trucks from Interstate 5 over the Little Potato Slough Bridge.We are considering the best approach for that location.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.13	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	On Byron Highway there is agricultural and school traffic.	Byron Highway is heavily congested and has a LOS F in the peak commute periods and LOS E in the mid-day off-peak period. These high traffic patterns would interfere with the transport of construction materials to and from the Southern Forebay Complex. We are looking at different strategies to minimize or eliminate project travel on that road, including direct rail access, to reduce the volume of construction trucks during some periods of the project, including during the beginning of the project when fill material would be moved from the south portion of the Southern Forebay complex to the northern portion of the Southern Forebay. These truck traffic could not be moved by rail; however, these trucks could be moved at night or by conveyor belts or bridges over Byron Highway.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.14	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	On the Highway 4 route, how about access for emergency equipment since lanes are old and narrow? There's been existing issues with blocked traffic.	We did not base our approach on Caltrans' methodology, although they use a very similar methodology for forecasting because it is industry best practice. We also did not take our traffic standards from Caltrans, though again there are similarities in standard traffic engineering practice. We did use data from Caltrans. Caltrans has imbedded loops that continuously collect information that helps their traffic management center react to different instances on the road. That information is available and that is the information received from Caltrans.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.15	5/27/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Is there an actual quantity of truck traffic that has been proposed?	The powerpoint file provided for the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting included histograms showing the currently proposed truck volumes to separate construction sites by month.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.16	5/27/2020	Jim Wallace	Althought CEQA doesn't require projects to use level of service, surely that can't be the ONLY factor?	Per SB 743, upon the adoption of the revised CEQA guidelines, which occurred in December 2018, automobile delay (like LOS) can no longer be used for determining impacts under CEQA. Agencies must use some other metric that matches the three goals in SB 743, namely reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. Most state agencies have chosen to use vehicle miles of travel (VMT). Level of service is not going away, since it can still be used for general plan conformity and impact fees, but it will not be used for CEQA. We used LOS for this planning study because we know that it represents local traffic conditions which are important to both Delta communities and to the project. DWR has indicated that it is planning to include LOS information within the Environmental Impact Report to provide additional information, but it will not be the basis for determining significance.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.17	5/27/2020	Douglas Hsia	2 weeks ago, provided suggestion to widen Diersson Road; is this under your consideration?	After the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting, we adjusted shaft locations to avoid any improvements at the Dierssen Road overpass at Interstate 5.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.18	5/27/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	It's important that Contra Costa County data is included in this information.	Contra Costa County information was included in the analysis presented at the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting. The powerpoint file presented at the meeting included information for Contra Costa County related to State Route 4 and Byron Highway, and focused on southwestern Sacramento County and western San Joaquin County where nost of the construction traffic would occur.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.19	5/27/2020	Sean Wirth	What is the possibility of moving the proposed haul road to the intakes? What if we shifted it closer to the Sacramento River than the eastern levee?	The proposed haul road along the western toe of the railroad embankment would be located so that vehicles could enter and leave the intake sites from the east side. We currently propose avoiding access to the intake sites from the west along State Route 160 to avoid construction traffic in the town of Hood and extensive truck traffic on State Route 160 which appears to be unsuitable for large volumes of truck traffic.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.20	5/27/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	On the graphic of truck trips, are estimates included for trucks hauling fill?	The graphics in the powerpoint file presented in the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting showed that the trucks for different materials using a color code, including blue color for the trucks hauling fill material.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.21	5/27/2020	Jim Wallace	If you improve the intersection of I-5 and Hood Franklin does that involve Federal Highways Administration? What do the communities think? Running trucks through Hood on the Sacramento River is a good idea, keeping it out of Hood is the best way to go, just a haul route, so without knowing how many trips that is, might have a more difficult time when trying to determine how that impacts wildlife.	After the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting, we determined that there would not be a need for an improvement of the intersection of Hood-Franklin Road and Interstate 5. As currently proposed, employees accessing Intakes 2 and 3 would exit Hood-Franklin Road to the east of the community of Hood onto a haul road that would be parallel to State Route 160.	Neil Paynter	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.22	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	Why are you not including traffic info for Yolo County, all connected so all traffic affects everywhere? The idea of driving those trucks through those preserves and the town of Hood is bad. I don't agree that there is no capacity issue on these roads; all it takes is one incident for it to last hours before you can pass. Twin Cities is rocky and bumpy and that should be a capacity limiter. Impacting the slough with trucks is bad and would like to see data that no damage will happen to the Slough and Stone Lakes Reserve.	None of the routes currently planned for the project use any of the local roads through Yolo County (some project traffic will use the Yolo portions of I-80 and I-5). None of the three routes between Interstate 5 and the intake locations would go through the community of Hood. The primary construction route would be along a haul road located to the west of the abandoned railroad embankment. As described in May 2020 Stakeholders Engagement Committee meeting, several roads would be widened to provide two 12-foot wide lanes with 4 to 6-foot wide shoulders which would provide adequate space in case a vehicle breaks down. We are proposing to make improvements to Twin Cities Road.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.23	5/27/2020	Sean Wirth	It would be better if truck traffic flushed wildlife into safe area in west than to an unsafe area.	The proposed haul road would be located to the west of the toe of the abandoned railroad embankment which would include the eastern edges of the three intake sites.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.24	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	I love the idea of widening Highway 12, long needed, big issue at various times of the day, not safe to drive on, leave it better than you found it.	As currently proposed, State Route 12 would be widened from Interstate 5 to the construction site.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.25	5/27/2020	Sean Wirth	Widening should take into consideration the fact that traffic will not change; that is a problem.	The Delta Conveyance Project would consider the increased traffic patterns due to construction in addition to traffic that would occur without the Delta Conveyance Project. For State Route 12, the portion of the roadway between Interstate 5 and the construction site is proposed to be widened to accomodate the construction traffic, but not other traffic patterns that would occur without the project.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.26	5/27/2020	David Gloski	Widening Route 12 would be great and would save lives and improve safety.	Under Central Corridor, State Route 12 would be widened from Interstate 5 to the construction site to accomodate the construction traffic to a new Bouldin Island offramp/onramp.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.27	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	We were told that the water board agreed that the Bouldin Island wouldn't work, and sending toxic fumes to a place where people live full time might not be the best move.	The State Water Resources Control Board did not come to any findings for the WaterFix Project before the application for change in point of diversion of the existing water rights was withdrawn. It is recognized that concerns were raised by opponents of the project, including concerns about air quality emissions during construction of a tunnel launch shaft site on Bouldin Island. The EIR for this project will evaluate air quality emissions due to implementation of the project.	Carrie Buckaman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.28	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	In order for a truck to get onto the bridge, because of the S-curve the traffic coming the oppposite way would have to stop to let the truck on. It takes both lanes for the vehicle to be able to get on the bridge.	The analysis we presented at the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting was high level analysis using LOS based on the number of lanes. For the number of lanes on State Route 4 , our computer model shows LOS D. The EIR analyses and future engineering analyses would consider more details, including constraining curves.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.29	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	Contra Costa County fire marshal was concerned because at the Discovery Bay Bridge, there are no emergency services from that bridge east, so no firefighters, etc. if there was an issue. If there's anything happening on Highway 4, it can take 8-10 hours to clear the vehicles. That road is a levee road which means that the 2 lane road is higher than the rest of the island; one side has ponds and the other side is agriculture so the turnouts would only be on the south sides of the road.	The DCA is considering the potential effects of vehicle break downs on traffic and construction operations. Therefore, we are considering a design standard of 12-foot wide lanes with 4-foot wide shoulders for routes that would carry a lot of construction trucks. We are also considering providing occasional turn-outs if road widening would not be feasible. We are also considering relocation of some tunnel shafts, including shafts that would be accessed from State Route 4.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.30	5/27/2020	David Gloski	I think Highway 4 traffic is event driven, it's always an issue. Wondering why rail wouldn't work?	As stated during the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting, we are not proposing to direct significant construction truck traffic to the Southern Forebay complex along State Route 4, and instead extend rail lines to the Southern Forebay complex.	Neil Paynter	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.31	5/27/2020	Philip Merlo	Most of the prevailing winds along Highway 4 are going into Stockton which is a city of low income people. Are any studies concerning CO2 emissions being conducted considering a vast majority of those emissions will be affecting a community with one of the highest rates of asthma? Civil rights issue since perks will be going to white people but the problems will be affecting people of color. Any reliance on rail that reduces truck traffic is appreciated.	As part of the EIR, DWR will be conducting air quality analyses as well as human health risk assessments related to construction vehicles and equipment. The EIR also will include analyses of Environmental Justice impacts to determine if the impacts would be disproportionately high and adverse on minority and low-income populations. Additionally, water from the proposed Delta Conveyance Project would be used by 27 million Californians, including minority and low-income communities.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.32	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	How is it that you are able to continue your work during a time when all other agencies are cutting their budgets? What is the truck traffic on the port of Stockton and what economic groups will be the most impacted? Make sure the voices of those who have lesser than us and will have to do more than us will be heard.	The environmental and permitting efforts for the Delta Conveyance Project are funded by the agencies that may receive water from the project. As part of the EIR, DWR will be conducting traffic and economic analyses related to construction vehicles and equipment. The EIR also will include analyses of Environmental Justice impacts to determine if the impacts would be disproportionately high and adverse on minority and low-income populations.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.33	5/27/2020	Jim Cox	Reiterate that Karen was saying about bridges on Highway 4. I have a pickup and when trucks are going across the Highway, you're making it essentially a one lane Highway so it takes time for trucks to get over bridges and therefore traffic backs up.	We are considering relocation of several tunnel shafts located along State Route 4 to reduce construction traffic along this road. If relocation is not advisable, the DCA can consider alternatives.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.34	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	The traffic data is incorrect because the traffic near Elk Grove is insane no matter which direction. It worries me when you say you will not affect traffic because the data is wrong. The other idea the people of Stockton will not notice is ingenuine. I know their traffic is already bad so increasing it would be terrible. Your modeling isn't aligning with the people who live there, get accurate representations for the Twin Cities connection.	The graph presented at the May 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting showed the anticipated traffic volumes on Interstate 5 between the community of Elk Grove and Hood-Franklin Road. In that roadway section, the volumes would be within the capacity of the freeway. There are times when traffic congestion would occur due to traffic issues outside of this freeway section and not due to capacity problems in this section of freeway. For the section of Interstate 5 within the Stockton area, we showed in graphs at the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting that there is recurrent congestion in this area. But we also showed that the construction traffic would be a small proportion of the daily variation in traffic. For example, in the southbound direction the construction traffic would be only about 10 percent of the variation that occurs in daily peak hours.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.35	5/27/2020	Jim Cox	Why improvements on Clifton Court weren't being included in this, the answer in the answer packet wasn't one. The damage being done at Clifton Court has been happening for years. Nothing has changed since 1995. I feel that this subject needs to be approached, this is the worst part of the Delta but if you're operating the same, you're still killing fish and all the problems with the current project. You're dodging the most critical part of the project. There wouldn't be a hotspot if they're wasn't flow in Clifton Court, and even cutting back down limits the problem. You're dodging the biggest concerns in this project, part of the act that created this said to restore the habitats of the Delta.	Modifications to Clifton Court or the Skinner Fish Facility are not part of the Delta Conveyance Project. DWR reached out separately to interested parties to help improve understanding of the issue.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.36	5/27/2020	Karen Mann	I keep waiting to hear what the benefits are for those who live near the Delta. I contacted part of my stakeholders (people in bus and gov) the fire chief of eastern Contra Costa County voiced his concern about increased traffic or heavy equipment of any projects. He has never been contacted for this project. The manager of Discovery Bay was taken by surprise by the location and approximation of the shaft and tunnel (600 ft within homes). Where this tunnel is planned, our only source for water is right there (400 ft away) our only waste treatment plant is on Highway 4 which will be above the tunnel. The municipalities need to be aware.	This DCA has discussed this comment with DWR, especially its emergency response team. Based on those discussions, the DCA and DWR anticipate additonal outreach efforts in the near future.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.37	5/27/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	In my review of the presentation looking at the Southern Bay Embankment design, there was a measure of the external slope, one being 6 ft of free board and another being 28 ft. How was that number derived and whether or not I can get the info on how that's being estimated?	The flood elevation of 20.8 ft near the Southern Forebay was determined using DSM2 Bay-Delta model simulations performed for the conceptual engineering design. The 200-year hydrographs (CVHS Scaled Events) from Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) 2017 update representing late century climate change hydrology were used for boundary flows at Sacramento River, Yolo Bypass, San Joaquin River and East-side streams. The analysis assumed projected sea level rise of 10.2 ft at Martinez for the year 2100 (State of California, Sea-Level Rise Guidance, 2018 Update). Only flows within the channels at DSM2 boundary locations were considered in this analysis. This analysis assumed no levee overtopping or breaches within the DSM2 Bay-Delta domain and represents a conservative projection of water surface levels in the Delta under the projected climate change and sea level rise conditions. Climate change and sea level rise projections are evolving and further analysis using the latest data and modeling tools will be conducted to refine flood protection elevations for final design and construction.	Graham Bradner	6/24/2020	Follow Up
8.38	5/27/2020	Anna Swenson	On 4/22, I asked what the ongoing noise would be. Phil answered noise should be minimal, but nothing can be minimal from 400-600 ft. The other thing I would like to encourage is that Susie has been very active and is knowledgeable in that area. I hope the DWR will take a genuine swipe at discovering what personal toll will have on her and her family. Karen: the domestic wells are close to the 150 ft down tunnel. What are you going to do about them?	The currently proposed Byron Tract Tunnel Maintenance Shaft would be over 4,100 feet (0.75 miles) from the eastern boundary of Discovery Bay development. The tunnel crosses under State Route 4 at approximately 120 feet below the ground surface and about 750 feet from the southeastern corner of Discovery Bay development.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.39	5/27/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	Given the issues with east Highway 4, I think that you should plan to build a safety center before Discovery Bay that includes more than tow trucks; ambulance and emergency personnel will be needed. Poor served area so you will need safety to go along with this project.	We are considering relocation of several tunnel shafts located along State Route 4 to reduce construction traffic along this road. If relocation is not advisable, the DCA can consider alternatives.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded
8.40	5/27/2020	Jim Cox	How about the tours of the fishing manufacturing?	We can plan a visit to the ISI facility in Freeport that manufacturers cylindrical tee fish screens. This will be discussed in more detail at the June SEC meeting.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded
8.41	5/27/2020	Jim Wallace	Map 13 is wrong, it says Sacramento River but it should say Slough.	Map reference has subsequently been corrected.	Don Hubbard	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.42	5/27/2020	Melissa Tayaba	Where are cultural resources in all of this? The AB52 meeting hasn't happened yet, we have concerns but we haven't had communication with them at this time.There are concerns about fish, pollution, restoration, birds. Some of those topics I feel like I can't bring to this setting here but all the maps that you're showing us, there are sites there. They're not being accounted for. We keep asking for alternatives but still we have those big questions. How will you protect sites and cultural resources…. before COVID, we were looking into the screens. Do you have any kind of statistics from the north and about screens and how they affected the fish and do you have the science of the vibrations on the fish?	DWR is responsible for tribal consultations under AB 52, and has reached out to all tribes with initial communications and updates. However, DWR understands that the tribes may not be staffing their offices during the COVID-19 operations. Additional updates will be provided to the tribes as alternatives are developed. The DCA can provide flash drives to the tribes with meeting presented at the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded
