

This summary is provided as a resource for committee members and the public to have brief highlights following SEC meetings. In addition to this summary, detailed meeting minutes, question and answer documents, and full meeting video will be available on the dcdca.org website.

MEETING OVERVIEW

At the fifth meeting of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee (SEC), held February 26:

- The SEC Roundtable provided an opportunity for members to comment on technical aspects of the project.
- DCA engineering staff presented information about the basics of Maintenance and Retrieval Shafts, their siting, and the methodology for ranking sites for suitability.
- During the March 11 meeting, DCA staff will provide an opportunity for technical input regarding the Maintenance and Retrieval Shaft siting, as well as continued discussion regarding Intakes and Launch Shafts.

The meeting video, agenda, presentation and supplemental materials are available for review on the dcdca.org website.

HIGHLIGHTS TO SHARE

- Members received new and updated materials to add to their information binders. All materials were provided to members on flash drives and will be posted to the dcdca.org website.
 - ◆ The information included updated glossary; maintenance/retrieval shaft siting evaluation methodology; responses to questions and requests from previous meetings; past meeting minutes; a copy of an Independent Technical Review (ITR) report and DCA's responses to recommendations; a map showing schools, hospitals and emergency services located in the Delta; and a map showing public boat ramps/launches, marinas and wildlife refuges, preserves and habitat conservation plan areas.
- Members commented on intake sites, community benefits, launch shaft siting methodology, and an Independent Technical Review report and DCA response that was presented at the Feb. 20th DCA Board meeting (provided on member flash drives and accessible at dcdca.org).
- **Maintenance/Retrieval Shafts:** The engineering team explained the purpose and size of the maintenance/retrieval shafts that are located roughly every 5 miles along the tunnel drive segments. The presentation included maps identifying where maintenance/retrieval shafts could be placed based on constraints, tunneling direction (north to south or south to north) and tunnel drive lengths.
- **Site Ranking Criteria:** DCA created an evaluation system to rank feasible sites within each corridor based on road access and proximity to schools, hospitals, residential structures, conservation land, refuges, preserves and vernal pool critical habitat. SEC members were asked to provide feedback or additional ranking criteria associated with design and construction of the facilities based on their local expertise and priorities.
- **Considerations for SEC:** In addition to input regarding the ranking methodology, DCA asked members to provide specific feedback about where the maintenance/retrieval shafts could be located within the Central or Eastern corridors based on the information provided and any additional considerations that are a priority to the local Delta community.

NEXT MEETING

DATE:
March 11, 2020

TIME:
3-6 p.m.

LOCATION:
Willow Ballroom
10724 CA-160
Hood, CA 95639

PURPOSE:
Technical roundtable regarding siting input for maintenance/retrieval shafts; discuss tunnel alignment refinements; South Delta Facilities Siting and Design.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

Consider the maps and narratives regarding maintenance and retrieval shafts.

- Is the methodology clear and should any other factors be included?
- Considering we need to site a shaft every five miles, please provide your preferences regarding where shafts would be best located. In these shaft sites you have identified, do you have ideas for a possible future use after construction is completed?
- Given our previous conversations about worker/materials movement and logistics, please provide ideas regarding logistics alternatives, such as barges, buses, rail or worker services.
- Do you need any additional information related to the maintenance/retrieval shaft sites?





COMMITTEE THOUGHT EXCHANGE

Intakes (Presented at January 22, 2020 SEC meeting)

- Mr. Tarango said that while potential Intake Sites C-E-2, C-E-3 and C-E-5 could destroy sacred, ceremonial and ancestral tribal sites that existed on all three locations, proposed Intake C-E-5 would likely be the least historically and culturally devastating if the project moves forward.
- Ms. Whaley asked if it would be possible to have a greater number of smaller intakes rather than up to three larger intake facilities.
- Mr. Cox said he is not familiar with the properties or the owners at the three intake sites. As a fisherman, he is most interested in how the fish screens will affect the fish in the Delta and asked clarifying questions about those impacts.
- Mr. Wallace said none of the proposed intake sites were beneficial. However, proposed Intake C-E-2 should probably be eliminated due to logistics challenges. He said proposed Intakes C-E-5 and C-E-3 would likely be the options to move forward, although C-E-5 holds sentimental value to his and other families. He would deem Intake C-E-3 as the “least worst” option.

