



June 19, 2020

Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority
Stakeholder Engagement Committee Members

Subject: ***Materials for the June 24, 2020 Regular Committee Meeting***

Members of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee:

The ninth regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Stakeholder Engagement Committee is scheduled for a remote video conference on **Wednesday, June 24, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.**

Please join our meeting from your smartphone, computer or tablet.

<https://meetings.ringcentral.com/j/1488971866>

SEC Members are asked to join the meeting at 2:45pm to ensure priority entry by the meeting hosts and to resolve any technical issues prior to the start of the meeting.

Enclosed are the materials for the committee meeting in a PDF file, which has been bookmarked for your convenience.

- **Meeting Agenda**
- **Meeting Minutes**- May 27, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting

All files presented during the meeting will also be available at dcdca.org by the Monday following the meeting.

Regards,

Sarah Palmer, DCA Board Member
Stakeholder Engagement Committee Chair

Barbara Keegan, DCA Board Member
Stakeholder Engagement Committee Co-Chair

DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, June 24, 2020

3:00 p.m.

Remote – Conference Access Information:

Phone Number: 1 (623) 404-9000 **Access Code:** 148 897 1866

Electronic Meeting Link:

Please join our meeting from your smartphone, computer or tablet.

<https://meetings.ringcentral.com/j/1488971866>

In compliance with the Governor’s Executive Orders and based on the recent Sacramento County health order and similar orders statewide, the meeting will be held electronically only through the listed meeting link and telephone number. Assistance to those wishing to participate in the meeting in person or remotely will be provided to those requiring accommodations for disabilities in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Interested persons must request the accommodation as soon as possible in advance of the meeting by contacting the DCA support staff at (916) 347-0486 or info@dcdca.org. Members of the public may speak regarding items on the agenda when recognized by the Chair as set forth below. Speakers are limited to three minutes each; however, the Chair may limit this time when reasonable based on the circumstances. **Persons wishing to provide public comments remotely on Agenda Items must email claudiarodriguez@dcdca.org by 3:15 pm.** Additional information will be provided at the commencement of the meeting.

The purpose of the Stakeholder Engagement Committee is to create a forum for Delta stakeholders to provide input and feedback on technical/engineering issues related to the DCA’s current activities. Please note, this meeting is **not** part of the Department of Water Resources’ California Environmental Quality Act public outreach process related to a potential Delta Conveyance project and therefore comments made in this meeting will not be recorded or tracked for those purposes. All items are information only. Members of the public may speak regarding items on the agenda when recognized by the Chair. Please note that Item 5 is a single discussion item. Subparts are listed for clarity. Speakers are limited to three minutes each; however, the Chair may limit this time when reasonable based on the circumstances. Persons wishing to provide live remote comments are requested to email claudiarodriguez@dcdca.org by 3:15pm with their name, phone number, or other identifier and the Item number(s) (3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and/or 8) that they wish to comment regarding. The public may also provide written public comment by email to claudiarodriguez@dcdca.org. All written comments received prior to the conclusion of the meeting will be included in the written record for the meeting but will not be read during the meeting.

- 1. WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL/HOUSEKEEPING**
- 3. MINUTES REVIEW: May 27, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting**
- 4. RALPH M. BROWN ACT REMINDER**
- 5. STAFF PRESENTATION & COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**
 - 5a: DWR Tribal Engagement & Other Updates
 - 5b: Delta-wide Soils Transportation and Balance
 - 5c: Update on DCA Follow-Up Studies in Response to SEC Comments
 - 5d: SEC Questions or Comments on May 27th Presentation
 - 5e: Public Comment on Item 4
- 6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
 - 6a. SEC Tour Updates
 - 6b. July 22nd SEC Meeting Topics
 - 6c. July 18th SEC Report to DCA Board
- 7. NON-AGENDIZED SEC QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS**



DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

June 24, 2020 REGULAR MEETING AGENDA, CONTINUED

8. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS

This is the time and place for members of the public to address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee’s jurisdiction but that are not on the agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes each; however, the Chair may limit this time when reasonable based on the circumstances. Persons wishing to speak are requested to email claudiarodriguez@dcdca.org by 3:15pm with their name, phone number or other identifier. As these items have not been agendized, the Committee is not legally able to discuss these items at this meeting unless a recognized exception applies.

9. NEXT MEETING

9. ADJOURNMENT

* * * * *

Next scheduled meeting: July 22, 2020 Regular Stakeholder Engagement Committee Meeting at 3:00p.m.



DCA
DELTA CONVEYANCE DESIGN
& CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT
COMMITTEE (SEC)

Memo

Contact: Valerie Martinez, SEC Facilitator

Date: June 24, 2020 SEC Meeting

Item No. 3

Subject: Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes from SEC Meeting 8 (May 27, 2020) are attached for your review. Please send any edits to hannahflanagan@dcdca.org by **noon Tuesday, June 23, 2020**. Since the SEC is not a voting group, this process will facilitate the review process and allow us to efficiently address the minutes at the meeting.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, May 27, 2020

3:00 PM

(Paragraph numbers coincide with agenda item numbers)

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

1. WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Delta Conveyance Design and Construction Authority (DCA) Stakeholder Engagement Committee (SEC) was called to order via RingCentral video conference at 3:00 pm.