8.43	5/27/2020	Sean Wirth	I've continued to do outreach and have talked to Kathryn. The major concern is the largest impact environmentally of areas that were set aside for the environment. It's concerning to see that level of impact on areas that we should completely avoid. We're going to need to return to get new aspects on what we can do for these species that we need to protect.	DWR will identify potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures during development of the EIR.	Carrie Buckman	6/24/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.44	5/27/2020	Douglas Hsia	How many more meetings do we have ahead of us?	We would like to have the Stakeholder Engagement Committee meetings continue as an ongoing process. We are planning for one meeting each month during the next year. Between June and September, we will be discussing siting and engineering items. In September, we can revisit the purpose and structure of the meetings.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded
8.45	5/27/2020	Douglas Hsia	Is the DCA Board meeting monthly? Will the 4 SEC presenters happen every month?	The DCA Board of Directors meeting happens on the third Thursday of every month. The ideas was for the Stakeholder Engagement Committee members to present to the Board of Directors. Depending upon what the Committee members desire, the presentation can continue to be 1 to 4 people. Due to the need for compliance with the Brown Act, Committee members cannot meet with a quorum of the other SEC members for their thoughts or opinions for this report to the Board of Directors.	Nazli Parvizi	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.46	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The northern stretch of both corridors is the same and so those comments are combined. The proposed haul roads for intakes 2 and 3 bisect lands in the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge and would be very destructive and disruptive to the wildlife that use and travel between the two sides that the road bisects. Sandhill Cranes use that area extensively in the fall and winter months. The hauling should be done on the River Road to the west to avoid the construction and use of such damaging new haul roads in the refuge. The intakes, which are drivers for the haul roads, but also have hugely damaging effects on the Refuge, should be moved to an area that has less negative effects to the Refuge, which is one of the most important regional conservation efforts in the Sacramento area.	The proposed haul road would be located along the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment so that vehicles can enter and leave the intake sites from the east side of the construction sites. It should be recognized that the intake construction sites extend towards the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment. We currently do not want to access the intake sites from the west near the river side to try to stay out of the community of Hood, and to avoid using State Route 160 which may not be suitable for large volumes of truck traffic. The haul roads would also be sited west of the toe of the abandoned railroad embankment in order to be outside of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge to take advantage of the embankment and tree barrier to serve as a buffer from the wildlife refuge on the east.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.47	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The proposed Hood Franklin interchange improvement would be growth inducing and the storage facility depicted southeast of that interchange would be disruptive to Refuge lands to the north and lands within the jurisdictional boundary of the Refuge to the south. The inducement of development east of I-5 would impact critical foraging habitat for sandhill crane and other migratory waterfowl. The road widening and bridge improvements on Hood Franklin Road would be disruptive to the Blue Heron Trails facility and would further isolate wildlife attempting terrestrial movement to the north and south in the Refuge. The use of the river or the River Road (160) would avoid these additional disruptions and impacts to the Refuge.	We have modified the roadway access plans to avoid using Hood-Franklin Road for major construction vehicles that would access Intakes 2 and 3.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.48	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	For the proposed Lambert maintenance shaft, the new interchange on Lambert Road would be growth inducing and potentially lead to increased urbanization to the east which would have demonstrable negative cumulative effects on local wildlife. The road widening of Lambert would be disruptive to wildlife and further isolate wildlife attempting terrestrial movement to the north and south in the Refuge, as well as wildlife attempting to utilize habitats nearby the road. The haul roads to the north and to the south of Lambert Road would also be disruptive to wildlife. Use of River Road (160) or the river to move material to the intake sites would lessen these impacts on the Refuge. The location of the Lambert maintenance shaft and the new haul road that would access it would also have substantial negative effects on wildlife from the Refuge.	We have modified the roadway access plans to avoid the need for a new interchange at Lambert Road and Interstate 5. Lambert Road and the bridge are not proposed to be widened over Snodgrass Slough and the embankment with the abandoned railroad alignment within the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. Materials must be moved from Interstate 5 to the intake locations, and DCA believes that Lambert Road currently represents the best overall choice to be used as a single corridor to the intake haul road which would be located to the west of the abandoned railroad embankment. State Route 160 may not be suitable for this amount of construction traffic and the traffic would go through the community of Hood.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded
8.49	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	For the intakes 3 and 5 configuration, the widening of Lambert road and the new interchange was just mentioned. The new haul roads associated with this configuration would disrupt and isolate wildlife in the Refuge.	We have modified the roadway access plans to avoid the need for a new interchange at Lambert Road and Interstate 5. Lambert Road and the bridge are not proposed to be widened over Snodgrass Slough and the embankment with the abandoned railroad alignment within the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. Materials must be moved from Interstate 5 to the intake locations, and DCA believes that Lambert Road currently represents the best overall choice to be used as a single corridor to the intake haul road which would be located to the west of the abandoned railroad embankment. State Route 160 may not be suitable for this amount of construction traffic and the traffic would go through the community of Hood.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.50	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The conclusion is that for both corridor options presented in the Map Books, the negative terrestrial effects on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge would be severe unless the River Road and the Sacramento River were used for access and for hauling material to and from the intake sites.	The proposed haul road would be located along the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment so that vehicles can enter and leave the intake sites from the east side of the construction sites. It should be recognized that the intake construction sites extend towards the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment. We currently do not wish to access the intake sites from the west near the river side to try to stay out of the community of Hood, and to avoid using State Route 160 which may not be suitable for large volumes of truck traffic. The proposed haul roads would also be sited west of the toe of the abandoned railroad embankment in order to be outside of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge to take advantage of the embankment and tree barrier to serve as a buffer from the wildlife refuge on the east. It may not be feasible to move large volumes of equipment, construction materials, and employees on barges along the Sacramento River. The Sacramento River between Rio Vista and the intake locations includes several relatively shallow areas, including one area between Rio Vista and Walnut Grove where barges could only move during high tides. There are	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.51	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	A corridor that is further west of the current Central Corridor should be considered to avoid these substantial adverse effects to the Refuge.	We have modified the roadway plans to eliminate major construction traffic on Hood-Franklin Road between Interstate 5 and the community Hood. We have also moved the proposed tunnel launch shaft site from the site on the western side of Interstate 5 to the Twin Cities Complex on the eastern side of Interstate 5. These changes to reduce the need for road modifications to Hood-Franklin and portions of Lambert Roads. The proposed haul road would be located along the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment so that vehicles can enter and leave the intake sites from the east side of the construction sites. It should be recognized that the intake construction sites extend towards the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment. We currently do not wish to access the intake sites from the west near the river side to try to stay out of the community of Hood, and to avoid using State Route 160 which may not be suitable for large volumes of truck traffic. The haul roads would also be sited west of the toe of the abandoned railroad embankment in order to be outside of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge to take advantage of the embankment and tree barrier to serve as a buffer from the wildlife refuge on the east.	Phil Ryan	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.52	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Both corridors are squarely within the Pacific flyway and enormous numbers of waterfowl and other migratory birds use the areas being contemplated for both alignments. As well, many non-migratory listed species utilize the areas being contemplated for both alignments. It is important to keep this in mind in any discussion of the two corridors under consideration.	The EIR will analyze the potential impacts of the corridor options on terrestrial species.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.53	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	For the Glanville Tract launch site, the shaft, conveyor belt and new roads are within the boundary of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. And here again, the Refuge would take the brunt of the negative effects of the tunnel infrastructure. It is important to note that a long standing conservation goal has been to provide connection for the Stone Lakes Refuge's Sandhill Crane population with that of the Cosumnes River Preserve, and parts further south. This was an important component of the crane conservation measures included in the BDCP to address impacts from the tunnels, and for the CA Waterfix iteration of the project as well. The strategy was to provide suitable permanent roosting complexes appropriately spaced along the spine of the Stone Lakes Refuge to allow cranes access to the foraging habitat within a 2 mile proximity of those sites such that when completed the southern established roosting sites would overlap with those of the Cosumnes Preserve and provide continuity and connection. The presence of the launch shaft and its substantial infrastructure would make this important goal difficult to impossible to accomplish. As well, there would be serious effects to Swainson's hawks and other listed birds from the placement of this shaft and its infrastructure.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.54	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Restoring the entire Glanville Tract site to Sandhill Crane roosting and foraging sites, as well as foraging for Swainson's hawks, and supplementing with substantial additional foraging acreage nearby, might help offset the substantial effects to those species from the enormity of the construction planned there.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.55	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The Glanville Tract storage and support site are not within the Stone Lakes National Refuge boundary, but they are extremely close to the conserved lands of the Cosumnes River Preserve and the multi year plan of construction would result in negative effects to wildlife in both the Refuge and the Preserve for more than a decade.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project on terrestrial resources. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.56	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The interchange work at Twin Cities and the road widening would both be growth inducing and have detrimental effects to wildlife, and further isolate and disrupt them.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources and the potential for growth inducement as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.57	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	It has been extremely disappointing to see that our most important regional conservation efforts and successes are being squandered for a project that is so regionally damaging to the environment.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources and the potential for growth inducement as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.58	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	A corridor that is further west should be considered to avoid these substantial adverse effects to the Refuge.	As described in the January 22, 2020 Stakeholder Engagement Committee meeting, intake sites would be located downstream of the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District Wastewater Treatment Plant outfall to minimize effects to the Sacramento Regional Water Authority Freeport intake. The intakes also would be located north of the confluence of the Sacramento River and Sutter Slough to minimize effects to some Delta fisheries. The proposed haul road would be located along the western toe of the abandoned railroad embankment so that vehicles can enter and leave the	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.59	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	New Hope Tract Maintenance Shaft: This is a high use area for Sandhill Cranes and migrating waterfowl, and local listed species. The shaft and the road improvements would effect wildlife and further isolate them. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.60	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Staten Island Maintenance Shaft: Staten Island is ground zero in terms of regional Sandhill Crane population. More cranes and migratory waterfowl use this Island than any other area in our region. I provided coordinates and a description for a maintenance shaft location that should have the least effect on the Island's wildlife, but that statement needs to be tempered with the acknowledgment that any effect on the most important regional resource for Sandhill Cranes and other waterfowl is too much. The suggested location for the maintenance shaft was 38 degrees 10" 59" N by 121 degrees 30'31"W, as near the road as possible, adjacent to Luc's house. This is an already disturbed area and, if near the road and power line, the facility would help keep cranes flying over that spot elevated over the line, perhaps reducing risk of collisions.	The DCA moved the proposed Staten Island tunnel maintenance shaft to the suggested location.	Graham Bradner	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.61	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Bouldin Island Launch Shaft: This is another important location for foraging and roosting Sandhill Cranes, as well as many other listed species. It is close to Staten Island and an important component of the available conservation for the Sandhill Crane. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) claimed that it purchased this island, along with three other Delta Islands, for the co-equal goals of a "restored Delta and a reliable water supply for California." If the incredibly damaging shaft is not located here, does that mean that MWD would only be planning for restoration for this site? This is an important point to understand in trying to determine which corridor would have less detrimental effects to terrestrial wildlife. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.62	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Mandeville Maintenance Shaft: This shaft and its new haul roads and bridges would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.63	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Bacon Island Reception Shaft: This shaft and its new haul roads and bridge would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.64	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Byron Tract Maintenance Shaft: This shaft and its new haul roads would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects.	The proposed tunnel shaft location on Byron Tract north of State Route 4 has been eliminated.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.65	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Southern Forebay Facilities: This huge expansion of the forebay facilities would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility. Given the amount of space depicted between the elements of the facility, there should be ample opportunity to maximize native plantings.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.66	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	New Hope Tract Maintenance Shaft: This more easterly location is preferable because of the reduction in road improvements, but it is unclear how access to the shaft would be attained. The one described road goes straight to the alignment and then stops with no indication of how it would proceed either north or west. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The proposed access road to the New Hope Tract tunnel maintenance shaft on the Central Corridor would extend to the west from West Lauffer Road. The proposed access road to the New Hope Tract tunnel maintenance shaft on the Eastern Corridor would extend to the west from Blossom Road, generally along a farm road.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.67	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Brack Tract Mainenance Shaft: This shaft is very close to both the north and the south units of the Woodbridge Ecological Reserve, which is second only to Staten Island in terms of Sandhill Crane density. This is also an incredibly popular area for crane viewing, with the south unit parking lot overflowing	The proposed tunnel shaft has been moved to Canal Ranch Tract. The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.68	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Terminus Tract Reception Shaft: The needed roadwork and level of disturbing effects to terrestrial wildlife is reduced for this shaft compared to its central corridor counterpart. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.69	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Kind Island Maintenance Shaft: The needed roadwork and level of disturbing effects to terrestrial wildlife is reduced for this shaft compared to its central corridor counterpart. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.70	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Lower Roberts Island Launch Shaft: local listed species here may be pushed over the brink by the added pressures of the construction and operation of this shaft, which could increase the chance for permanent abandonment of the area by some of those species. This shaft and its new haul roads and bridge and barge landing would further isolate and negatively effect local listed species. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The proposed barge landing was deleted from the Lower Roberts Island tunnel launch shaft site. The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
8.71	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Lower Jones Mainenance Shaft: The needed roadwork and level of disturbing effects to terrestrial wildlife is reduced for this shaft compared to its central corridor counterpart. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.72	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Victoria Island Maintenance Shaft: The needed roadwork and level of disturbing effects to terrestrial wildlife is reduced for this shaft compared to its central corridor counterpart. No available recommendations to minimize effects beyond minimizing the footprint and maximizing native plantings on and around the facility.	The proposed Victoria Island tunnel maintenance shaft has been deleted.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.73	5/26/2020	Sean Wirth	If the Bract Track Maintenance Shaft could be moved further north so that it is more than one mile from both the southern and northern units of the Woodbridge Ecological Reserve, the eastern corridor would appear to have less negative effects on terrestrial wildlife. Much more still needs to be done to reduce effects on wildlife in the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge.	The proposed tunnel shaft has been moved to Canal Ranch Tract. The EIR will analyze potential effects of implementation of the alternatives on terrestrial resources as compared to existing and future conditions without the Delta Conveyance Project. Responses to potential impacts to terrestrial resources would be addressed by DWR.	Gwen Buchholz	6/24/2020	Responded
8.74	5/30/2020	Karen Mann	Please make sure the traffic people are aware and monitor the number of deaths/year on Hwy 4 (San Joaquin County AND Contra Costa County area) – then check Byron Highway.	The DCA shares the community's emphasis on safety regarding State Route 4. We are evaluating potential adjustments to tunnel shaft locations based on Stakeholder Engagement Committee feedback as well as our own observations to minimize construction traffic on the two State Route 4 bridges.	Kathryn Mallon	6/24/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.01	6/24/2020	David Gloski	At the last meeting, during the non-agenized portion, I 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?	The Brown Act was discussed in detail during the June SEC meeting.	Josh Nelson	7/22/2020	Responded