Siting Logistics

- Committee members Mr. Hsia and Mr. Gloski said the siting methodology should include tribal, historic and cultural sites in the ranking criteria.
- Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla noted a sculling center is currently being planned in Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel and Mr. Moran said the Franks Tract Futures Project is also currently in the planning stages.
- Ms. Mann indicated that there is only one middle school that serves the communities near Discovery Bay. Many parents drive kids to school and there are no sidewalks for those who ride bicycles or walk, creating a safety hazard for students. This should be considered when determining the traffic on the roads in that area.

Community Benefits

- Mr. Wallace suggested that rather than trying to avoid community effects through siting facilities, the group should discuss ways that potential community benefits could address effects.
- Mr. Robertson suggested a park near the Stockton Port could boost the local economy by attracting residential boaters and fishermen.
- Mr. Gloski suggested that siting considerations should include possible long-term use of some of the facilities such as parks, recreational boating and/or visitor education centers.
- Mr. Cosio said existing levee maintenance should be funded by project proponents.
- Ms. Tayaba suggested hiring tribal members as consultants to the project team to advise on siting decisions.

ITR & DCA Response

- Ms. Swenson and Ms. Barrigan-Parrilla questioned why the committee is considering the Central Corridor or discussing Reusable Tunnel Material in light of the ITR's recommendations regarding the Central Corridor's logistics challenges and the potential difficulty of disposing of tunnel material.

- Ms. Swenson said the ITR should have been sent directly to the SEC as soon as it was available instead of providing it in print at the first SEC meeting following the DCA Board meeting where it was presented. The process created a gap in trust between her and the DCA.
- In response, staff clarified that the ITR is one small piece of a much larger analysis that will inform the potential project's design and construction. The ITR's recommendations are from an engineering and contracting perspective and do not include or reflect the insight of the stakeholders or staff with knowledge of the project and the Delta as place, the communities' needs, environmental effects, prior experience and studies, or local/regional concerns. The DCA's response to the recommendations is equally important to the recommendations themselves because the DCA has an operating and historical foundation of the project's local context to a greater extent than do the international contractors that comprise the Independent Technical Review Team. For this reason and because ITR's are routinely performed throughout the planning process as part of a peer review process, ITR recommendations alone are not definitive determinations as to how the potential project may proceed. The DCA will send future ITR reports and DCA response memoranda to the SEC for informational purposes.
- Dr. Lytle commented that the ITR team included world-renowned experts whose recommendations should be given serious consideration, noting that the tunnel material is going to be a topic for ongoing study and discussion.

Other Comments

- Ms. Liebig asked whether future alternatives, if there are any, would receive the same level of review and consideration as the two corridors listed in the NOP. Ms. Liebig said it is necessary to see and understand the components and land required for the entire project, especially in consideration of potential effects to prime farmland.
- Some members said that providing feedback at the early conceptual stages of the project is difficult because they do not feel they have the data and technical background to provide the critical information. Mr. Moran noted SEC members have the unique, powerful local insight that is needed to guide the engineering direction.
- Ms. Mann suggested a charter boat tour of the river to help better understand where the various project components could be located.

Informational Tours

DCA staff is currently coordinating SEC Member tours for the following:

- Tunnel launch shaft site in Silicon Valley (first/second week in March)
- ISI fish screen manufacturing facilities in Freeport
- Intake facilities in Red Bluff

SEC members should contact Valerie Martinez (valeriemartinez@dcdca.org) if they are interested in participating. Further details will be provided.