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

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

2. ROLL CALL/HOUSEKEEPING

Committee members in attendance were Angelica Whaley, Anna Swenson, Cecille Giacom, David Gloski, Douglas Hsia, Isabella Gonzalez-Potter, James Cox, Jim Wallace, Karen Mann, Lindsey Liebig, Malissa Tayaba, Dr. Mel Lytle, Philip Merlo, Peter Robertson and Sean Wirth. Ex-officio members Gilbert Cosio and Michael Moran were also in attendance. Tribal representative alternate Jesus Tarango also attended.

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

DCA Board Members in attendance were Director Sarah Palmer (Chair) and Barbara Keegan (Vice Chair) [Editor's Note: Ms. Palmer left the meeting early and Ms. Keegan presided over the remainder]. In addition, DCA and DWR staff members in attendance were Kathryn Mallon,

Valerie Martinez, Joshua Nelson, Don Hubbard, Graham Bradner, Nazli Parvizi, Claudia Rodriguez, Jasmine Runquist and Carrie Buckman.

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

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

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

Ms. Martinez noted that the members received the agenda and April meeting minutes prior to this meeting. They also received the updated May map books, the DCA presentation, as well as the traffic zip file which contains the information that is going to be presented in that meeting. The members were sent the tracking packet which contains all of the questions and their answers from each meeting, including questions and comments sent via email or online.

3. MINUTES REVIEW: April 22, 2020 Regular SEC Meeting

Ms. Palmer asked if there were any comments on the minutes, which were distributed to members. Any changes can be reported to Jasmine Runquist. No objections or changes were reported by SEC members; Ms. Parvizi noted the addendum to the minutes should include Ms. Swenson's name for clarity about the source of the contribution.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS/PRESENTATIONS

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

a. CEQA Process Update

Ms. Buckman provided an update on the status of the environmental review and conclusion of the scoping period. An overview of the process was presented, which included the NOP being released in January and the scoping meetings that followed. Now is the period where the Scoping Summary Report is being developed. An impact assessment is upcoming with an Administrative Draft EIR to follow and the Draft EIR releasing early in 2021. The Draft would

then be circulated for public comment and public hearings with a Final EIR expected in early 2022.

The scoping period included a 93-day public comment period from January 15, 2020 to April 17, 2020 with 8 public meetings throughout the state that had 735 total combined attendees. DWR received over 850 comment letters and over 3,500 individual comments.

Current activities include reviewing the comments received and the feedback from agencies and members of the public during scoping to consider how to incorporate it into the Draft EIR. Specifically, DWR is looking at the range of alternatives and the scope of the environmental impact analysis. A scoping report is also being prepared that captures all scoping-related information, including comments received and scoping meeting transcripts. Next DWR will be preparing the Draft EIR and environmental impact analysis. Tribal consultation is continuing at the Tribes' discretion. At the start of the project, letters were sent out to 121 tribes throughout the study area to initiate consultation under AB-52 and DWR's Tribal Engagement Policy. All tribes that responded to those letters have been reached out to, but due to the current public health conditions as a result of COVID-19, some tribes want to delay discussion. There have been meetings with the interested tribes and communication with the tribes that are not yet ready. These meetings will be to work with tribes to identify potential effects to tribal cultural resources and consider potential mitigation measures.

Ms. Buckman presented upcoming CEQA milestones which included the publication of the scoping report and the selection of alternatives this summer. The publication of the Draft EIR is expected for early 2021. The Draft Engineering Project Reports are due July 2020 and the Final is due September 2020. Since no alternatives have been selected, the July date may be slightly delayed.

The Draft EIR will look at a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that can achieve the project objectives and avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts, consistent with CEQA requirements. Alternatives are currently being formulated by a screening process informed by scoping and information from past projects. When alternatives are identified, the DCA will prepare the conceptual design, with the SEC providing input on that design. There will be an update in June or July to present the results of the screening process for more information so that the SEC understands why they are providing feedback on the alternatives.

Mr. Wirth asked where NEPA fits in.

Ms. Buckman answered that it is still being worked on. DWR asked the Central Valley Flood Protection Board last week for a letter to initiate the Section 408 process with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The project does not currently have a federal partner, so one of the regulatory agencies will need to be the NEPA lead. They will need to decide who is the most appropriate NEPA lead as the federal agency group. The processes with the federal agencies have been initiated so they can decide the NEPA lead. DWR is also working to initiate the 404 process as well, so that the relevant groups of the USACE are involved. The 408 initiation letter does not indicate that the project was approved by the

Flood Board or that the Flood Board agreed that this project should move forward; it was just initiation for coordination.

Mr. Gloski asked if the DCA staff is involved with the project alternatives. Does DCA get involved in the evaluation of the alternatives?

Ms. Buckman said the DCA is only involved to the extent that they have suggested some alternatives as technical experts, but it's up to DWR to make a decision. DWR looks at alternatives from a CEQA perspective.

Ms. Martinez clarified that all DCA work is assigned by DWR.

Ms. Buckman confirmed and said DWR will make a decision and ask the DCA to design the alternatives.

Ms. Swenson asked if there is a list of alternatives? Are any of the alternatives that are being considered different from the other iterations of this project?

Ms. Buckman said there is not yet a list of alternatives, but any such list will be part of an alternatives presentation to the SEC. Some of the alternatives are different than the previous iteration of the project. Most are from ideas that have been heard before.

b. Presentation Traffic Impacts and Logistics Improvements

Ms. Mallon introduced DCA Traffic Planner Don Hubbard for a presentation on Traffic Impacts and Logistics Responses. Mr. Hubbard created a model for traffic in the Delta and the primary reason of the presentation is to determine what engineering logistics solutions need to be included in the design that will be handed off to DWR for the alternatives' analysis. The analysis described in the presentation is not a CEQA study. DWR will be conducting a CEQA study on traffic impacts that may result in changes.