9.02	6/24/2020	Gil Cosio	How do we locate the actual Section 404 application package that DWR submitted to the USACE, and what is USACE's public notice process?	The application is on DWR's website: https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/Delta-Conveyance/Public-Engagement/DCP_Section404_Application_Package_508.pdf?la=en&hash=00A1F058F9AD8947F9DEF251558C9CF88CF0A2B3.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.03	6/24/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Paril	What will happen in terms of having a lead agency for NEPA and what the NEPA process look 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?	DWR's understanding is that the President's executive order does not apply to the Delta Conveyance Project. After the last SEC meeting, USACE sent a letter to DWR indicating that their office will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under NEPA, which is consistent with this understanding.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.04	6/24/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Paril	One of the departments not listed on the presentation was CalEPA's Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), will you be looking at standards that would be evaluated by a department like that for pollution and soil by CalEPA?	Yes, DTSC standards would be included along with criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.05	6/24/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Paril	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.	The response provided in the meeting was incorrect. Based on review of available data, Chromium VI was not detected in either the baseline (non-conditioned) samples or conditioned samples. The analyses indicate that the Maximum Detection Limit (MDL) of the testing method is above the USEPA Regional Screening Level (RSL).	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded
9.06	6/24/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Paril	Is there 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 we are 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.	Many different types and brands of conditioners are used in tunneling based upon soil conditions present along the alignment. Conditioners are generally categorized as foams, polymers and bentonites. On recent projects, DCA consultants have observed the use of Soilax S products (available from the manufacturer Boraid Products) which are surfactants (i.e. detergents) and mixed with clean water as a foaming conditioner. Sometimes, a cellulose product, like Soilax C, is added into the conditioner mix to provide added strength to the soap bubbles, which helps when the conditioner is injected into certain soil formations. Thickening agents, such as polymers and a bentonite (a naturally occurring clay), are also used for different soil conditions. These include such products available from Mapei Products. These are just examples of some products that could be used, including products from CONDAT, NORMET, and BASF. Safety Data Sheets for CONDAT, NORMET, and BASF will be placed on the DCA website. The construction specifications would require any conditioners to be inert (chemically inactive). See https://dcdca.sharepoint.com/sites/DCAProgram/Working/SE/Outreach/Forms/AllItems.aspx?viewid=b67b83df%2D738a%2D464e%2D85ff%2Dc14a0897a80b&id=%2Fsites%2FDCAProgram%2FWorking%2FSE%2FOutreach%2F2020%20SEC%20Meetings%2F2020%2D06%2D24%2F00%2DQ%26A%20Log%20Final As currently proposed, the RTM will be placed in areas following removal of vegetation during clearing and grubbing efforts at the construction sites for the Southern Forebay embankments or tunnel shafts. Runoff from these construction sites will be collected, and treated if necessary, to meet all regulatory water quality criteria for adjacent lands or water bodies	Gwen Buchholz	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.07	6/24/2020	Michael Moran	In regards 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?	The differences in RTM volumes produced are based on the range of tunnel diameters and variations in project alignment. Tunnel diameter could range from 28 to 40 feet (Internal Diameter) depending on the project diversion rate. Under the current configurations, total tunnel length could range between approx. 43 to 48 miles.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded
9.08	6/24/2020		In regards 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?	Bulking and compaction factors along with reduction in moisture content affect the volume estimates. The RTM will coming from more consolidated soil deposits that are confined at depth. When they come to the surface they will expand, then as they are dried and compacted for structural fill they will reduce in volume back down to approximately the original volume.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded
9.09	6/24/2020	Jim Wallace	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 Easter SJ County or Mt Diablo. Curious as to where borrow material is coming from and if enough has been identified as available.	The current approach is to use all available on-site material that is suitable for reuse in an effort to limit imports and associated hauling. However, there may be some instances where materials need to be imported because they cannot be derived through project activities, or because the timing of the need does not match the material production schedule. As such, some materials are likely to be imported. The source of these materials may vary depending on the material type, such as rip-rap, AB road base, embankment filter sand, and fine-grained embankment core. It is assumed that the materials would be acquired and hauled from a range of existing quarries or borrow sites that surround the Delta.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.10	6/24/2020	Jim Wallace	The presentation says that metals and organics generally resemble naturally occurring levels. Arsenic is very high naturally occuring in the Delta and it is a water quality issue. Although they might be naturally occuring, doesn't mean they meet environmental standards or environmental minimums for soil contamination.	Arsenic was detected in both baseline and conditioned soils samples at concentrations between 4.03 and 4.51 mg/kg, which is above the EPA and DTSC screening levels but consistent with or below typical background concentrations and regulatory-agency-acceptable remediation goals, which for California sites range up to approximately 12 mg/kg. Waste classification in California is accomplished, in part, through comparison with regulatory thresholds. Thresholds include the total threshold limit concentration (TTLC), based on solid-phase concentrations of the soil matrix, and soluble threshold limit concentrations (STLC), based on an extraction procedure that releases soil-bound materials into liquid in soil pores. The total concentrations of inorganic constituents and dissolved concentrations of inorganic constituents, including Arsenic, in baseline and conditioned soil samples are generally orders-of-magnitude lower than corresponding waste-classification thresholds for hazardous materials. Based on the available test results, there is no indication that RTM would require handling as hazardous waste material. RTM would be expected to meet conditions acceptable for unrestricted land uses, with or without added soil conditioners. However, further risk assessment(s) are anticipated. Determination of appropriate exposure scenarios, and the specific risk-assessment details, is a collaborative process with regulatory agency and/or permitting agency authorities (e.g., the California RWQCB, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), or the DTSC), depending on the re-use option.	Andrew Finney	7/22/2020	For Future Discussion
9.11	6/24/2020	Douglas Hsia	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?	Based on studies reviewed or completed by the DCA, the RTM appears to meet the geotechnical requirements. The biggest challenge will be removing the moisture from the RTM. The moisture will be removed with mechanical dryers or evaporation.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.12	6/24/2020	Karen Mann	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.	Electricity to the construction sites will be provided by either Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Pacific Gas & Electric Company, or Western Area Power Administration. DWR is currently working with these entities to determine the most appropriate entity for each construction site. The RTM material will be moved from the Twin Cities Complex to the Southern Forebay by railroad. RTM material will be moved from the Twin Cities Complex to tunnel shaft locations by truck. RTM material will be moved around the Southern Forebay Complex by rail and truck.	Gwen Buchholz/Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.13	6/24/2020	Karen Mann	Will the cost of electric come out of tax payer money? Who will pay for the cost of electrical use? Why won't generators be used?	Electricity used during construction and operations will be funded by the water agencies participating in the Delta Conveyance Project. This project will not be funded by with State taxpayers.	Gwen Buchholz/Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.14	6/24/2020	Karen Mann	Are the power companies aware of this anticipated draw of electricity at the proposed sites? It's shocking considering the hydro-electrical troubles in California.	Electricity to the construction sites will be provided by either Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Pacific Gas & Electric Company, or Western Area Power Administration. DWR is currently working with these entities to determine the most appropriate entity for each construction site.	Gwen Buchholz/Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.15	6/24/2020	Gil Cosio	This is a big construction project so the power lines, sub stations, etc. are not surprising. 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 awhile. What are the conditioners made from? What do they do physically or chemically to material? At which process will it be put in?	Conditioners will be introduced within the tunneling operation to provide moisture and surfactant to make the soil workable and not clog the operations. When the RTM is raised to the surface, the moisture will be removed. During drier periods, a mixture of mechanical drying and evaporation will be used to remove the moisture from the RTM. Depending upon how the RTM will be used, water may be added during placement at future embankments and tunnel shafts. Many different types and brands of conditioners are used in tunneling based upon soil conditions present along the alignment. Conditioners are generally categorized as foams, polymers and bentonites. On recent projects, DCA consultants have observed the use of Soilax S products (available from the manufacturer Boraid Products) which are surfactants (i.e. detergents) and mixed with clean water as a foaming conditioner. Sometimes, a cellulose product, like Soilax C, is added into the conditioner mix to provide added strength to the soap bubbles, which helps when the conditioner is injected into certain soil formations. Thickening agents, such as polymers and a bentonite (a naturally occurring clay), are also used for different soil conditions. These include such products available from Mapei Products. These are just examples of some products that could be used. The construction specifications would require any conditioners to be inert (chemically inactive).	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.16	6/24/2020	Cecelia Giacoma	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?	Many different types and brands of conditioners are used in tunneling based upon soil conditions present along the alignment. Conditioners are generally categorized as foams, polymers and bentonites 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. Chromium VI was not detected in either the baseline (non-conditioned) samples or conditioned samples. The analyses indicate that the Maximum Detection Limit (MDL) of the testing method is above the USEPA Regional Screening Level (RSL). Methylmercury was detected at concentrations between 0.00004 and 0.00005 mg/kg compared to an RSL of 7.8 mg/kg. Arsenic was detected, but at concentrations consistent with naturally-occuring conditions in the State. RTM would be expected to meet conditions acceptable for unrestricted land uses, with or without added soil conditioners. However, exposure of people, wildlife and plants to conditioned soil will likely require further risk assessment(s). Determination of appropriate exposure scenarios, and the specific risk-assessment details, is a collaborative process with regulatory agency and/or permitting agency authorities (e.g., the California RWQCB, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), or the DTSC), depending on the re-use option.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.17	6/24/2020	Anna Swenson	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 farm land will be put out of production to dry tunnel muck?	Soil investigations are planned for the Eastern Corridor in the future. The soil samples from those investigations will be used to evaluate potential RTM characteristics. The mechanical dryers are expected to be operated Monday through Friday during and immediately following tunneling operations which will occur from 16 to 20 hours/day. The mechanical dryers would be located within a building and include large paddles to move the RTM material close to the heat sources. The mechanical dryers and evaporation areas to remove moisture are proposed to be located within the Twin Cities Complex and the Southern Forebay complex. The paddles of the thermal dryers are slow moving, on the order 4 revolutions per minute, and as such very little noise is produced, typically less than the limit for which ear protection would be required for operators inside the building. The area for evaporative drying could vary from 200 to 400 acres per launch shaft; and would be reduced by 20 to 25 percent with the use of mechanical dryers.	Graham Bradner/Phil Ryan		Responded
9.18	6/24/2020	David Gloski	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.	Moisture discharged from dryers should be minimal compared to the surrounding air mass.	Phil Ryan	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.19	6/24/2020	Peter Robertson	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?	The natural drying process assumes 18-inch tall piles worked daily would reach optimum moisture content in 19 days during periods of favorable weather conditions. TThe mechanical dryers are expected to be operated Monday through Friday during and immediately following tunneling operations which will occur from 16 to 20 hours/day. The mechanical dryers would be located within a building and include large paddles to move the RTM material close to the heat sources. The mechanical dryers and evaporation areas to remove moisture are proposed to be located within the Twin Cities Complex and the Southern Forebay complex. The paddles of the thermal dryers are slow moving, on the order 4 revolutions per minute, and as such very little noise is produced, typically less than the limit for which ear protection would be required for operators inside the building.	Graham Bradner/Phil Ryan	7/22/2020	Responded
9.20	6/24/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Paril	What is the plan for containment of blowing dust during the natural drying process? I'm 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.	Immediately after removal of the RTM from the tunnel, the RTM will be extremely moist and will not generate dust. As the RTM dries, dust control measures would be implemented to meet regulatory requirements. Dust control measures is expected to generally involve application of water. The water for the RTM areas will generally be applied by a sprinkler system to minimize the use of water trucks. The peat/organic soils are not expected to be present in the RTM because the tunnel excavation depth will be below the peat layers. The shafts that would provide access to the tunnel would be excavated from the ground and may encounter peat/organics at some locations. The excavated peat materials will be separately stockpiled and managed to limit oxidation and exposure prior to eventual burial on-site under more stable soil material.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.21	6/24/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	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.	Many different types and brands of conditioners are used in tunneling based upon soil conditions present along the alignment. Conditioners are generally categorized as foams, polymers and bentonites. On recent projects, DCA consultants have observed the use of Soilax S products (available from the manufacturer Boraid Products) which are surfactants (i.e. detergents) and mixed with clean water as a foaming conditioner. Sometimes, a cellulose product, like Soilax C, is added into the conditioner mix to provide added strength to the soap bubbles, which helps when the conditioner is injected into certain soil formations. Thickening agents, such as polymers and a bentonite (a naturally occurring clay), are also used for different soil conditions. These include such products available from Mapei Products. These are just examples of some products that could be used, including products from CONDAT, NORMET, and BASF. Safety Data Sheets for CONDAT, NORMET, and BASF will be placed on the DCA website. The construction specifications would require any conditioners to be inert (chemically inactive). See https://dcdca.sharepoint.com/sites/DCAProgram/Working/SE/Outreach/Forms/AllItems.aspx?viewid=b67b83df%2D738a%2D464e%2D85ff%2Dc14a0897a80b&id=%2Fsites%2FDCAProgram%2FWorking%2FSE%2FOutreach%2F2020%20SEC%20Meetings%2F2020%2D06%2D24%2F00%2DQ%26A%20Log%20Final The previous BDCP/WaterFix report is publically available.	Gwen Buchholz	7/22/2020	Responded
9.22	6/24/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Paril	The charts on truck traffic loads are just for the RTM. When will all the sources of truck traffic together be discussed?	The presentation in the May SEC meeting included information related to hauling of many materials, not just the RTM. The different types of materials were provided with different colors, such as on Slide 27 of the truck traffic presentation.	Nazli Parvizi	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.23	6/24/2020	Jim Wallace	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?	The currently proposed Twin Cities Complex site has been reduced in size to about 450 acres, and could be reduced further as plans are developed. The Twin Cities Complex site was selected due to its geographical position along the tunnel alignments between the intakes and the Southern Forebay. Due to the geotechnical conditions at this location, the soil could be used to construct the tunnel shaft at the Twin Cities Complex and possibly two other shafts prior to the generation of RTM at Twin Cities Complex. Site specific geotechnical investigations wil determine the depths of the borrow areas. RTM material will be used to refill the borrow areas following the tunneling activities. Based on information available at this conceptual level of detail, it is anticipated that excavation activities on the Twin Cities Complex may require compliance with the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA). Under SMARA, “surface mining operations” are defined as “all, or any part of, the process involved in the mining of minerals on mined lands by removing overburden and mining directly from the mineral deposits, open-pit mining of minerals naturally exposed, mining by the auger method, dredging and quarrying, or surface work incident to an underground mine... .“ Regulations promulgated by the Department of Conservation to implement SMARA state that “surface mining operations” include borrow pitting and stockpiling. Further assessment of the activities on the Twin Cities Complex will be required to determine SMARA compliance needs. DWR will be coordinating with the Department of Conservation to assess the process for compliance with SMARA.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.24	6/24/2020	Cecelia Giacoma	What is SMARA?	SMARA is the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA). It is anticipated that SMARA will apply to the activities required for construction of the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. DWR has an exception under SMARA that applies to “mining operations” on lands owned or leased, or upon which easements or rights-of-way have been obtained by DWR, for the purpose of the State Water Resources Development System (SWRDS) or flood control. The proposed Delta Conveyance Project is considered part of the State Water Project (SWP). To comply with SMARA under the DWR-specific exemption, DWR will be required to consult with the Department of Conservation, submit reclamation plan(s) and annual reports, and pay annual fee(s).	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.25	6/24/2020	Cecelia Giacoma	Do the levee improvements on Bouldin Island take sea level rise into account?	The DCA is evaluating the condition of existing levees using the currently available 100-year return period water surface elevation produced by the US Army Corps of Engineers consistent with elevations used by the Reclamation Districts to evaluate levee geometry. The period of Project construction is potentially several years in the future, and maintenance and rehabilitation of levees in the Delta is an ongoing and continual process due to subsidence/settlement and increasing/changing water levels. An evaluation of current levee geometry using a water surface elevation that includes sea level rise for the purposes of identifying potential levee repair extents for the Delta Conveyance Project will not include proposed projects by local Reclamation Districts in case those projects were not completed prior to tunnel construction. Future refinement of levee repair extents would be coordinated closely with the Reclamation Districts and using the current and future predicted water surface conditions appropriate for that time period.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.26	6/24/2020	Anna Swenson	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?	Air quality will be discussed in the EIR and at future SEC meetings. Runoff and dewatering water from the intakes, tunnel shafts, and Southern Forebay Complex construction sites will be collected, treated, and reused on-site for dust control, ground improvement, and other construction activities. If the amount of runoff or dewatering flows exceed the on-site water demand, the treated flows will be stored on the construction site or discharged to surface water bodies in accordance with State Water Resources Control Board permits. Capacities of surface water bodies to accept these discharges will be confirmed prior to inclusion in the applications to the State Water Resources Control Board for discharge permits. DWR does not own the proposed Twin Cities Complex land, and acquisition plans will be developed in the future by DWR.	Gwen Buchholtz	7/22/2020	For Future Discussion