Mr. Hubbard said he will first explain the methodology of the traffic modeling and then he will present the results utilizing that modeling. The goal of the traffic planning exercise is to identify measures that minimize the effects of the project's truck and worker traffic loads on the Delta communities. The team is aiming to find the solution that will allow the project to be built while being the least impactful to Delta communities. This was done by developing a traffic model that allowed the team to quickly evaluate the effectiveness of a wide range of alternatives to show the differences in traffic effects under a consistent set of criteria. This is not a CEQA analysis, so the goal is not to identify the effects of the project, but rather to identify what the proposed project actually is. Ultimately, the CEQA process will be the final arbiter of recommended logistics improvements to manage traffic impacts. Traffic level of service is no longer the method to assess significant impacts under CEQA but nevertheless represents something important to local communities. It was used in this analysis because a traffic planning exercise allows for more flexibility as it is not a CEQA study.

One challenge of this project is the sparse road network within the region, and few roads designed for heavy vehicles or heavy traffic volumes. The region also has moveable bridges with limited capacity and, when closed, which interrupt traffic flows. There are, however, opportunities for this project that are not available to most projects. Rail, barge, and

conveyor belts are possible for some locations, and the duration of the project could make some of these investments worthwhile. Some sites can be designed with enough storage space to allow for stockpiling that would allow materials to be moved during off-peak periods.

Since this is a planning study, not an EIR, the purpose of traffic thresholds is to serve as targets during iterative adjustments of the plans (i.e. which remedial actions to include). “Remedial actions” refer to transportation infrastructure developed as part of the project to support a reasonable traffic level of service (LOS) during the construction period. In most cases, this is infrastructure, in other cases it could be operational changes. DWR will later decide on the methodology and significance thresholds used in the EIR phase. As a State agency, DWR is not subject to local regulation and will establish its own thresholds for use in the EIR.

Mr. Hubbard presented the way that traffic is usually studied which is through Level of Service (LOS), measured on a scale A-F, similar to school grading. Level A to C allows traffic to move at the regular posted speed limit with more traffic density in LOS C. Level D has more restriction from other traffic and is most common on urban and suburban roads. At LOS E traffic is unstable, moving relatively quickly at times but can become slow due to minor incidents. At LOS F a driver’s ability to maneuver is restricted by the vehicles around them and speeds are slow. San Joaquin County’s LOS Policy’s target is LOS D or better for roads in the Congestion Management Plan (CMP). Mr. Hubbard presented a map showing all the roads in the CMP and highlighted important routes for this project, including State Route 12, State Route 4, Byron Highway, and Mountain House Parkway. All other roads in the county that are not shown on the map have a LOS C policy. Sacramento County is very similar; it has a LOS D target for rural collectors, such as Twin Cities Road.

LOS D is a target that is not being achieved in existing conditions. Mr. Hubbard presented maps showing that certain sections of I-5, SR-12, and SR-4 are level of service E at certain times of the day. Byron Highway is LOS F for many hours of the day. The target is being achieved in most places but on the routes important to this project, there are these existing problems.

For this study, DCA sets the threshold for remedial action. Remedial action would be needed if the construction traffic creates (or worsens) a LOS worse than the target LOS and the project’s traffic is 10% or more of the total traffic volume. Both of those criteria must exist for remedial action. The target LOS is LOS C for local roads, LOS D for major commute roads (SR-4, SR-12, Byron Hwy), and LOS D for any new roads built for this project. So although DCA is not subject to local regulation it is using an LOS policy similar to those of San Joaquin and Sacramento Counties but with consideration of the project’s traffic in relation to existing traffic.

There are also design criteria and safety considerations. For roads with heavy truck traffic the standard is 12-ft lanes with 4-ft shoulders. The recommendation is 6-ft shoulders where there are bike lanes; for example, Hood Franklin Road.

Mr. Hubbard explained the summary of the traffic modeling steps as:

Step 1: Build model of Delta road system.

Step 2: Collect best available data on existing traffic levels including diurnal variations and forecast data to anticipated period of construction.

Step 3: Import construction truck and worker traffic counts and add to forecasted background levels.

Step 4: Assign construction traffic to routes based on regional industry and population data (i.e. where are the trucks and people coming from?)

Step 5: Import proposed Delta Conveyance logistic improvement options into model.

Step 6: Analyze results and identify least impactful solution that meets goals.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) model was used to forecast future traffic which includes new developments going on. The SACOG model was used in the north part of the study area and the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) model was used in the south. Traffic counts were taken from existing sources, including Caltrans, SJCOG, and previous traffic studies. Forecasts were needed because most of the busiest years for project construction work will be 10-15 years into the future. Traffic was factored up or down to forecast volumes for specific years.

Mr. Hubbard displayed an example of forecasting background growth for PM peak hour, showing that in existing conditions, SR-12 is at a LOS E, but projected to increase to LOS F in 2032 under no-project conditions.

DCA's engineering group produced histograms by making a schedule for different construction activities on each of the sites, and determined what material needs to arrive and be removed from the site in each month of construction. From a traffic standpoint, these different materials may need to be on different types of vehicles. Some may be able to shift to different modes, like rail, while others may not. In terms of distributing the traffic loads, different routes may be used. In the example of Bacon Island, three path options are Hwy 4 West, Hwy 4 East, and Tracy Blvd.

For the presentation of results, a color coding was used in which green was used for LOS A, B, or C, yellow for LOS D, amber for LOS E, and red for LOS F. Each section will have three maps presented. The first map will show the forecasted no-project condition of the road network for the peak construction year. The future year depends on the location because the peak construction activity will take place at different sites at different times. Then the traffic impacts of all materials arriving by truck and all workers driving to each location will be shown. This would be the smallest geographic footprint since no new facilities would be built that would impact the land. The one exception would be a haul road to service the intake locations so that there would be no project traffic on SR-160. DCA has determined that that road is unsafe for large volumes of heavy trucks. The third figure shows what would happen after the proposed remedial actions are added. This could include Park-and-Ride lots, improvements to existing roads, separate haul roads, barge landings, and railroad spurs.

In addition to the truck traffic, there are also worker trips. This was forecasted by first identifying the labor pool for the project. These are the workers in the construction, mining, and utilities sectors residing in each county sub-division within realistic commuting distance of project sites. The data came from the U.S. Census Bureau. DCA used county sub-divisions rather than counties to get more realistic routing and a better estimate of the distance that workers will be traveling for the VMT calculation. Then a gravity model was used to determine the willingness to travel to the project given the worker's residential location (based on data from the National Cooperative Highway Research Program). Gravity models are often used in traffic models to account for how travel time affects how far people are willing to travel. These were combined to produce a forecast of the likely residential distribution of project workers and the likely path taken from homes to the work sites. DCA then converted the worker-trips into vehicle-trips using vehicle occupancy, including the effects of carpooling incentives and park-and-ride lots.

Mr. Hubbard presented the catchment for the labor force, which stretches from Yuba City in the north to Modesto and San Jose in the south, and from San Francisco in the west to Placerville in the East. Depending on the size of the labor pool in each location they would be providing more or fewer workers, and depending on the distance they would be providing more or fewer workers.

Using the gravity model for worker traffic forecasting, it was predicted that most workers (69%) for construction sites in the north part of the study area would come from the Sacramento Area. In the south, most workers (69%) are expected to come from the Bay Area, with some from Stockton and the Central Valley, as well. This is what you would expect; that workers would go to a site near their home if their type of job was available at that site until the close sites are filled, then they would go to one further away. However, there are some jobs that are only offered at certain sites so they may need to travel to a site further from their home. This is why there is distribution from the north and the south.

Ms. Whaley asked as part of the CEQA process, is a current traffic study being conducted using data that is more recent than 2018.

Ms. Buckman answered that the hope was to do traffic monitoring this summer but with the current COVID situation, traffic patterns are different than they would typically be since schools are closed and many are working from home. The team expects it will be a while before traffic conditions are similar to what they typically are or what they will be in the future. The information we have is relatively recent. The CEQA process will include more modeling. Monitoring will happen if traffic goes back to normal.

Ms. Whaley asked if there has been an analysis of the agricultural traffic separate from day to day traffic along the Delta.

Mr. Hubbard responded that the original plan was to do traffic counts at four different times during the year in order to get the seasonal differences, but that is not currently possible. If it becomes possible, that's the recommendation. The team has information for the Caltrans facilities that have embedded loops that are continuously collecting information, so that gives some information on seasonality.

Ms. Whaley said that grape harvesting trucks take up the whole road.

Mr. Hubbard said that this is why DCA is looking at 12-ft lanes. The design standards are for trucks to be able to maneuver and pass each other safely. It's being taken into consideration.

Ms. Swenson asked for clarity on the statement "DWR is not subject to local regulations." A 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 old census information will be use? 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.

Mr. Hubbard said that DCA is not using Caltrans' methodology, although they use a very similar methodology for forecasting. DCA hasn't spoken to Caltrans about traffic standards; these are ones being developed. With regard to DWR being a state agency, not subject to local regulation: State law is set up in a way that for someone building a house in the area, they are subject to the appropriate jurisdiction and their regulations. State agencies have a different set of rules, especially with a project going through several different jurisdictions. The lead agency sets the thresholds. It can take the local thresholds into consideration if it wishes to. In this case, for the planning study, the LOS thresholds being used are consistent with local jurisdictions. Regarding Stone Lake and the bike lane, there are several different options but these will be discussed later in the presentation. Caltrans has imbedded loops; they have data and are continuously collecting information from these and videos that helps their traffic management center react to different instances on the road. That's the information received from Caltrans. Although the census is done once every 10 years, there is also the American Community Survey that's done more consistently. It is updated constantly, surveying and getting more information. The information being used is therefore not 10 years old.

Mr. Cosio asked for clarification on the portion of the presentation regarding Hwy-160.

Mr. Hubbard explained that for one scenario, DCA will present the results of the no-project scenario, the scenario if all trucks and cars use existing roads (without remedial action), and the scenario with remedial action. For Hwy-160 however, even without other remedial actions, there will certainly be a haul road to allow truck traffic to get to the intake sites from the east, rather than use Hwy-160 and come from the west. There are many good reasons for not putting trucks on Hwy-160.

Ms. Giacoma said she is concerned with data coming from 2018 because traffic has increased extremely each year. Is there 2019 data that you can access from Caltrans?

Mr. Hubbard said data is received from Caltrans' PeMS¹, so that is quite recent. For other places, accounts have been updated based on the growth projections from SACOG and SJCOG. DCA didn't just take raw traffic volumes from a previous year. Some growth was

¹ Freeway Performance Monitoring System

anticipated. He noted that some things are strange in this area as some of the traffic before the recession was actually higher than more recently, but the best available data is being used. The 2018 data was taken from a 2019 report, the most recent congested management program. (Ref: Slide 9) this is the latest version of SJCOG's Monitoring and Performance Report updated by DCA using data from the PeMS system, that is pre COVID, last November. There are growth factors that came from traffic models from SACOG and SJCOG.