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.27	6/24/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	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 spoiles 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.	Subsurface exploration and testing at the proposed Twin Cities Complex is expected to be performed to understand the conditions, but based on available information the shallow subsurface materials at Twin Cities Complex appear suitable for reuse based on the likely geotechnical criteria. The available testing of baseline and conditioned materials representing potential RTM were collected along an alignment more similar to the Central Corridor, but were within geologic formations that extend broadly within the region of the Central Valley and will likely also be encountered along the Eastern Corridor. More investigation and testing along both the Central and Eastern Corridors will be helpful to further validate the reuse plans. The DCA will be interested in any information related to future dredging projects by the Delta agencies.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.28	6/24/2020	Lindsey Liebig	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.	DWR will analyze the potential impacts to agricultural land use during development of the Environmental Impact Report, and will consider the concerns associated with dividing parcels.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.29	6/24/2020	Cecelia Giacoma	Suggestion for DWR's Tribal Consultant to remain engaged in the process.	DWR's Tribal Policy Advisor, Anecita Agustinez, is leading DWR's tribal consultation processes under both AB 52 and DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy. She will continue to be actively engaged throughout the project.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.30	6/24/2020	Peter Robertson	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. Request for those aids to navigation to 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 giong 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.	This request was received and is in development. The DCA is overlaying Delta Conveyance Project construction sites on nautical navigation charts within the project area to serve as a resource for mariners. The DCA is aware of the need to coordinate with the US Coast Guard and the need to provide notice to mariners regarding any changes within waterways.	Karen Askeland	7/22/2020	Responded
9.31	6/24/2020	Jim Wallace	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.	As proposed, the tunnel will cross I-5 north of Dierssen Rd. and then near the Twin Cities Road/I-5 intersection. A gantry crane would extend about 80 feet above the top of the tunnel shaft. If a track mountes crane were used it could extend up as much as about 150 feet, which would be somewhere around 130 feet above the top of the shaft. The Delta Conveyance Project would require coordination and permits with CalTrans and Federal Highway Adminstration near several locations along I-5. The Project also would require coordination and permits from CalTrans due to work along State Routes 160, 12, and 4. The DCA and DWR have already been in discussions with CalTrans.	Phil Ryan	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.32	6/24/2020	Michael Moran	Will moving the Glanville Shaft over to Twin Cities depot extend the footprint or will it remain the same?	The total area for the proposed Twin Cities Complex would be less than the total area for Glanville Tract Tunnel Launch Shaft Site and the area located along Franklin Boulevard.	Phil Ryan	7/22/2020	Responded
9.33	6/24/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Paril	To expand on impacts to the Consumnes Preserve, the farmland around the Preserve is a place for feeding and roosting for Greater Sandhill Cranes. Concerned if this is getting bigger near the Preserve.	DWR will analyze the potential impacts associated with changes in available feeding and roosting areas as part of the Environmental Impact Report.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.34	6/24/2020	Sean Wirth	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.	DWR will analyze potential impacts to cranes at Stone Lakes and Cosumnes preserves as part of the Environmental Impact Report.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.35	6/24/2020	Anna Swenson	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?	DWR is planning to assess the potential for increased water surface elevations through modeling; based on preliminary information, any increase would be insubstantial. Therefore, the project does not currently include raising levees near the intakes on the Sacramento River. No construction or construction traffic would occur on the western side of the Sacramento River for the eastern or central corridors. DWR will assess the potential for noise or vibration impacts as part of development of the Environmental Impact Report.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.36	6/24/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Paril	Confused about 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 meausures for mitigation on this end of the Delta. Even if a range could be given, that would be helpful.	The traffic portion of the May SEC meeting included an appendix (starting on Slide 67) with slides showing the truck volumes by month to individual locations. The appendix slides were not discussed in the May SEC meeting due to time limitations, but did refer the SEC members to these slides.	Don Hubbard	7/22/2020	Responded
9.37	6/24/2020	Anna Swenson	Several community members of Hood gave feedback that they are uniformed on the project and they need more individualized information as they are impacted from both the north and south. Can a presentation be provided for Hood in particular? COVID-19 has limited how much can be done in person. This would help Hood stakeholders plan and make preparations. Hood is an internet black hole, so that would need to be taken into account.	An update with some of the key effects to Hood can be put together, especially around the intakes. A webinar type format can be used. The DCA are planning to contact representatives of businesses and/or residents of Hood. The DCA would appreciate being provided with appropriate contacts for the Hood community.	Nazli Parvizi	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.38	6/24/2020	Peter Robertson	The current infrastructure of bridges and ferries are not running at 100%. There has been construction repair to some of the major arteries with one lane roads. The top concern in presentations to stakeholders bridges and ferries and how to go from point A to point B.	Any road, bridge, or ferry improvement project currently under way should be completed before work on the Delta Conveyance begins. The traffic presentation in the May SEC meeting described a number of possible roadway and bridge improvement projects that will be included in the alternatives sent forward for environmental review. If the selected alternative includes roadway improvements then these would be done in advance of major construction at the sites served by these roadways. Project traffic is not expected to use roads, bridges, or ferries that are partially closed for construction.	Don Hubbard	7/22/2020	Responded
9.39	6/24/2020	Melissa Tayaba	Update from tribes: had tribal engagement meeting yesterday with DWR. Delta tribes remain concerned about the destruction of cultural and natural resources. Tribes seem to be paying a higher price with the proposed project. Discussed having DWR report directly to the tribal group and DCA. That is a request that the tribal group is asking the DCA. Hoping for a meeting with just the tribes and the DCA. The reason for that is because the materials are hard to obtain and print. It is hard to understand engineering aspects and DCA would explain better. As tribal liaison, Ms. Tayaba will be hand delivering many of the materials.	DWR and the DCA are presenting to the tribes on July 15.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.40	6/24/2020	Anna Swenson	How many more SEC meetings should members be expected to attend? Is there an end date?	Overall, DCA is planning for monthly meetings through June 2021. However, as the project continues, the meeting frequency could be reduced based upon the need for input and the development of new information by DCA.	Nazli Parvizi	7/22/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.41	6/24/2020	Sean Wirth	Interested in the idea of converting the Twin Cities Complex to permanent wildlife-friendly agriculture (irrigated pasture for wildlife foraging) after the project is constructed.	DWR will consider this option during development of the Environmental Impact Report.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.42	6/24/2020	Sean Wirth	Are there ideas for funding to preserve land in agriculture in perpetuity and would this be discussed at a future SEC meeting?	Preserving agricultural land may be considered as a mitigation measure as part of DWR's efforts to develop an Environmental Impact Report.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.43	6/24/2020	David Gloski	Earthquake Analysis – I'd like to see anything available on Earthquake analysis being done.	The seismic analysis results will be discussed at future SEC meetings.	Andrew Finney	7/22/2020	For Future Discussion
9.44	6/24/2020	David Gloski	Drying Process – I hear discussion about the project will either use natural drying, but when that is not available it'll use mechanical dryers. It sounded like either/or. I suggest thinking about whether the drying process overall, even during the summer, maybe the mechanical drying makes sense to get the bulk water out and when the muck is dryer, it might be easier to handle for getting the last bits out naturally.	We agree with the suggestion and are developing footprint accomodations and evaluating plans for potential hybrid approaches to drying RTM.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded
9.45	6/24/2020	David Gloski	Rainy Season and Drying – So during the winter, what does this drying process look like? So you use mechanical dryers but when you are done it gets soaked anyway? Do you cover it somehow? Support drainage off it?	Soil that has been mechanically dried will be stockpiled either at the drying location or at the reuse location. Rainfall could saturate the top several inches of the stockpiled RTM; however the entire stockpile would not become saturated. Drainage would be directed away from the stockpiles to prevent ponded water from unneccessarily saturating stockpiled soils.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded
9.46	6/24/2020	David Gloski	Electric Dryers – I didn't chime in at the meeting due to time, but I agree that using electric dryers seems like a bad use of smart energy. For something like drying I would expect oil or gas to be used. Is there an issue here with environmental emissions and electric being cleaner?	The thermal mechanical dryers under consideration will be electrically heated. The electrical source would likely be from the existing electrical grid, which has a range of contributing power generation sources. On-site diesel or oil generators would result in increased air quality emissions. The proposed Twin Cities Complex and northen Southern Forebay locations are not located near natural gas utilities.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.47	6/24/2020	David Gloski	Indirect Emissions for Electric Use – The GHG footprint of the project needs to consider the indirect sources of energy like the electric use. Much of that is likely low GHG content due to hydro power, but it should be factored in.	DWR will consider power sources as part of the analysis of air quality and climate change in the Environmental Impact Report.	Carrie Buckman	7/22/2020	Responded
9.48	6/24/2020	David Gloski	Air Emissions from Dryers – So I do wonder about Arsenic and other parts of the RTM being blown into the air as part of the drying process. Normally I would expect it to stay in the soil, but if we are blowing air through or over the soil to dry it, does this create unwanted emissions?	Immediately after removal of the RTM from the tunnel, the RTM will be extremely moist and will not generate dust. As the RTM dries, dust control measures will be implemented to meet regulatory requirements. Dust control measures will generally involve application of water. The water for the RTM areas will generally be applied by a sprinkler system to minimize the use of water trucks. The dust will be controlled on-site to minimize dust leaving the construction site.	Gwen Buchholz	7/22/2020	Responded
9.49	6/24/2020	Michael Moran	During Graham's first presentation, the referenced core sample locations coincided with neither the Eastern nor Central Corridor alternatives. What is the confidence level applying these samples to either alignment? Will new cores be taken along the chosen corridor or is the geology consistent enough that the exisiting cores provide necessary accuracy?	The available testing of baseline and conditioned materials representing potential RTM were collected along an alignment more similar to the Central Corridor, but were within geologic formations that extend broadly within the region of the Central Valley and will likely also be encountered along the Central and Eastern Corridors. More investigation and testing along both the Central and Eastern Corridors will be helpful to further validate the reuse plans.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.5	6/24/2020	Michael Moran	With the expressed concerns about surfactants, might the DCA provide some background information IN LAY TERMS? A "Surfactant 101" presentation or document? I can certainly see how this may result in side-tracking, but it may clarify an important project component, focus concerns, and dispel unfounded worries.	Many different types and brands of conditioners are used in tunneling based upon soil conditions present along the alignment. Conditioners are generally categorized as foams, polymers and bentonites. On recent projects, DCA consultants have observed the use of Soilax S products (available from the manufacturer Boraid Products) which are surfactants (i.e. detergents) and mixed with clean water as a foaming conditioner. Sometimes, a cellulose product, like Soilax C, is added into the conditioner mix to provide added strength to the soap bubbles, which helps when the conditioner is injected into certain soil formations. Thickening agents, such as polymers and a bentonite (a naturally occurring clay), are also used for different soil conditions. These include such products available from Mapei Products. These are just examples of some products that could be used, including products from CONDAT, NORMET, and BASF. Safety Data Sheets for CONDAT, NORMET, and BASF will be placed on the DCA website. The construction specifications would require any conditioners to be inert (chemically inactive). See https://dcdca.sharepoint.com/sites/DCAProgram/Working/SE/Outreach/Forms/AllItems.aspx?viewid=b67b83df%2D738a%2D464e%2D85ff%2Dc14a0897a80b&id=%2Fsites%2FDCAProgram%2FWorking%2FSE%2FOutreach%2F2020%20SEC%20Meetings%2F2020%2D06%2D24%2F00%2DQ%26A%20Log%20Final If desired, a presentation could be provided for the SEC at a future meeting.	Graham Bradner	7/22/2020	Responded
9.51	6/24/2020	Michael Moran	Beyond managing/phasing the Twin Cities Road footprint in such a way to minimize impact on Sandhill cranes/other wildlife, consider creating or enhancing adjacent/nearby habitat to "redirect" wildlife.	DWR will analyze the potential impacts associated with changes in available feeding and roosting areas as part of the Environmental Impact Report.	Gwen Buchholz	7/22/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
9.52	6/24/2020	Michael Moran	I realize we are early in the project and operational/contractual issues are not being addressed yet, but are there ongoing/long term mitigation/enhancement/improvement funding sources being considered for the life of the project? The model that comes to mind is a Land & Water Conservation Fund (LCWF) model for the Delta.	DWR will analyze mitigation measures for significant adverse impacts as part of the Environmental Impact Report.	Gwen Buchholz	7/22/2020	Responded
10.01	7/22/2020	Jim Wallace	Is the Through-Delta alternative the same as the No-Project alternative under CEQA? It was said in the presentation that CEQA is a methodology to inform decision making but DWR is the project proponent, the lead agency, and the decision maker. Will the decisions being made be fair and not heavily politicized?	The alternatives in the "Through Delta" category include specific levee or structural improvements within the Delta. The purpose of the EIR is to clearly analyze and document the environmental impacts and mitigation for the proposed project and alternatives; DWR's goal is to make this document transparent and understandable for consideration during decision-making. The Governor will make a final decision that is informed by the EIR.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.02	7/22/2020	Gil Cosio	A comment was made to move intakes to Sherman Island and it's not shown on the presentation with dual conveyances or isolated conveyance. Was it put somewhere else?	The Alternative Points of Diversion alternative grouping includes different options for diversion locations, such as Sherman Island. The concept for a Sherman Island diversion is also similar to the Western Delta Intake concept discussed during the alternatives presentation.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.03	7/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	On the isolated conveyance alternatives, does that include the dismantling of the existing pumps and their infrastructure?	Some of the isolated conveyance concepts would continue use of Banks Pumping Plant but would only accept water from a new diversion facility and not continue diversions from Clifton Court.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.04	7/22/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	The SEC's interaction with DWR has been limited to design and construction issues, with no discussion of CEQA. Now, the SEC is being presented a preview of CEQA alternatives and being asked for our comments. How will these comments be handled? Are they actual CEQA document comments that will be reported based on feedback from the SEC? It would be helpful to understand the flavor of this discussion.	DWR will ask the DCA to design alternatives that move forward for more detailed analysis in the EIR. The DCA anticipates working with the SEC on any new alternatives in the same way that it has presented conceptual designs to date. It would be difficult to involve the SEC in alternative design if the SEC does not understand the context of the origin of this alternative. Today's presentation is an opportunity for transparency of the process and dialogue, but the comments are not a part of the official CEQA process.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.05	7/22/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Discussing CEQA now, in a way, disqualifies earlier discussion where individuals wanted to discuss CEQA components but were forbidden to. It seems unfair that the SEC has been asked to stay within certain parameters for discussion, then that suddenly changes based on what you want for discussion going forward. It seems irregular if you want genuine input from the SEC that this is sprung on us.	DWR and the DCA have committed to being transparent during the planning process. This conversation is contextualizing the DCA's work. DWR will provide the DCA with alternatives to analyze and providing some additional information is helpful to the conversation. The goal of the presentation was to give opportunity to everyone to understand the work being done at greater depth.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.06	7/22/2020	Sean Wirth	Since the Central Tunnel and the Eastern Tunnel are being so highly considered, will alternatives be considered for the various components of the infrastructure? Will the SEC be considering alternatives for intakes and various shaft sites? This doesn't necessarily work for the intakes. There is no input for the intake siting.	The process to refine site locations has been taking place within the SEC. As DWR moves through the environmental process, the anlaysis may identify environmental effects that could be avoided by moving sites. There will be an iterative process to consider any changes that may occur as part of this process.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.07	7/22/2020	Karen Mann	From where did these lists of alternatives derive?	The main source of alternatives was scoping comments. Additional slternatives were identified from past projects and technical experts working on the project.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.08	7/22/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	A yellow pipeline going across Sherman Island was shown for the Garamendi alternative, does that go under or over the island? My concern is that the yellow alternative will go right under the largest community on Sherman Island. Will it impact the surface?	