Ms. Liebig said regardless of COVID, agricultural traffic will be the same with the same capacity so those studies should be able to be 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 grape trucks which can be looked at easily. Caltrans can be difficult to work with.

Mr. Hubbard said he went through all comments from the previous EIR and saw that seasonality is a big concern. DCA would have to count the same locations at different times of the year to obtain a comparative analysis. Hopefully everything gets back to normal so that traffic data can be collected.

Ms. Mann said she 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 Hwy-4. Contra Costa County is going to be adversely affected significantly, they are in the DNF category on the charts presented.

Mr. Hubbard answered that they did look at their material and a number of other studies. There is one by Byron Highway, but for the purposes of this presentation the focus was on San Joaquin and Sacramento counties. Later it will be shown that the north, middle, and south are all quite different. The south part definitely has existing traffic conditions that are challenging.

Ms. Mann informed that on Hwy-4 there are three bridges between Stockton and Discovery Bay and a proposed maintenance shaft. Semi-trucks take two lanes to get on the 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?

Mr. Hubbard said later in the presentation one particular bridge will be discussed. Most truck traffic will come from the east. Depending on the alignment that is ultimately selected, they might be able to avoid some of those bridges. Truck traffic for the proposed project might not cross Sacramento river.

Ms. Mann said that Hwy-4 is a primary route for commuters between Stockton and East Bay.

Ms. Mallon said this can be discussed when the results portion of the traffic information is presented.

Ms. Mann added that on Byron Highway there is agricultural and school traffic.

Mr. Hubbard said the team is aware of the issues on Byron Hwy and have been struggling with them. It'll be covered during the last part of the presentation.

Ms. Mann asked on the Hwy-4 route, how about access for emergency equipment since lanes are old and narrow? There have been existing issues with blocked traffic.

Mr. Hubbard responded that there are not plans to send a lot of trucks on Hwy-4.

Dr. Lytle asked is there an actual quantity of truck traffic that has been proposed?

Ms. Mallon said that is one of the bars on the graph presented. It'll be discussed at the next meeting and how the RTM moves around the Delta as part of the project will also be addressed.

Mr. Wallace said although CEQA doesn't require projects to use level of service, surely that can't be the only factor in determining traffic impacts.

Mr. Hubbard said SB-743 included a section saying that as of the adoption of the revised CEQA guidelines by the Natural Resources Agency, which occurred in December 2018, that automobile delay (including LOS) could no longer be used to determine impacts under CEQA. Some other metric that matches the 3 goals specified in SB-743 must be used; most state agencies use vehicle miles. LOS can be used for transportation planning and mitigation fees. So Level of service is not going away, but it is no longer required for CEQA.

Ms. Buckman added that DWR will be looking at vehicle miles traveled to identify significant impacts but will also complete a level of service analysis.

Mr. Hsia said two weeks ago he provided a suggestion from one of his constituents to widen Diersson Road. Is this an option under consideration?

Mr. Hubbard said that it is a results question and the presentation will address each area.

Ms. Giacoma said that it is important that Contra Costa County data is included in this information.

Mr. Hubbard replied that Contra Costa data was included and will continue to be; it is not represented on the slides explicitly due to the necessity to simplify information for purposes of the presentation. Although he will not be doing the EIR traffic study, he would assume Contra Costa data will continue to be utilized in DWR's analysis. The graphics shown were just two models: SACOG's and SJCOG's.

Mr. Hubbard began presenting the results portion of the presentation. Due to the area being so big and traffic differing throughout, this portion of the presentation was divided into three study regions: North, Middle, and South. The North goes through New Hope and Staten Island, the Middle is mostly SR-12, and the South included SR-4 and Byron Hwy.

The facilities in the North included the intake locations with two different scenarios. For traffic purposes, these scenarios are not too different. The dark blue route shows a combination of Intakes 2 and 3 with sites at Lambert and Glanville as well. The other option

is Intakes 3 and 5 with no site at Lambert. There would be material depots at Hood Franklin and Twin Cities, and batch plants at Lambert and Twin Cities.

There are three options for delivering materials to the Intake locations. The first option is to exit I-5 at Hood Franklin and use it to reach the haul roads, going north for Intakes 2 and 3, and south for intake 5. Note that the haul road runs to the west of the railroad. There will be no impacts to the railroad embankment. Option 2 is to exit I-5 at Twin Cities (East), going north on Franklin Blvd. to Lambert, west on Lambert to the haul roads, and then north to the intake sites. Option 3 is to exit I-5 (West) going east on Twin Cities to the Power Line Corridor, north to the haul roads, then north to the Intake sites. Any of these three options could be used, and even all three could be used if you wanted to spread out the traffic.

Mr. Hubbard presented the traffic effects of the delivery options. The graph shown (ref. Slide 27) displays a significant amount of green which is spoils transportation; the peak month is in January of year 5. The future no-project conditions have a good LOS. There would be no capacity problems even without remedial actions. Twin Cities would see a LOS D but that is allowable there. There would become even less of an effect with remedial action. The north doesn't see too much traffic trouble, as long as some road improvements are done for safety purposes. Different work would need to be done depending on the route that ends up being used. For example, should it be Hood Franklin Rd., the lanes would need to be widened. Not all of the improvements would be done, only the improvements for whichever route option is chosen.