The yellow and orange lines are pipelines. In construction and as currently contemplated, the pipeline trench would be excavated, the pipe would be installed, and the trench would be covered. The pipeline would tunnel under waterways. Construction could affect surface features and would be considered in the EIR.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.09	7/22/2020	Gil Cosio	Removing Sherman because of water quality impacts due to sea level rise, is it assumed that state and federal water projects will not be responsible for maintaining water quality in the Delta in the future, as they are now?	The assumption is that regulations about water quality in the Delta will continue to govern operations. As the sea level rises, the ability of the CVP and SWP to modify operations to meet requirements may be more limited. Sherman Island may have increased concern in the future, which makes it not as desireable of a location when trying to be resilient to climate change and sea level rise.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.10	7/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What data are you using for seismic resilience? This has been a hard issue for the people in the Delta. It feels like the data being used is not recent and does not deal with proximity of earthquakes or past tests results of active fault lines. Can you discuss all the parameters for determining seismic resilience? Has the DCA considered or updated those standards so that it's using criteria that's more comprehensive? In regards to the statement about DWR being the operator of the State Water Project, how does this match up with the DWR's mission including being the provider and steward of water resources for all of California? That also includes people that do not draw water from the State Water Project.	For alternative screening, seismic resilience is being considered at a conceptual level. More detailed evaluation and data will be included in the EIR. At this point, the alternative formulation process is considering whether an alternative, at a conceptual level, has the potential to provide seismic resilience for the SWP. In other words, if there is an earthquake in or near the Delta that causes a water quality problem, does the alternative help keep the SWP operational or help the SWP return to operations as soon as possible? DWR's mission is "to sustainably manage the water resources of California, in cooperation with other agencies, to benefit the state's people and protect, restore, and enhance the natural and human environments." DWR considers many projects to satisfy this mission. For the Delta Conveyance Project, DWR's goal is to maintain function of the SWP into the future when faced with multiple challenges.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.11	7/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	Could the Garamendi alternative reduce the impact on farmers' use of water on the Sacramento River?	It is a constraint for all alternatives that they cannot affect the water rights of downstream water users. If a project moves forward, the next step would be to petition the State Water Resources Control Board to change the SWP point of diversion (by adding another diversion location). In order to approve a project and stated at a very high level, DWR needs to document that the project would not negatively impact water rights for legal users of water. The EIR will also consider potential effects to water supplies.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.12	7/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Based on this evaluation, it's been decided that these alternatives don't address the water quality criteria for the SWP but there is no description about how water quality challenges are going to be addressed in the Delta. Impacts from operations haven't been addressed yet. Completing analysis for the SWP is disallowing for the consideration from the non-SWP users that have equal duty to be protected. Confused that impacts on water quality aren't a part of the analysis.	The EIR will analyze the potential for the proposed project and alternatives to adversely effect water quality based primarily on standards set by the State Water Resources Control Board. The EIR will discuss water quality concerns and assess if there is a potential for alternatives to worsen conditions, consistent with those standards. If there is a potential to cause significant impacts to water quality, the EIR will include mitigation measures to avoid or reduce that significant effect.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.13	7/22/2020	Jim Wallace	The No-Tunnel alternative doesn't meet climate or seismic resiliency. It seems that water will only be taken when it's available. If these alternatives don't meet the project objectives, does that mean that SWP water will be taken out of the intakes in the north Delta to ensure mitigation of water quality issues? It seems contradictory. This is going to become an operational issue that has yet to be answered.	Dual conveyance alternatives (such as the proposed project) would continue operations of both the existing south Delta pumping facilities and a new diversion facility in coordination. Providing an alternate point of diversion would allow SWP diversions to continue at times that south Delta pumping is constrained. Dual conveyance will be studied further trhough operational modeling.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.14	7/22/2020	Karen Mann	It seems that that the concern is more for the people in the south, rather than for the people who moved here intentionally because this water provides life. The scope of the decision making includes water quality. The SEC needs to know the definition. The presentation mentioned that this would only be used occasionally. It's concerning that this would be expensive to only use it on occasion.	Existing water quality concerns are very important but it is not an objective of the proposed project; the State Water Resources Control Board has responsibility for regulating water quality in California. Improving water quality is not a project objective for the Delta Conveyance Project, but the EIR will analyze potential water quality impacts (and mitigate potential significant impacts if feasible). Project operational criteria will be developed in coordination with the fishery agencies to avoid or minimize potential significant impacts to sensitive species. These criteria likely will limit the amount of water that could be diverted at a new diversion point based on, among other things, flow in the Sacramento River. To focus back on the project objectives, the purpose of this project is to make the SWP more resilient to a future that has risks of potential seismic activity, climate change, or sea level rise.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.15	7/22/2020	David Gloski	It's concerning that this alternative was just eliminated from the start from future analysis. It seems like the focus of this project is to keep state water running, rather than address larger environmental issues. There is the ability to affect algae problem, with less water flowing through that will be more of a problem. It seems like the desire to not keep the current conveyance and just jump into the next.	See previous response.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.16	7/22/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	With the existing message of removing water from the Delta and sending it south, the water quality is already degraded around Sherman Island due to excessive removal of water. How will it be ensured that this doesn't worsen? How will the people there and their water be protected?	The EIR will include an extensive modeling effort to assess potential water quality effects throughout the Delta. Modeling will indicate if an alternative could significantly affect water quality near Sherman Island or other locations. If the assessment identifies the potential for significant impacts, the EIR will evaluate feasible mitigation measures to avoid or reduce these effects. All feasible mitigation must be adopted consistent with the requirements of CEQA.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.17	7/22/2020	Michael Moran	Specific to the Bethany Alternative, is the size of the existing reservoir going to increase? Does the function or purpose then change? If more capacity is offered for this particular project, might that mean that water has to be diverted in a more consistent fashion? Water would not be able to be stored as much at Bethany than it would at a Forebay, therefore the tunnel has to be operating more often?	Based on preliminary considerations, it does not look like Bethany Reservoir would need to expand to accommodate the Bethany Alternative. The DCA is just starting to study this alternative and will share more information with the SEC as it is developed.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.18	7/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Why are the sensitive receptors in Hood, Courtland, or other areas less valuable or less considered than those in Clarksburg? It seems like these alternatives were stacked up with rationale as to why they couldn't be considered. How does any of this lessen the dependence on the Delta? There are no eliminations of alternatives or intakes, so how can the dependence on the Delta be rationalized?	The distance from Intake 5 to Courtland is greater than the distance from Intake 2 to Clarksburg, so the sensitive receptor concerns regarding noise would not be the same. Hood, unfortunately, has the potential to be affected by the noise from Intake 3, so the DCA is working on design considerations to minimize noise and construction impacts to the maximum extent possible. The issue of redcued reliance will be evaluated during the environmental permitting process.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.19	7/22/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	The No-Project alternative is still going to be analyzed because it is a requirement under CEQA. The main complaint from the SEC at the past meeting was that the analysis for the No-Tunnel alternative dropped things and dismissed them as to why they won't work. If there is still a No-Tunnel alternative, will it include things that the SEC believes should be included? Or will everything be analyzed status quo? This will end up in the same fight from four years ago. The No-Tunnel included new fish screens and levee repairs. If the analysis is done because it is a requirement but the SEC's requests are dismissed, will it end up back to sqaure one?	DWR is working to identify projects to include in the No Project Alternative that could be considered if the proposed Delta Conveyance Project or Alternatives are not approved. Some projects, like levee improvements, are part of the baseline and are planned to move forward with or without the proposed Delta Conveyance Project. The No Project Alternative will not focus on these types of projects, but will focus on the potential projects that would not move forward if the Delta Conveyance Project were implemented.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.20	7/22/2020	Anna Swenson	Concerned about the compaction and how it will affect the domestic wells. Abandoned water infrastructure was mentioned, but there is no such thing in the Delta, so whose water infrastructure will be used? Who decides what is lost and kept? Where will the tunnel muck be stored? How do you know that taking a layer of tunnel muck and putting the top soil back will lead to productive farmland? Major water infrastructure is being put on top of farmland, they can't live there, fields will be taken, and soil will be ruined. What happens to the year of non-productive farming? What will happen to the people there during this time? It's not a year or two, it's a long period of time. The Twin Cities burrow is not purchased land, but the plan is to make it a burrow pit. Can it be clarified whether or not the land being discussed is land that the project already owns?	For each property, the need to remove or continue to use water infrastructure would be determined based upon the constructed facilities at that location. Existing wells could continue to be used with withdrawals not greater than existing withdrawal rates. If existing drainage facilities also serve adjacent properties, facilities would be constructed to maintain drainage conveyance to properties not involved in the construction. Water generated on the construction site (including stormwater flows) would be reused on-site to the extent possible. The Post-Construction Land Restoration would be applied to the portion of the site where construction equipment and materials would be removed following construction. On sites where soil would be excavated, such as the Twin Cities Complex, RTM would used to fill the excavation borrow and topsoil initially removed prior to construction would be placed over the RTM. The Post-Construction Land Restoration approach is a concept being considered for incorporation into the CEQA environmental impact analysis. At this stage, no project has been selected and therefore land has not been acquired. Following adoption of a project, the land would be acquired by DWR prior to construction.	Graham Bradner	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.21	7/22/2020	Sean Wirth	Would this reclamation be considered avoidance minimization or mitigation in CEQA? Who would own the reclaimed land? It would make sense for large portions of the north Delta to be restored to an agricultural cover type that these impacted species can utilize. If it's private land, this would require row crops. Both habitat and mitigation can be accomplished for a lot of the project's footprint. If you have 100 acres, then you reclaim that 100 acres, have 100 acres of mitigation already been provided as part of the project? Then 100 acres of reclamation is added additionally? Who would own the land?	DWR is planning to include any land reclamation as part of the proposed project so that the effects of the entire project are considered. Reclaiming the land so it can be returned to a useful purpose will be part of the proposed project. DWR will look at each parcel, the activities of the parcel, and assess potential impacts and mitigation. The owner of the land after the project is not clear at this point in project development.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.22	7/22/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	What is the timeline of this restoration and is there intent to use adaptive management? The graphic shown earlier in the presentation that showed a large yellow to red area, is there a key to understand the different colors?	The restoration activities at specific construction locations would occur immediately following completion of construction activities and generally be completed within a year. Adaptive management would be part of the process since the actual effects induced by construction would be best understood following completion of site activities. Pilot studies are also being considered to validate the initial approach described for post-construction land restoration. The colors on the map show different peat thickness in the Delta is based on publicly-available information. A few references are provided below. See page 26 of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Atlas: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/exhibit3/rdeir_sdeis_comments/RECIRC_2646_ATT%203.pdf See page 25 of the Delta Risk Management Strategy Phase 2 Report: https://deltarevision.com/2011_docs/drms-again/DRMS_Phase2_Report_Section9.pdf	Graham Bradner	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.23	7/22/2020	Lindsey Liebig	A lot of us in the agricultural community don't believe this tunnel muck will be reusable as proper agricultural land after it's restored. Compaction is a major concern with using that land. A lot of prime farmland is being taken out of production and turning it back into a low-value crop is going to have a disproportionate effect on the ag economy. Only taking 12 inches of top soil isn't enough, the amount won't make a difference post construction. The adjacent land use, especially for intakes, in one of the graphics, for example, there was a large square of land with a u-shape around it. Yes, that can be restored but is it really farmable? Something like having an ag base plus having environmental access for terrestrial species would be great. I'm hopeful that this land can be turned back into productive ag land. Still, there are a lot of concerns to see how this is going to affect the productivity of the ag community as a whole. These approaches still need to be discussed and talked about with farmer engagement.	The Post-Construction Land Restoration approach will continue to be discussed with the local agricultural community and refined. Pilot studies are also being considered to validate the concepts described in the post-construction land use approach. Input and engagement from the agricultural community will be very important for the success of potential pilot studies.	Graham Bradner	8/26/2020	Responded
10.24	7/22/2020	Michael Moran	I encourage consulting with the Farm Bureau. Ms. Mallon's comment about proof of concept is very encouraging. With the unprecedented scale of this project, there is an unprecedented amount of study and funding for it for this to be done through mitigation. If we're going to use this as a project base, the same approach should be taken for studying it.	Feedback from farming communities will be considered when developing mitigation.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.25	7/22/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Engaging with the ag community is very important as well as offices in that area and maybe local universities. This would allow for a better understanding of RTM and how many acres of land you estimate to be reclaimed. If you have any familiarity with mine land reclamation principles, reclaiming lands that have been impacted by construction, you can be more sophisticated with impacts on the overalaying soils, how nutrients move and dynamics, and developing lists of crops that can live in ths type of soil. You need to actually try what crops would thrive in the artificial soil. Need to conduct these studies. The original part of the “we don't own any lands, et.c” there are some islands that are already owned by state water contractors. It's a unique opportunity in that you already have land and use the properties for pilots so that when youre trying to reclaim lands you know that these steps are credible.	The approach described will continue to be discussed with the local agricultural community and refined. Pilot studies are also being considered to validate the concepts described in the post-construction land use approach. Input and engagement from the agricultural community will be very important for the success of potential pilot studies.	Graham Bradner	8/26/2020	Responded
10.26	7/22/2020	Jim Cox	How much top soil on top of the muck is being considered? I suggest taking a good look at Fosum City, it is built from reclaimed bay water with a topsoil and bay muck underneath. There's about 40 years of growth there that can be studied.	The initial approach for post-construction land restoration currently under review assumes placing approximately 12 inches of topsoil for discing and reintroduction of local organic material. The thickness of topsoil will be a subject of future study likely as part of site-specific pilot studies or proof of concept studies.	Graham Bradner	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.27	7/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	Who would restore the land? The SCFB or the end user? Also, today there was talk about using the RTM to recover the ground, but there was discussion at the last meeting that there would not be enough RTM to do so.	The initial restoration activities would be completed as part of construction activities. The final site preparation activities would be dependent upon the ultimate land owner. For example, different site preparation would occur for pasture versus orchards or habitat. The quantity of available RTM would vary based on tunnel diameter and alignment. For the smallest tunnel diameter under current review, the quantity of RTM is not sufficient to construct the Southern Forebay, so additional imported fill would be required for the Southern Forebay. However, RTM generated at the launch sites, such as the Twin Cities Complex, would be used to fill the borrow areas.	Graham Bradner	8/26/2020	Responded
10.28	7/22/2020	Anna Swenson	On the Twin Cities slide, what happened to the intermediate forebay that was supposed to be near that site? Is it no longer a part of the consideration? Is that then balanced and accounted for in terms of not being able to restore the land?	Results of hydraulic analyses completed in late 2019 indicated that the Intermediate Forebay was not needed, and that the hydraulics in the tunnel would be improved without inclusion of the Intermediate Forebay. Therefore, this facility is not included in the conceptual options currently being developed by DCA.	Gwen Buchholz	8/26/2020	Responded
10.29	7/22/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	A reminder that rich farmland is a living organism so when you scrape it up and store it, it dies. There is no returning fertile land to agricultural use, you need to rebuild that.	The Post-Construction Land Restoration approach would include deep ripping of the soil following removal of above-ground facilities and ground cover, and would probably include application of nutrients during the deep ripping activities. These plans will continue to be discussed with the local agricultural community and refined. Pilot studies are also being considered to validate the concepts described in the post-construction land use approach. Input and engagement from the agricultural community will be very important for the success of potential pilot studies.	Graham Bradner	8/26/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.30	7/22/2020	Michael Moran	Is it correct that the majority of the conditioners are applied inside the machine? The CO2 that it is converted to when it comes to the surface, is that an amount of concern? Even if it's not toxic, it's not adding nutrients to the muck, correct?	Soil conditioning is used to improve TBM performance and to modify ground conditions to provide better control of the tunneling operation. The addtion of conditioning agents may be introduced at various points in the tunneling process, including: at the cuttehead/ground interface, within the cutterhead chamber, in the screw conveyor and around the outside of the tunneling shield. The additives used for soil coniditoning in TBM operations will be non-toxic and biodegradable so that the amount of CO2 that is naturally produced will have neglible impact on the environment.	Steve Dubnewych	8/26/2020	Responded
10.31	7/22/2020	Peter Robertson	For Mandeville Island, the diameter is reduced from 82 feet to 70 feet. Is there an anticipated figure for how long it will take to do the project on Mandeville Island?	The proposed shaft on Mandeville Island would be used to perform maintenance on the TBM which could last several weeks. Once maintenance is completed the TBM would move on and would continue to excavate the tunnel drive. It would take approximately 18 months to construct the 82 foot diameter shaft. The schedule and time to construct the 70 foot diameter shaft is currently being developed.	Steve Dubnewych	8/26/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.32	7/22/2020	Cecilia Giacoma	I have input from Delta stakeholders stating that the DCA should discontinue the evaluation of the 3000 cfs intakes previously proposed because they cannot reasonably protect fish and other aquatic species. They have significant impacts on Delta legacy communities. A smaller design should be worked on to allow salmon to be exposed to the intakes for no more than 15 minutes. A smaller intake would also allow for more flexibility on where to put them.	Several of the options include intakes with a design capacity of 1,500 cfs, and the potential changes to aquatic resources and other environmental resources would be analyzed in the EIR. The use of a an inake with a design capacity of 3,000 cfs was used as a basis of most options to minimize the number of intakes along the riverbank.	Phil Ryan Gwen Buchholz	8/26/2020	Responded
10.33	7/22/2020	Douglas Hsia	Some of our constituents are farmers within the water burrows, they know that the DCA has already identified some property for boring tests. They are wondering when people are going to be contacted regarding the tests?	DWR will be contacting land owners by phone beginning in mid-August, which will be followed with a letter from the DCA in late August. The letter will provide details on the subsurface exploration program and will provide specific contact details for each owner.	Andrew Finney Karen Askeland	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
10.34	7/22/2020	David Gloski	In the email before the meeting, there was an attachment with a list of 23 different alternatives but I'm confused. We discussed four alternatives and one we are talking about again. It looks like a couple were dismissed. I would just be expecting more tables and numbers for CEQA process analysis. Constituents encourage to send in their comments to CEQA process. If it's at the level of response seen today, that would be disappointing.	DWR document the full consideration of all alternatives suggested through scoping in an alternatives formulation appendix to the EIR. Today's presentation was a preview of the process and results of that appendix, but it will include a substantive description of each alternative, the screening process, and screening results.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.35	7/22/2020	Michael Moran	If the SEC could get a synopsis of what DCA or DWR thinks of different alternatives, even just a paragraph. As far as addressing concerns, that and some reference points would be very useful. How did DWR come to their conclusions? It would help clarify that the goal is to disseminate information instead of dismiss ideas.	See previous response.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.36	7/22/2020	Sean Wirth	The environmental community has a lot of interest in working on the mitigations for the regional impacts of this project. We want to maintain and gain new regional approaches to mitigation.	DWR appreciates the collaboration of the SEC members.	Carrie Buckman	8/26/2020	Responded
10.37	3/11/2020	Barbara Barrigan Parilla	Observation: 10 feet perimeter levee seems too low to protect RTM with flood at Twin Cities Rd.	The perimeter levee at Twin Cities was designed to protect against the 100-year flood elevation of Elevation 19.0 feet with 1.5 feet freeboard. Ground elevations at the Twin Cities Complex site range from approximately Elevation 10 to 15 feet, therefore, the levee height would range from 5.5 to 10.5 feet.	Graham Bradner	8/26/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.01	8/26/2020	Peter Robertson	The biggest question received is about interruption to vessel traffic, especially with the bridges and ferries on the Delta having operational issues. How are we going to get there? How will boats be moved? Some events on the water like a salmon derby, for example, could have around 80 boats on the water, so there would be a lot of traffic. Will there be a system set up to tell people when and where there will be work that will impact the waterway? This is critical and a lot of boaters are asking. We need to know exactly where it's going to be. The Coast Guard does notice to mariners, will we be connected with them? That system works very well.	The conceptual plans no longer include barge landings. As currently considered, barges could be used for a few days at the end of construction at the intakes to place riprap. The plans also have been modified to minimize increased construction traffic on State Routes 160, 4, and 12. Therefore, there should not be any substantial impacts to the waterways. There would be a few minor bridge modifictitons in across streams that are not navigable, including Snodgrass Slough and Connection Slough. Work at the intake would occur near the riverside. For all in-water work at the intakes and minor bridges, all activities would be coordinated with the Coast Guard and the Department of Boating and Waterways.	Phil Ryan	9/23/2020	Responded
11.02	8/26/2020	Isabella Gonzalez-Pott	Can we dive a little deeper into Staten Island and the maintenance shaft there? As part of the Nature Conservancy, there is an increased interest there. Increased communication would be helpful, especially with conversation about the birds.	Future meetings are being considered with The Nature Conservancy for work on Staten Island for Delta Conveyance activities.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.03	8/26/2020	Sean Wirth	Could we see some refinements to the times of usage for the haul roads to the intakes? It would be helpful to minimize impacts. There was a lot of outreach and stakeholder involvement in dealing with mitigation. Although we are not involved with CEQA, this is a project with regional impacts to species and a regional approach to mitigation would be appropriate. It should be looked at as more of a regional effort than just site by site with ways to offset impacts.	The traffic histograms prepared for SEC have been considered regionally as well as for each key feature site. The EIR will also be analyzing traffic impacts for individual roadways and regional traffic corridors.	Phil Ryan	9/23/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.04	8/26/2020	Sean Wirth	The filter discussion about removing different alternatives at the last meeting was not satisfactory to the environmental community. There were no metrics and it was not done to the level of scientific and engineering refinement that this group is used to. It seemed more subjective. Would the new histograms be the last word on that or will there be opportunity to refine them at all? Suggestion for a regional mitigation strategy for the project vs a direct impacts approach.	The alternatives presentation at the last SEC meeting was an overview of the work being completed to formulate alternatives for the EIR. This work will be documented in the EIR in more detail, and the public will be able to comment on that work as part of the EIR process. DWR is considering ways to reach the public regarding the work that will be completed for the environmental analysis and will update the SEC as more information is available.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.05	8/26/2020	Anna Swenson	How will it be ensured that tunneling under the cranes' sacred roosting sites will be safe?	Tunneling will occur at least 100 feet below the ground surface. As will be described in more detail in the Engineering Project Report, ground settlement above the tunnel would not be noticeable. Based upon experiences on other tunneling projects, noise will occur at the launch shaft; however, we do not anticipate any noise at the ground surface over the tunnel.	Carrie Buckman Phil Ryan	9/23/2020	Responded
11.06	8/26/2020	Anna Swenson	There hasn't been much discussion on the impacts on communities such as Hood, a majority Native American community.	DCA and DWR have met with community leaders in Hood and the DCA Board recently approved adding a new SEC member position specifically targetting Hood stakeholders in order to make sure they are well represented throughout this process.	Nazli Parvizi	9/23/2020	Responded
11.07	8/26/2020	Anna Swenson	There is concern about the impact on Twin Cities, not only with recreational boating but also for the farmers moving in and out, and moving crops. There was a bridge closed this past month and it has had a large impact. Noticing and signage were confusing.	The proposed Twin Cities Complex is located to the east of Interstate 5, and is not close to boating areas. The Twin Cities Road improvements would be located immediately to the east and west of the Interstate 5 interchange, and would be conducted in a manner to widen the roads to allow ingress and egress in the area for farming at levels similar to existing levels.	Phil Ryan	9/23/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.08	8/26/2020	Anna Swenson	I spoke with some farmers about the plan of scraping top soil and replacing with tunnel muck and there is concern that this will destroy the ecosystmem of the Delta, making the land unfarmable. There is a specific farmer whose property is shown as a borrow pit on the map and he was unaware. It's concerning that eminent domain is on the horizon and noticing hasn't been done.	The approach currently being considered for the CEQA process includes several steps to preserve local organic material, protect the foundation from consolidation, protect the soils from contamination, as well as, steps to characterize and restore the foundation for agricultural or habitat purposes. RTM would only be used to restore topography, where needed, but is accounted for in the approach for restoration. The approach has pre-, during, and post-construction steps for characterizing site conditions and is intended to be tailored for site-specific circumstances. Delta Conveyance is still in the environmental documentation and evaluation of alternatives stages. As such, no project has been selected and no specific properties are being pursued for project elements.	Graham Bradner	9/23/2020	Responded
11.09	8/26/2020	Anna Swenson	Has county input happpened on the Draft Engineering Report? What is the timeline on that report? I noticed on the DCA materials that the timeline had changed regarding the SEC, can we have some clarification on that?	An outline of the content of the Engineering Project Reports as well as a schedule for delivery is included in the September SEC Meeting presentation material.	Kathryn Mallon	9/23/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.10	8/26/2020	David Gloski	I was surprised when the budget came out and there was nothing for dual-use facilities, benefits, and other things that we had discussed. I'm getting concerned that it won't be addressed. A lot of people from various groups are putting time and resources in, but what's coming back? Our role may not be in the main stream of payments and such, but we're neightbor and we're being directly affected. What are the benefits? What is this area getting out of all this? We should start handling the different issues presented as what we would like out of it. Through conversations people, the only thing that gets them interested and listening is in talking about the benefits of the project. We should start a real discussion about the benefits.	The budget for community benefits will be finalized as part of the comprehensive capital budget for the Delta Conveyance Program. That budget will be prepared once/if the final alternative is selected, the concept design is finalized, and the environmental mitiations have been identified. The primary purpose of the Cost Assessment presentation to the DCA Board was to provide an "in progress" estimate of the construction of the project. It was not intended to be a comprehensive assessment of all program costs.	Kathryn Mallon	9/23/2020	Responded
11.11	8/26/2020	Jim Wallace	Early on in the project, Ms. Mallon talked about mutual benefits and she was reaching for feedback from the committee. I told her that there aren't any, but there is an opportunity to begin a process for community benefits and agreements. I'd want to see the SEC and DCA establish a way to begin to identify how a benefits agreement could be reached. It sounds like just identifying a process is necessary. I think that the Metropolitan Water District would welcome the idea of having conversations with the SEC and the people of the Delta to discuss what kinds of benefits can accrue throughout the Delta. It seems like if we don't move forward in this direction, we might become another Owens Valley. I hope we have this opportunity to meet with water contractors and with Met, which could be facilitated by the DCA.	DWR and the DCA have also been thinking about how to move forward with developing ideas around community benefits. The ideas about process are very helpful for us. We are planning to talk more about this issue soon with the SEC, and expect to start discussing community benefits in more detail by the end of the year.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.12	8/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	There is concern about the information provided on why no analysis will be done of the No-Tunnel alternative. If there is a want for honesty and transparency, the rationale needs to be released or it'll go on being a conflict. The more you can explain about that decision, the better.	Consistent with its purposes under California Legislative, DWR's objectives for the Delta Conveyance Project are focused on enabling the State Water Project (SWP) to continue to function in the face of multiple challenges (including sea level rise, climate change, and earthquake risk). Many of the no tunnel alternatives proposed do not meet these objectives because they would not be under DWR's legislative authority and would not help the SWP continue to function. However, these non-tunnel proposals represent actions that may be taken by California public water agencies that contract with DWR for SWP deliveries if Delta Conveyance does not move forward. While DWR is not planning to evaluate these actions (including conservation, recycling, and desalination) in detail as part of an action alternative in the EIR, DWR is going to be developing a robust No Project alternative that considers actions that may be taken if the Delta Conveyance Project does not move forward.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.13	8/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Last month, when we reached out about water quality, we were promised something would happen for today's meeting. The water thresholds in San Joaquin County are 220x more than what is concerned the danger threshold. The problem with the whole process, while I understand the SEC is only dealing with construction, is that what we need to hear from you regarding water quality hasn't happened. My fear is that by the time the discussion for community benefits happens, we'll lose control of the estuary. Proactive discussions regarding water quality and environmental justice populations need to be happening simultaneously.	DWR is not the state agency that manages water quality; that responsibility falls under the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). But DWR is interested in ways to be positively involved in issues surrounding Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs). The Delta Conveyance Project is planning to develop a "deep dive" video to help increase understanding of the issue. DWR (beyond the Delta Conveyance Project) is considering ways to get involved and will follow up with Ms. Barrigan-Parilla.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.14	8/26/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	In the updated traffic histograms, is there any new information around the Port? CARB has sent a strong letter to the Port about failure to do outreach and increased pollution in the community. There are many issues going on all at once. We need to push to mitigate for air quality impacts to one of the most vulnerable communities in California.	The updated histograms reflect Delta Conveyance-related traffic increases. DWR will analyze how the increased vehicle trips could affect air quality in different parts of the project area. The EIR will include an analysis of air quality emissions and, if appropriate, mitigation measures to reduce those impacts.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.15	8/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	It's a struggle to get information out to people. I've been looking at the map books with landowners and working with them directly because they don'tt realize that their land is being directly impacted.	Many landowners have been reached out to already via postcards and phone calls because of Geotech work that will be undertaken throughout the Delta region. We are working to reach out to owners of property considered in the siting analyses, especially in the virtual tour being released, in order to reassure them that sitings are for illustrative purposes only at this time.	Nazli Parvizi	9/15/2020	Responded
11.16	8/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	The agricultural community is mostly concerned about the overall impact to the agricultural community within the area. We are anticipating so many ripple effects on what construction will do to the surrounding areas. More and more ag will go out of production aside from direct impacts, not only impacted from eminent domain. The effect will be greater than anticipated.	The EIR will analyze both direct and indirect impacts to agricultural resources associated with the alternatives.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.17	8/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	Farmers are still not convinced about the tunnel muck. There are concerns about the feasibility of the land and contamination.	Based on the information available on ground conditions and constituents of the RTM, the proposed land restoration approach appears to be viable (but certainly subject to site-specific refinement). The approach provides a basis to account for the environmental effects of the restoration effort in the enviromental documentation.	Graham Bradner	9/23/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.18	8/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	The most difficult part of the process is having to balance being part of this committee and getting pushback from the community, as well as being contrained to the discussion about construction. It's hard to get information about what we're asking without being able to talk about what those concerns are. The process has been very informative but is also one-sided certain conversations aren't allowed. It's hard to sell the project with the community when the EIR and alternatives haven't been vetted. After last months presentation, it's not selling on a lot of community support. It's a struggle to feel like we can't bring in the right content or the right questions we're receiving because we can't discuss them here.	DWR is working on additional outreach opportunities as a part of the environmental process to provide additional ways for the public to provide input on concepts that are not a part of the DCA's efforts.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.19	8/26/2020	Lindsey Liebig	It's also important to ensure that we're not just talking to landowners, but whoever is working the land as their may be potential lease agreements and such.	DWR is trying to reach as broad of an audience as possible.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.20	8/26/2020	Mike Moran	What is really important to stakeholders is what will happen to this place. Some community benefits items might require engineering elements, so it might need to be incorporated into this and to ensure that they're applied moving forward. I think we're off to a good start and it is step one in a multi-step process.	DWR and the DCA have also been thinking about how to move forward with developing ideas around community benefits. We are planning to talk more about this issue soon with the SEC, and expect to start discussing community benefits in more detail by the end of the year.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.21	8/26/2020	Mike Hardesty	The difficulty is that the importance of this is so narrowly concentrated on the engineering. This is the problem and we have focused on it for too long in turn excluding conversation about impacts consequences. As much as benefits are important to look at in any project, so are the impacts. Some concerns are water quality, alterations in the flow of water, water surface elevations (in terms of affecting farmers and irrigation). These topics are not unlike traffic studies. It's time to have the conversation of aspects besides construction, like operation of the completed project.	DWR is working on additional outreach opportunities as a part of the environmental process to provide additional ways for the public to provide input on concepts that are not a part of the DCA's efforts.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.22	8/26/2020	David Gloski	Is there a task force at DWR for the algae problem? Is there a plan or strategy?	SWRCB has organized the California Cyanobacteria and Harmful Algal Bloom (CCHAB) Network, which is a group of state, federal, tribal, local, and nongovernmental representatives working to standardize monitoring and reporting efforts.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.23	8/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	Two part question. 1) Have you considered doing any value engineering to look at the costs of the program. 2) Have there been two additional expert reports that have been completed? We only analyzed one of them. What's the status?	Value engineering will be part of the program delivery. The DCA plans to conduct Value Engineering sessions before finalizing the baseline program costs. Any formal ITR reports are always reviewed at DCA Board meetings. Information that could affect the stakeholders, that information is shared with the SEC. Results of the ITR can be found in the Board Meeting packages that are included on the DCA website.	Nazli Parvizi	9/23/2020	Responded