Mr. Hubbard showed projected traffic volumes for each of the 3 options discussed, beginning with the Hood Franklin Rd. option. The blue bars (ref. Slide 30) show no-project background traffic which is very low in comparison to the capacity of the road. The dark grey shows truck traffic that has been converted into passenger car equivalents. They look large because each truck is equivalent to three cars. Due to workers using park-and-ride, there is not much project-related car traffic (light gray bars). The left diagram shows traffic split 50% between Hood Franklin Rd. and one of the other routes. The right shows Hood Franklin as the only route. The existing capacity is sufficient to accommodate project traffic while maintaining an acceptable LOS (C), even if all of the traffic to both Intakes used them.

Road improvements would still be made for safety reasons as Hood Franklin Rd. has narrow lanes. There are some places on the road with 10 to 11-ft sections that should be widened to 12-ft. One side would have a 6-ft shoulder as part of the Bicycle Master Plan with the idea that bicyclists would be on this side of the road. The other side would have a 4-ft shoulder to allow trucks to pass each other safely without slowing down too much. The team is aware that this is a sensitive area which is why it is being presented for discussion to determine whether or not these measures should be taken.

The Lambert Rd. option provides even less background traffic because it doesn't have an interchange with I-5. Even if all routes were to use Lambert, LOS would still be good.

Ms. Mallon added the team looked at the Lambert interchange that they were proposing but decided it was better to use the existing interchange at Twin Cities and then head up north on Franklin to Lambert Rd.

Mr. Hubbard said that is an example of using this analysis to help the team determine which components need to be part of the project.

The traffic is higher at Twin Cities Rd. If it was used for one intake, it would be LOS C without our project. With the project, it would push it to LOS D, which would still be acceptable. If it was used for both Intakes, it would push higher up LOS D, but would still be acceptable.

The north doesn't see any capacity problems. So the issue there is not traffic; it is identifying the route that would be least impactful from the point of view of the communities.

Mr. Wirth said this will have a significant impact on the wildlife as it is within the refuge. 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? If birds were flushed, they would be flushed towards the refuge, as opposed to being caught with a road between them and the refuge. It's a haul road, so it's being built with what is on the ground. In terms of species, the possibility of using the toe of the levee should be considered.

Mr. Hubbard asked if in terms of route 1 versus route 2, is going along the left ledge more impactful than going north and south along the other edge?

Mr. Wirth said they're both bad but does not yet have a definitive answer.

Ms. Mallon added that since the last meeting, Twin Cities was brought in as an option, to distribute the traffic even more.

Mr. Wirth said that the new haul roads are more problematic than widening existing roads.

Ms. Giacomini asked if the truck trips graphic includes estimates for trucks hauling fill.

Mr. Hubbard said the graphs represent the truck trips for fill from the job sites in blue.

Ms. Mallon added that there is very little hauling of borrow in that area.

Mr. Wallace asked if improvements made at the intersection of I-5 and Hood Franklin would involve the Federal Highways Administration.

Mr. Hubbard responded that Caltrans has jurisdiction, but it does get federal funds. There is some discussion about improvements to that intersection related to a different project.

Mr. Wallace asked what 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. If it's just a haul route, without knowing how many trips that is, might have a more difficult time when trying to determine how that impacts wildlife.

Ms. Mallon confirmed that it is a dedicated haul road just for the project. There is also an appendix with a lot more detail than what Mr. Hubbard has put into the diagrams. Every single site is in there for study.

Ms. Martinez encouraged to read the materials before the meeting and said the team will add it to the Q&A matrix for everyone to be able to refer back to.

Ms. Swenson asked why traffic information for Yolo County is not being included. All things within the Delta are connected, so all traffic affects everywhere. The idea of driving trucks through the preserves and the town of Hood is bad. Disagrees that there is no capacity issue on these roads; all it takes is one incident for it to last hours before traffic 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.

Mr. Hubbard said none of the three routes options presented go through Hood. The purpose of the north-south haul road is to make sure trucks don't have to go through Hood. It will be approached from the east side. Improvements would be made to Twin Cities Rd. if it is the chosen route for the reasons Ms. Swenson stated.

Mr. Wirth mentioned it would be better if truck traffic flushed wildlife into safe area in the west rather than to an unsafe area.

Mr. Hubbard presented the middle region of the Eastern Alignment. This area has maintenance shafts, but they do not have much activity compared to the launch shafts or Intakes. There is also a retrieval shaft here which is also a low-activity area. There is a significant peak month in August of year 1 with traffic generated from hauling excavated material from Glanville site to the shaft site. The peak is very sharp, but there are options for what to do about it.

The results showed that no-project conditions would have a LOS E, which is the current condition. The project would push it into LOS F. Some remedial actions can be taken to push it back to LOS E, which is the same as the no-project conditions. Physical remedial actions that can be taken include dampening peak deliveries by spreading work over a longer period of time. If the distinct peak month was drawn out over a 5-month period, it would lessen the impact. Median turn pockets at Guard Rd. could be constructed. Eastbound and Westbound turn pockets could be constructed at the shaft site. Another possible option is a minor haul road to the Brack Tract site.

SR-12 has background traffic into LOS E without the project and at some points in the day, even has LOS F. The project does add some traffic but less than 10% to background levels. There are some options to ensure that the project does not bother SR-12 and vice versa. One option is a proposed remedial action which is to deliver borrow material to the site over a longer period to dampen the peak. Others include expanding SR-12 to Terminous Shaft Site and hauling excavated material from the Glanville site to the middle area shaft sites during night shift. The last option is to evaluate alternative designs to reduce size and height of construction pads at shaft sites.