11.24	8/26/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	At the Board meeting, Ms. Mallon gave a presentation on the six areas that the SEC has had impact in the design discussion. This is interesting because there is a term called value engineering, which takes place after the design to determine if there could be more value. This has been an interesting exercise in that there has been a preliminary value engineering that the SEC has produced through our comments and how they have changed the overall dynamic of the project. Is there a value there? How long is the SEC going to continue to meet?	As currently proposed, SEC will meet through the rest of the year. How often and if we meet next year will be up to discussions between the DCA and SEC discussion, the need to discuss specific topics, and agenda items that are relevent to the SEC while being sensitive to the time committment SEC members have made.	Nazli Parvizi	9/23/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.25	8/26/2020	Gil Cosio	North Delta Water Agency has a contract with the State to maintain water quality in the North Delta. With sea level rise, are you going to trash this contract? What will happen here?	The issues with sea level rise and changes in Delta conditions will likely have an effect on many of the current agreements between water users, including ones with DWR. It will also effect water right and water quality standards applicable to the Delta. The contract between NDWA and DWR, like most agreements, do not have specific provisions related to changes in future conditions and changes in the agreement would need to be addressed between the parties.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.26	8/26/2020	Anna Swenson	I'm concerned about flood and using current systems to take water out.	Considerations for flood management are considered in several ways for the proposed Delta Conveyance Project, including placement of intake structures in the Sacramento River, and protection of Delta Conveyance facilities from future flood events. With respect to the intakes, the structures will be required by permit conditions from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Central Valley Flood Protection Board to not increase peak flood surface water elevations. All key features would be designed for protection of the 200-year flood event plus sea level elevation for the Year 2100. The EIR will analyze the impacts to flood protection of existing lands. Based on the impact analysis, the EIR will also identify mitigation measures to reduce or avoid impacts (if appropriate).	Gwen Buchholz	9/23/2020	Responded
11.27	8/26/2020	Melissa Tayaba	What are the impacts to the plant life, fish, and water quality?	The EIR will analyze the impacts to plants, fish, and water quality. Based on the impact analysis, the EIR will also identify mitigation measures to reduce or avoid impacts (if appropriate).	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.28	8/26/2020	Melissa Tayaba	Tribes want to know information regarding Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge and what the impacts will be here.	The SEC has provided feedback about ways to reduce construction-related effects to Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and this feedback has been incorporated to the design process. DWR and the DCA have also been meeting with the refuge management team to gain insights. The EIR will assess remaining impacts and identify mitigation measures to further reduce or avoid impacts (if appropriate).	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.29	8/26/2020	Melissa Tayaba	Tribes are still really asking about the No-Project alternative.	Consistent with its purposes under California Legislative, DWR's objectives for the Delta Conveyance Project are focused on enabling the State Water Project (SWP) to continue to function in the face of multiple challenges (including sea level rise, climate change, and earthquake risk). Many of the no tunnel alternatives proposed do not meet these objectives because they would not be under DWR's legislative authority and would not help the SWP continue to function. However, these non-tunnel proposals represent actions that may be taken by California public water agencies that contract with DWR for SWP deliveries if Delta Conveyance does not move forward. While DWR is not planning to evaluate these actions (including conservation, recycling, and desalination) in detail as part of an action alternative in the EIR, DWR is going to be developing a robust No Project alternative that considers actions that may be taken if the Delta Conveyance Project does not move forward.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.30	8/26/2020	David Gloski	There is a big size differences between the old forebay and Bethany Reservoir. It will function much differently than a forebay, correct? Did the forebay before have any storage benefit? Bethany doesn't look to be too big so you'll balance how much you can take from the tunnel with how much you can take from the Delta, right? What is the discharge of Bethany in cfs?	The conceptual Southern Forebay would provide temporary storage (up to 12 hours depending upon hydraulics) to manage delivery of up to 6,000 cfs water from the Southern Forebay and water from Clifton Court Forebay to the Banks Pumping Plant. The combined water flows would be conveyed from the Banks Pumping Plant to Bethany Reservoir. The Southern Forebay would be needed to balance flows from both forebays into the Banks Pumping Plant. When the water enters Bethany Reservoir, water immediately flows into the California Aqueduct and/or South Bay Aqueduct. Under the Bethany Alternative being studied, up to 6,000 cfs of the Delta Conveyance flows would be delivered directly to the Bethany Reservoir; and flows from Clifton Court Forebay would continue to be conveyed via Banks Pumping Plant to Bethany Reservoir. The forebay is not needed to balance operations of Banks Pumping Plant. When the water enters Bethany Reservoir, water would continue to immediately flow into the California Aqueduct and/or South Bay Aqueduct.	Phil Ryan	9/23/2020	Responded
11.31	8/26/2020	Douglas Hsia	Was the Glanville Shaft also eliminated?	Based upon comments from the SEC and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge staff, the proposed tunnel shaft was moved from Glanville Tract to the west of Interstate 5 to a location to the east of Interstate 5 (and west of Franklin Boulevard).	Gwen Buchholz	9/23/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.32	8/26/2020	Anna Swenson	You said that the elimination of intake 2 reduced the noise for Clarksburg and Elk Grove. How loud are these pile drivers? Noise is one of the major concern of residents.	At a previous SEC meeting, a sound pressure map was presented that showed different levels from pile driving. The sound would occur equally at all directions. At proposed Intake 2, the noise would be heard loudest in Clarksburg. However, the noise also would be heard to a lesser degree in portions of Elk Grove that are located at a further distance than Clarksburg. The sound pressure levels in the previous SEC presentation showed noise levels that were essentially unmitigated. The DCA is considering a test pile programs to test different ways to reduce sound. Therefore, projected noise levels are expected be lower than previously discussed at the SEC. Additional geotechnical data is required to determine different strata conditions to determine pressures required to install sheet piles. Currently, DCA is evaluating methods to reduce driven pile lengths and the number of driven piles.	Phil Ryan	9/23/2020	Responded
11.33	8/26/2020	Mike Moran	Does the alignment of Bethany by Clifton Court go under the Jones Plant? Anywhere near it?	The alignment for the Bethany Alternative is still under development. The alignment could need to cross the Delta-Mendota Canal near the Jones Pumping Plant; however, the alignments under consideration do not appear to be under the pumping plant.	Phil Ryan	9/23/2020	Responded

DCA DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
11.34	8/26/2020	Sean Wirth	I would like the SEC to ask the DCA for a very robust No-Tunnel Alternative and truly determine the need for the project. Can we get away with not having this, with the environmental impacts?	Consistent with its purposes under California Legislative, DWR's objectives for the Delta Conveyance Project are focused on enabling the State Water Project (SWP) to continue to function in the face of multiple challenges (including sea level rise, climate change, and earthquake risk). Many of the no tunnel alternatives proposed by commenters do not meet these objectives because they would not be under DWR's legislative authority and would not help the SWP continue to function. However, these non-tunnel proposals represent actions that may be taken by California public water agencies that contract with DWR for SWP deliveries if Delta Conveyance does not move forward. While DWR is not planning to evaluate these actions (including conservation, recycling, and desalination) in detail as part of an action alternative in the EIR, DWR is going to be developing a robust No Project alternative that considers actions that may be taken if the Delta Conveyance Project does not move forward.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.35	8/26/2020	Dan Whaley	We were surprised to see the delay in design modeling after being told that there was no room for any delays. Please provide everyone with the new expected time lines and an explanation for this change.	The updated schedule was presented during the SEC meeting and is available in the meeting materials on the DCA's website.	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded
11.36	8/26/2020	Dan Whaley	The Delta has changed significantly in the last five years. In addition to the multiple added Vineyards, and agricultural uses, the Google map has rerouted much of the Bay Area traffic through the Historical Victory Highway. We are also now designated a National Historic Area. Has the consultation with DPC begun on that issue?	DWR is coordinating with the Delta Protection Commission on a variety of issues. The Delta Protection Commission NHA management plan is not yet complete, but DWR will continue to coordinate as the plan is developed. The EIR also will evaluate potential impacts on historical sites. Based on the impact analysis, the EIR will also identify mitigation measures to reduce or avoid impacts (if appropriate).	Carrie Buckman	9/23/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.01	9/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Was information about surface water included in the survey?	Yes, under the screen "Your Experience and Nature," we ask a question about safer waterways; that reflects the input we received about that concern.	Genevieve Taylor	11/5/2020	Responded
12.02	9/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Most of the Filipino community takes pride in also speaking English, but other Cambodian languages are not included in the survey. They do a lot of fishing in the Delta. Why is only Tagalog included? Suggestion to work with Apsara to do the translations, which would result in thousands more responses.	Tagalog is the third most commonly spoken non-English language in the 5-county Delta region. Among speakers of non-English languages, Spanish makes up 54%; Chinese makes up 9%; and Tagalog makes up 6.4%. However, we learned shortly after the SEC meeting from several Filipino community members that there are several dialects spoken in the region. They also shared that the community was accustomed to reading and writing in English. We were told that this is even true in the Philippines because the dialects are not mutually understandable. We were urged to drop that translation and focus on more widely spoken languages, pending available resources. Due to that guidance, we decided to cancel the translation of the survey and accompanying materials into Tagalog. There could be value in translating the survey into other languages commonly spoken in the region, especially if we can identify community partners willing to help us successfully reach those communities. We would need to explore whether the budget is available to cover the	Genevieve Taylor	11/5/2020	Responded
12.03	9/23/2020	Jim Wallace	In CEQA, there is no such thing as environmental justice resource. Environmental justice is applied differently in CEQA because it's supposed to assess the physical effects of a project on a community. It would be helpful to clarify exactly how CEQA addresses environmental justice.	While the EIR and EIS will be separate documents, DWR is planning for the EIR to include the information required for both CEQA and NEPA. As the project proponent, DWR knows that the Corps will be incorporating information from the EIR by reference and this approach will provide the information needed for NEPA compliance. The plan is to structure the environmental justice analysis in the EIR based on NEPA requirements.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.04	9/23/2020	Jim Wallace	Will this data from the survey be shared with the Army Corps of Engineers preparing the NEPA document? NEPA does have an environmental justice category that is very specific about the data that will need to be used. How will low income communities/communities at risk be identified? Background information would be helpful.	The data will be shared with the Corps. As stated above, while the EIR and EIS will be separate documents, DWR is planning for the EIR to include the information required for both CEQA and NEPA. As the project proponent, DWR knows that the Corps will be incorporating information from the EIR by reference and this approach will provide the information needed for NEPA compliance. The plan is to structure the environmental justice analysis in the EIR based on NEPA requirements, with direct input solicited from the Corps.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.05	9/23/2020	Jim Wallace	Another survey has been circulating in the Delta about water usage and it has been resisted by large portions of the population because it seemed to be invasive and a duplicate of the Census. Unless the survey is presented in a way that makes people feel comfortable, there might be some resistance in receiving responses.	The team has been thinking about how the survey would be received. The strategy is to work with community organizations that have trusted relationships and give them plenty of information so they can speak to it. The marketing has been made to be engaging and the language made to be inviting to assure the public how information is being used and why. The hope is that folks have several points of contact. For example, mail, Facebook, or around the community to make it worthwhile to be involved. Finally, the intent is that the results of the survey will be helpful to others in a variety of ways as well, and so would be appealing to send out. It would be helpful for the SEC members to try to push the survey out, as well.	Genevieve Taylor	11/5/2020	Responded
12.06	9/23/2020	Douglas Hsia	Will the survey be pushed out to Elk Grove? There is a large Chinese population in Elk Grove.	The goal is to reach anyone that is somehow connected to the Delta. We will include Elk Grove in our outreach. Zip codes are also included in the survey, so we can identify who is responding from what zip codes. That demographic information will be very important in determining what kinds of representation we have achieved through the survey.	Genevieve Taylor	11/5/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.07	9/23/2020	Melissa Tayaba	How would the survey work for tribal groups? We would definitely like to participate.	Tribal participation and Tribal input is highly valued and welcomed in this survey. The Team is aware of the need to maintain confidential information, and will monitor responses to make ensure confidentiality is maintained. However, because sensitive information may be shared, any sensitive information is better provided through the formal tribal consultation process. There is a question under the maps about historical and cultural resources that is identified as confidential. The team will go through the answers and anything that could be confidential will be flagged.	Genevieve Taylor	11/5/2020	Responded
12.08	9/23/2020	Karen Mann	It looks like it would be a great cost savings not having to dig another forebay. Was that part of the plan?	The sensitivity analysis did not include costs as a factor. The sensitivity analysis focused on extent of disturbances and physical characteristics of construction sites that would result in complex construction methods.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.09	9/23/2020	Karen Mann	In reference to the presentation on Bethany facilities, it appears that there are no additional fish screens. Is that correct?	As currently under study, the Bethany Alternative would include the same intake and tunnel shaft facilities as presented for the Eastern Corridor option upstream of the Lower Roberts Island Tunnel Launch Shaft site.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.10	9/23/2020	Karen Mann	To clarify, there are three different alternative sites to present to the governor, correct? Will input and considerations be taken for the intakes?	DWR has asked the DCA to provide conceptual designs for the proposed project (including the Eastern and Central corridors) and one additional alternative (the Bethany alternative). In addition to these alternatives, there may be operational components that are layered in as the EIR moves forward. DWR has not identified the final number of alternatives. The alternatives will use combinations of the three intakes identified on the Sacramento River.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.11	9/23/2020	Karen Mann	The amount of electricity to pump water over the Tehachapis to Southern California is a great amount. What about this pump station? What kind of magnitude? It's a big deal, especially with all the fires.	There are no overall differences in power requirements between the different alignments under study, all water needs to be pumped to existing Bethany Reservoir. Under the Central and Eastern Corridors options, the water from the Delta Conveyance Project would be pumped through the existing Banks Pumping Plant. Under the Bethany Alternative, the water from the Delta Conveyance Project would be pumped in the new Bethany Alternative Pumping Plant. All of these alternatives would rely upon the Banks Pumping Plant to continue using Banks Pumping Plant to move water from Clifton Court Forebay to the existing Bethany Reservoir. Total power consumption would depend upon the operational criteria related to the volume of water diverted into Clifton Court Forebay and at the new intakes.	Phil Ryan	11/5/2020	Responded
12.12	9/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	What are the levee heights for the maintenance shafts for Lower Roberts Island down to Bethany Reservoir?	As currently shown, shaft pad heights would range from approximately 18 to 24 feet above the existing ground surface at the shaft locations from Lower Roberts Island to the reception shaft near Mountain House.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.13	9/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	The team really needs to look at flood inundation on the San Joaquin River side because that's the biggest flood threat, not the Sacramento River. The Delta Stewardship Council is using sea level rise forecasts from the Oceanic Administration and is middle of the road in their forecasting. Keep in mind flood threat and an accelerated threat that would flip the switch. Does this project's pumping plant replace that completely?	The Bethany Pumping Plant currently being studied would be constructed on natural ground at elevation 45-50 feet, which is above current or future projected flood elevations.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.14	9/23/2020	Sean Wirth	Who owns the easements? Were they set out to protect particular species? Why shouldn't we assume that the downslope habitats aren't as important as those in the easements?	The easements near Bethany Reservoir are held by DWR and DFW, including habitat lands for the benefit of California red legged frogs, California tiger salamanders, San Joaquin kit fox, and burrowing owl in wetlands. It is a mitigation easement from the South Bay Aqueduct Improvement Project. The terms of the easement generally prohibit certain construction activities.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.15	9/23/2020	Anna Swenson	How do you analyze which alternative is best? Are you looking from a position of land use? What is the main driver in determining facility routes?	In terms of feasibility, the evaluation of engineering alternatives considers a range of factors: construction considerations, geotechnical conditions, existing infrastructure, land use, among others. Detailed evaluations of project environmental impacts, including certain land use conflicts, will be performed by DWR as part of the CEQA process to analyze alternatives and recommend a project alternative.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.16	9/23/2020	Anna Swenson	Will residents be put up in hotels during the construction if it is close to their homes?	DWR will analyze construction-related impacts to local residents as part of the EIR. The DCA and DWR are trying to avoid these impacts where possible. If remaining impacts are significant, the EIR will identify mitigation measures to reduce or avoid the impact, including the possibility of temporary resident relocation.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.17	9/23/2020	Mike Moran	In previous presentations, there have been mockups of what facilities might look like in the landscape. Will this pipeline be buried?	The pipelines shown in the mockups would be buried with a small mound soil over the top in a manner similar to the Central Valley Project aqueducts between the Jones Pumping Plant and the open canal portion of the Delta-Mendota Canal	Phil Ryan	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.18	9/23/2020	Dr. Mel Lytle	To clarify, how much water are Banks and Bethany capable of pumping? Has there been any preliminary analysis on seismic vulnerability in that area? When another pumping station is placed so close to the state and federal pumping stations, if there is a seismic vulnerability area right there, all the conveyance facilities will be sabotaged. Please look at this closely.	The capacity for the Bethany Pumping Plant under review would be the same as the capacity of the Central and Eastern Corridor options (3,000 to 7,500 cfs). For the 7,500 cfs Project capacity option, up to 1,500 cfs for the CVP would be pumped into the Delta-Mendota Canal; and up to 6,000 cfs would be pumped into pipelines for delivery into Bethany Reservoir. Seismic analysis of the new facilities would be completed as part of the design process.	Phil Ryan	11/5/2020	Responded