Mr. Hubbard moved on to the Central Alignment which is further west at Bouldin Island. The launch shaft is here and if there is a barge landing, it'll be on the southside of Bouldin Island. The peak here is multi-month with the basis for analysis being April of Year 2. All of this is preparation activities hauling borrow material from Glanville to Bouldin Island. Although the

addition of a barge landing would not affect the peak period, it would significantly reduce the truck volumes in later years.

The no-project condition is a LOS E with the project increasing it to LOS F. There are remedial actions that can be taken that would make it a LOS A or B. These include widening SR-12 from two lanes to four lanes and constructing median turn pockets at Guard Rd., N. Peatland Rd., and Correia Rd. DCA would also construct an interchange at the turnoff to the shaft site to allow for left-turn movements without interfering with opposing traffic, and is evaluating if existing undercrossing can be converted for project traffic. The Barge Landing at Bouldin Island is under consideration as well, and employee park & rides in Rio Vista and Flag City.

One potential issue is Potato Slough Bridge which is about half a mile long and difficult to widen. Widening it would be a significant project in itself. This would be a two-lane section in what would otherwise be a four-lane road.

Traffic volumes for SR-12 are at LOS E with some parts of the day at LOS F, even without the project. If the remedial action of widening SR-12 takes place, the traffic volumes wouldn't change but the capacity would increase. Transitions for LOS E or F to LOS A or B. Options for SR-12 improvements are expanding to four lanes (proposed remedial action). There is still a need to study Potato Slough Bridge with potential widening there. Expanding SR-12 may allow for the elimination of a barge landing. The haul excavated material from the Glanville site to Bouldin Island could occur during the night shift pending environmental review. Borrow material could be hauled to the site by barge to reduce traffic but would need to identify borrow source.

Ms. Swenson said she loves the idea of widening SR-12, it has been long needed as it can be a big issue at various times of the day. It does not feel safe to drive on and should be left better than found.

Ms. Giacomina asked what route is being used to take barge materials to Bouldin Island?

Ms. Mallon said the routes to Bouldin were shown in the last packet. The route is coming from the San Joaquin.

Mr. Wirth said widening should take into consideration the fact that traffic will not change is false; that is a problem.

Mr. Hubbard said that induced demand is part of the reason why under CEQA they moved away from LOS. In this particular case, DCA would be widening this portion of SR-12, not the remainder of the route. It would be solving a local problem and therefore might be appreciated. But most people driving this route are going quite a long distance. This would only be improving a portion of their trip and it isn't likely to have a strong induced demand effect. In any case this analysis will be part of the CEQA document.

Mr. Gloski said widening SR-12 would be great, it would save lives, and improve safety. When the east and west were compared in this area, the eastern alignment has about four

facilities and the eastern has just one facility. Can you explain why one alignment has only one facility and the other alignment has four?

Ms. Mallon said each alignment has about the same number of facilities but Staten Island and New Hope on the Central Alignment were covered in the north map. They are both green and not heavily trafficked roads so it was not covered in this presentation as the focus was the Intakes in the north. There is only one additional shaft on the Eastern as opposed to the Central, but everything is covered in the appendix.

Ms. Mann said for WaterFix, they were told that the Water Board agreed that Bouldin Island wouldn't work due to the toxic fumes and dust and would send it into Tower Park. Tower Park has a full-time manufactured home development, as well as a KOA family park campground. Sending fumes and dust to a place where people live full time and recreate might not be the best move.

Ms. Buckman said the Water Board did not finish the hearing process for WaterFix and did not complete findings. Concerns were raised regarding air quality during the hearing but the State Water Resources Control Board did not reach conclusions about these findings. An assessment of air quality effects will, however, be part of the CEQA analysis.

Mr. Cox asked if "haul borrow material to site by barge" was referring to liners.

Ms. Mallon said it would be soil material to do site prep before the start of shaft construction. All of these sites need a lot of material upfront before there is necessarily enough RTM to serve them. Borrow is just excavated material from somewhere, brought to the site. Glanville is not accessible by barge so that is why that is in there, another place has to be found with borrow material and barge access. If SR-12 is expanded and improvements are made to Potato Slough Bridge, so much capacity would have been created that the barge landing becomes less necessary as a way to reduce traffic.

Mr. Hubbard presented the Southern Region Facilities, which includes Lower Roberts Island Launch Shaft, Lower Jones Tract Maintenance Shaft, Victoria Island Maintenance Shaft, Southern Forebay and Pump Station, and South Delta Outlet Control. The peak month is June of Year 3 and the traffic is generated from hauling excavated material from the Delta Conveyance Outlet Control Structure south of Byron Highway to the Forebay site north of Byron Highway. A site south of Byron Highway is producing a lot of material that will be moved along Byron Highway to the north side.

SR-4 would have much less project traffic than Byron Highway, which is about 20,000 trucks. SR-4 is about one tenth of that. The peak month is June of Year 3 generated from hauling excavated material from Glanville to the shaft sites. There are haul roads at the Lower Roberts Island Launch Shaft and the Lower Jones Tract Maintenance Shaft. A rail spur is being proposed that would provide direct access to the southern complex. Remedial actions for the Southern region include realigning a section to decrease the need for project-specific intersections, and reducing the intra-projects trips interacting with public traffic. Remedial actions also include new railroad siding at the work area, park & ride lots in Byron and near Mountain House, and shoulder widening and acceleration lane for S. Holt Rd. For the Byron Highway load which does produce over 20,000 trucks for certain periods, a rail line can be

done. The rail line does not reduce the peak month load but greatly reduces the truck volume in the later years. This is because the peak is moving materials a short period from south of Byron Highway to North of Byron Highway, which would be difficult to do by rail.