12.19	9/23/2020	Douglas Hsia	What is the present condition of Bethany? Will it require much improvement?	No condition or performance issues have been reported by DWR relative to existing Bethany facilities . The proposed Bethany alternative would require coordinated operations with the Banks Pumping Plant and downstream deliveries. The Bethany Alternative and the Central and Eastern Corridor options would not change the existing Bethany Resevoir water levels.	Phil Ryan	11/5/2020	Responded
12.20	9/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	It says the material isn't available for local beneficial uses. Aren't there places nearby where more materials could be stored for levee upgrades? Especially with the push for clean construction equipment and clean trucks. The recent executive order from the California Governor says that all vehicles will have to be electric by 2035. What can be done to accelerate things to make the best decision?	Excess soil that is stockpiled would be available for local beneficial uses, such as for restoration or levee repairs. However, for CEQA the analysis conservatively assumes the stockpiles would be permanent since the end use is not known at this time and therefore no detailed analysis of the transport and use of this material would be included in the EIR. Consistent with the requirements of CEQA, the environmental impacts of hauling borrow from the stockpiles and use at a particular site would likely need to be assessed separately associated with future individual projects.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.21	9/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	This is such a massive project, do you have any leverage to push these things like electric vehicles in the industry?	CEQA requires DWR to rely on information that is readily available and technology and condidions that exist at the time of the EIR preparation. The DCA and DWR team discussed whether it would be reasonable, based on current information, to rely on electric vehicles. The concept that this project may help push the industry is interesting and could occur, but the team was concerned that relying on these vehicles for the EIR analysis is not reasonable based on current information and may result in an overly conservative analysis. If the development of electric vehicles moves forward, this would be a topic to reconsider.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.22	9/23/2020	Mike Moran	Twin Cities is a big crane habitat. Are there any studies on the physical impacts of putting that much soil on top of the existing land that can impact the Consumnes area?	Impacts to crane habitat will be assessed in the EIR. Site-specific investigation, testing, and analysis would be performed to fully assess the physical impacts of fill placement in this area.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.23	9/23/2020	Peter Robertson	What is the percentage on contaminants that can't be used?	Contaminants are not expected based on existing available information. However, additional assessments would be completed during the design phase. For consideration of environmental impacts, the team is assuming 5% of the RTM would not be usable for structural fill.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.24	9/23/2020	Cecelia Giacoma	Concerned about the area around Twin Cities; they have flooding issues currently. If stockpiles of RTM are added, it will severely impact their situation that is already a problem. Not just the obvious risk of flooding to the people but that flow also goes to the preserve. If there is a flood there that is exacerbated by the RTM, it will flow to the preserves.	The currently proposed Twin Cities Complex and associated RTM stockpile would be located within Glanville Tract (RD 1002), which does have a perimeter levee system. However, in recognition of periodic interior flooding from the east a ring berm would temporarily be constructed around the tunnel launch site and RTM stockpile area. The effects of the temporary ring levee and permanent RTM stockpile on hydraulic conditions within Glanville Tract would be further evaluated during the design phase.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.25	9/23/2020	Douglas Hsia	Regarding intakes 2 and 5, my constituencies mentioned that near the south of maintenance area 9, according to their study the levee condition is very bad there and were wondering if you could do any levee improvements.	The proposed project would include seepage cutoff walls along modified levee sections that would extend beyond the project limits. If future repairs were identified by others in the vicinity of the intake structure construction, the future repair projects would be able to tie-in to the intake cut-off walls.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.26	9/23/2020		Regarding recreation facilities and mutual benefits, would Davis-Dolwig considerations be utilized?	DWR is coordinating with the Department of Parks and Recreation to consider Davis-Dolwig requirements.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.27	9/23/2020	Mike Moran	The RTM was at least preliminarily evaluated for use of reclamation and not for habitat use, correct? Does the RTM analysis include physical subsidence reversal and putting topsoil?	As stated above, stockpiled excess soil would be available for local beneficial uses but because of the current speculative nature of this, the detailed assessment of transport and specific use of the material will not be part of the EIR. The properties and geotechnical characteristics of the RTM have been evaluated using available test results. Based on available information, the material could be suitable for structural fill or non-structural grading for habitat restoration once excess moisture has been removed. Organic additives would likely be needed for supporting vegetation since the RTM derived from tunnel depth would generally be lacking in organic matter. Additional testing would be performed to confirm the suitability of RTM and the performance as a growth media.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.28	9/23/2020	Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla	Although the SEC can't talk about operations or water quality enforcement, could there be opportunities in design and construction for creating solutions for water recirculation for HABS?	Operations and water quality issues are part of the scope of the EIR and all are encouraged to participate in that process. In addition, as it overlaps with the scope of posible "community benefits," this will be a topic of discussion in the upcoming on SEC meeting.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.29	9/23/2020	Anna Swenson	Will December 2020 be the end of the meetings?	The DCA has proposed a budget that will keep the SEC funded until March 2021. We will revisit the ongoing role of the SEC after that date.	Nazli Parvizi	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.30	9/23/2020	Karen Mann	Considering the proximity of the Bethany alternative to the community of Mountain House, DCA may want to consider adding an SEC representative of the Mountain House community.	While we are not yet decided on whether or not to add another SEC member to the committee, we have reached out to the Mountain House CSD manager and San Joaquin officials and will be meeting in order to update them on the proposed alternatives and potential construction affects to the local community.	Nazli Parvizi	11/5/2020	Responded
12.31	9/23/2020	Angelica Whaley	I would like to know who in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife approved intake locations 2, 3, and 5, and when? And how did they consider effects of the intakes on North Delta communities and North Delta businesses in making that approval? Particularly on the towns of Hood and Clarksburg? And will they give a presentation to the Stakeholder Engagement Committee on their "constraints and siting criteria?	As you know, a detailed assessment of a variety of resource issues were completed as part of the BDCP/California WaterFix environmental review process. Where appropriate, the information from that process was reviewed and updated for application to the Delta Conveyance Project. For BDCP/California WaterFix, a Fish Facilities Technical Team (FFTT) comprised of expert resource agencies (including USFWS, NMFS, CDFW, USBR, and DWR) and consultant members was formed to evaluate intake sites. The FFTT conducted a series of evaluations using a wide variety of criteria (focusing primarliy on engineering feasibility and avoidance of impacts to sensitive fish species but also considering land use effects) to select the number and location of suitable intake sites for the project. The agency members of the FFTT ultimately provided final recommendations regarding intake siting. That process and associated impact analysis were summarized in the BDCP/California WaterFix EIR. For the Delta Conveyance Project, the original analyses from the WaterFix Project were reviewed by DCA and DCO, with input from USFWS, NMFS, and CDFW, and supplemented with more current information regarding the study area, including new bathymetric data and characteristics of the area. Suitable sites were identified as part of that process and they turned out to be substantially the same as those recommended for the BDCP/California WaterFix Project, primarily due to river bathymetry. A comparative analysis between sites was conducted, and sites 2, 3 and 5 were recommended for further consideration. The results of the updated siting analysis were shared with agency staff, including representatives from USFWS, CDFW, and NMFS, and will again be summarized in the EIR for the Delta Conveyance Project. Effectively, DWR determines the actual intake locations if and when the project is approved and the only specific "approval" from the regulatory agencies for these sites would come in the form of permits for implementing the proposed project. DWR will analyze	Phil Ryan	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.32	9/23/2020	Angelica Whaley	I would like the DCA to explain in more detail how they are going to protect the Hood levees from vibration during construction, up and down the river from the intakes.	Site-specific analyses would be performed to confirm levee stability during the design phase and after project construction. DCA and DWR are in the process of pursuing collection of additional subsurface data and testing to support these analyses. Analysis of the levees will be performed in compliance with US Army Corps of Engineers EM 1110-2-1913 Design and Construction of Levees with consideration any vibratory loads induced by project construction.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.33	9/23/2020	Angelica Whaley	I'd like to ask the DCA to provide conceptual design for the smaller, 1,500 cfs capacity intake that Phil mentioned in the slide. I'd like to compare the footprint and local impacts for the 3,000 cfs intake with the impacts for a 1,500 cfs intake.	The options developed by DCA and provided to DWR for consideration in the EIR include both a 1,500 cfs and 3,000 cfs intake at the Intake 5 location.	Phil Ryan	11/5/2020	Responded
12.34	9/23/2020	Angelica Whaley	I would like to know who was on the DCA team that conducted the site investigation, and decided that the five sites from the WaterFix project were the only candidate sites, and that the best three were the intake sites selected for the WaterFix project.	Phil Ryan of the DCA led the analysis for the Delta Conveyance Project. As stated above, the assessment of the intake sites was based on what had previously been prepared forthe BDCP/Calfironia WaterFix Project.	Phil Ryan	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.35	9/23/2020	Angelica Whaley	I also want to request that DWR explain to the Stakeholder Engagement Committee members how the review of the Central and Eastern Corridor options by the Stakeholder Engagement Committee relates to DWR's implementation of Delta Plan DP P2, "Respect Local Land Uses when siting water or flood facilities or restoring habitats." We've had many presentations about DWR's implementation of the CEQA process, but none about DWR's implementation of Delta Plan DP P2.	If the Delta Conveyance Project is approved through the CEQA process, then DWR will determine if the project is consistent with the Delta Plan policies and prepare a "certification of consistency" for the approved project for submittal to the Delta Stewardship Council in compliance with the Delta Reform Act. It is not the responsibility of any single Covered Action to implement Delta Plan policies but rather a project proponent is charged with demonstrating consistency with Delta Plan policies and providing substantial evidence in support of that certification of consistency. The Delta Stewardship Council's Administrative Procedures Governing Appeals states that 10 days after receiving a notice of appeal the record that was before the state or local agency at the time it made its certification must be submitted. The record for a Delta Conveyance project would be developed along with the certification and will include items that go beyond the scope of CEQA procedures for several, if not all, of the applicable Delta Plan policies. Information related to the SEC process may be included in the record per the DSC administrative procedures but will certainly not be the full extent of substantial evidence for demonstrating consistency with any policy, including DP P2.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.36	10/4/2020	David Gloski	Requesting the SEC gets a presentation of the Proposed Emergency Action Plan for the project?	The DCA has considered several emergency responses in the development of key features descriptions, including responses to floods, fires, and power outages. DWR will be responsible for operation of all new and existing facilities; and therefore, relative adopted emergency actions for the SWP facilities would also be included emergency action response plans that will be developed during the design phase.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.37	10/7/2020	David Gloski	Army Corps Scoping Docs – Is there a link for this process for public to participate?	Here is the webpage for the USACE public scoping: https://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Delta-Conveyance/	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY | STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE (SEC)

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.38	10/7/2020	David Gloski	Community Benefits from Design – Community benefits can come from set aside $ to deliver community benefits, but there is also the ability for the community to get benefits from the actual design. For example, my desires to see the this project deliver the end conveyance systems with the ability to pump water into the south delta. There are likely others as well if a design leaves improved roads for example.	The SEC can discuss this point as part of DWR's community benefits program development process, starting in December.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.39	10/7/2020	David Gloski	Requests expand discussions when dealing with benefits related to operations related to design.	DWR is still working on defining operational criteria, so this work is not yet ready to share with the SEC. The SEC can talk about specific information needs that may be helpful for the community benefits discussion.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.40	10/7/2020	David Gloski	Operational Capabilities and Flexibilities around Bethany and Jones pumping stations – I want all the considerations analyzed. I'd like to see the ability for the Bethany plant to deliver water taken out of the Clifton Forebay for example.	The Bethany Alterantive tunnels and pumping plant would be operated independently of Clifton Court Forebay (CCF). The Bethany Pumping Plant would not be connected to CCF and could not pump water from Clifton Court Forebay. A new pumping plant to deliver water from CCF would be a different alternative from the Bethany Alternative and would have to be identifed by DWR and considered as part of the CEQA process.	Carrie Buckman, Graham Bradner, Phil Ryan	11/5/2020	Responded
12.41	10/7/2020	David Gloski	I'd like to see Jones be able to deliver water from the new tunnel conveyance. You should have dual operational flexibility for maintenance, emergencies etc. I'd like either stream to be able to push water into the south delta for quality or emergency response.	At this point, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Central Valley Project have not indicated interest in participating in the Delta Conveyance Project. The EIR will consider an alternative that has a connection to Jones Pumping Plant, but it is not part of the proposed project for that reason.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.42	10/7/2020	David Gloski	Can someone give me a comparison of the Southern Forebay capacity and elevation compared to the Bethany capacity and elevation? Just looking at a map the area footprint of the proposed southern forebay was so much bigger than Bethany. Assuming somehow we now don't see the need for this water storage that we were getting? Swapping Bethany for Southern Forebay is not apples to apples. Operationally things will be very different depending on which plan you go with. How does the choice here affect operations which could have an effect on benefits to the delta?	The proposed Southern Forebay is 9,000 acre foot capacity with normal operating elevations between about 5 and 17 feet (not including overflow and freeboard requirements). Bethany Reservoir would have a capacity of about 4,600 acre-feet and would normally operate between elevations of about 238 to 245 feet.	Phil Ryan	11/5/2020	Responded
12.43	10/7/2020	David Gloski	Why all of a sudden is it okay to haul wet RTM? Previously everything was being dried.	Wet hauling of RTM is only being considering for off-site reuse where it could be placed wet, such as quarry restoration. All potential project reuses (i.e. Southern Forebay embankment construction) would require the excess moisture be removed before placement as structural fill.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.44	10/7/2020	David Gloski	This project has looked at all levees that can affect the project and analyzed those effects. And apparently you are coming up with a list of things to improve. Can we get that part of this project packaged so that there is a methodology and process to follow for any Delta organization to look at levees that are important to them and follow the same process to start to identify things that they should be looking at. Can we at least produce a procedure and use the project results as an example? (Another community benefit)	Proposed potential levee improvements were based on evaluation of levee geometry and comparing with PL84-99 and Bulletin 192-82 standards. This approach is similar to what is commonly used by the Reclamation Districts in the Delta. It should be noted that this DCA study was only performed at a screening level to support the CEQA process, and further study would be required for design projects.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded

SEC Member
Question/Comment Tracking Master Log
Updated 11.05.2020

ID #	Date	Requester	Questions/Comments	Response	Responder	Date Responded	Response Status
12.45	10/7/2020	Sean Wirth	I have had some time to think about my suggestion that possibly the stockpile of RTM generated by the Twin Cities launch site could be used for creating upland forage for Sandhill Cranes in the floodplain of the lower Cosumnes River for use by them during the cyclical flooding that occurs there every seven to ten years or so; and which will likely increase in frequency due to climate change. As well, sea level rise has the very real potential to put much of the lands already conserved for the Crane at risk, making upland forage sites even more valuable.	This suggestion has been provided to the team working on the EIR.	Carrie Buckman	11/5/2020	Responded
12.46	10/7/2020	Sean Wirth	Mentioned the need to coordinate efforts with the SSHCP and Regional San. Regional San may be able to use some of the muck for creating berms to impound tertiary treated water for infiltration into the groundwater table.	Yes, additional coordination with local agencies and entities is expected to be performed regarding reuse of RTM.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded
12.47	10/7/2020	Sean Wirth	Are you aware of any studies that deal with repurposing RTM that likely has little to no organic content as soil suitable for agriculture?	We are not aware of any studies related to reuse of the type of RTM expected to be generated from the project in the Delta. Additional testing to evaluate the viability of RTM for growing vegetation would be conducted during the design phase.	Graham Bradner	11/5/2020	Responded