Byron Highway is already LOS F without the project, but the project would make it LOS F for a longer period. There are some remedial actions that can be done to reduce it down similar to no-project conditions.

The project would add relatively little traffic to the traffic volumes of SR-4. There is minimal traffic generated from Shaft Sites. The target LOS D would be maintained without the need for remediation.

Byron Highway has a poor LOS even in the no-project condition with LOS F for multiple periods throughout the day. The project would add little traffic. The problem here is that the existing traffic would cause problems for the project, making it unclear if shipments could arrive on time. This would cost more since trucks would take longer getting stuck sitting in traffic.

An option for SR-4 for Victoria Island is to haul excavated material and concrete on SR-4 during off-peak hours to avoid added traffic on Middle River and Old River Bridges during peak hours (pending environmental review).

Some options for Byron Highway include constructing a connector haul road or conveyor belt with an overpass to transport excavated material from the Outlet Structure over Byron Highway and to the Forebay site for the peak. Once the rail line is in and the excavated material process is done, which is only 6 months, the project will not be putting much traffic on Byron Highway. Another option is to haul excavated material across during the night shift pending environmental review. Lastly, additional material could be shifted to rail delivery, although that is not expected to make much difference to the peak month.

Ms. Mallon added that with the addition of the conveyor belt, there would no longer be that significant 20,000+ truck peak. The use of rail will significantly decrease the remaining traffic as well, so it will just be underlying traffic there. There is a lot of fill material in that area from when the canals were built and the DCA team wants to use that for embankment material, so it will be moved across Byron Highway.

The haul roads that would be built in the south region would be a bit different; they would not be going on SR-4 for the shafts but would be building a road crossing it. This would not be a public road and would only be used for construction. There would be park & ride lots similar to the Eastern Alignment. The results are essentially the same as the Eastern Alignment except that Byron Highway would cause some issues for the project.

Ms. Mallon added the team was surprised the traffic in the south was only at LOS D and wanted to hear if the people of the southern Delta felt that to be accurate. Mr. Hubbard said that the planning-level model was based on the number of lanes and did not include S-curve, which could be causing a lot of the back-up.

Ms. Mann said that in order for a truck to get onto the bridge, because of the S-curve the traffic coming the opposite 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. It has caused a truck to flip over before.

Ms. Mallon said they were surprised that the computer model for Highway 4 gets into LOS D. In talking to Mr. Hubbard, he says the model can't reflect the traffic backup that the bridges cause because the model just sees two lanes with a load. It doesn't see obstructions in the way. The team will have to observe to see if this traffic volume chart really reflects what's going on.

Ms. Mann said the Contra Costa County Fire Marshal was concerned because at the Discovery Bay Bridge, there are no emergency services from that bridge east, so there would be no firefighters if there was an issue. If there's anything happening on Highway 4, it can take 8-10 hours to clear the vehicles. Trucks would not be able to turn around. 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.

Mr. Hubbard said the team was concerned about that and are looking into options like turnouts for vehicles. But once this was looked at, they saw they don't use SR-4 very much.

Ms. Mallon added the team will need to take a deeper dive but they agree and would like to avoid those bridges at all costs.

Mr. Gloski said he thinks Hwy-4 traffic is event driven and isn't always an issue. The conveyer sounds like it makes a lot of sense. Why wouldn't rail work?

Mr. Hubbard said in order to get rail in, because it can't take a very steep grade, it isn't certain how far north it would need to get. Otherwise, at-grade crossing would hold up traffic. For incident-driven traffic problems, it is important to have shoulders and adequate lanes so trucks pulling over wouldn't cause too much problem.

Ms. Mallon said tow trucks could be stationed nearby. More time will be spent thinking about Hwy-4. DCA agrees that there is no reason to put huge load if there is no need to.

Mr. Merlo said most of the prevailing winds along Hwy-4 are blowing into Stockton which is a city of primarily people of color. Are any studies concerning CO2 emissions being conducted considering how a vast majority of those emissions will be affecting a community with one of the highest rates of asthma in the state? This is a civil rights issue since most of the benefits of this project will be going to primarily white communities but the problems will be affecting people of color. Any reliance on rail that reduces truck traffic is appreciated.

Ms. Buckman said DWR will be looking at not only emissions but will also be doing air dispersion modeling and a human health risk assessment to determine if traffic and construction could cause air quality effects. Environmental justice impacts will be analyzed to determine if any construction activities have the ability to disproportionately affect low-income or minority communities.

Mr. Hubbard said it looks like the rail, in terms of removing trucks from the road, will have significant impacts in reducing diesel emissions.

Ms. Swenson asked 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 impact on the port of Stockton? How many truck trips are planned out of the Port of Stockton for this project? What socio-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.

Ms. Keegan informed that the people who use the water are the ones paying. Staff can go into greater detail but end users end up paying for the project.

Mr. Cox said he'd like to reiterate what Ms. Mann was saying about bridges on Hwy-4. Having a pickup truck, he understands that when trucks are going across the Highway, it's essentially a one lane Highway. It takes time for trucks to get over bridges and therefore traffic backs up. An overpass on Byron sounds very reasonable.

Ms. Mallon said one of things the team is considering is eliminating one of the shafts. If shafts can be spread out differently, Lower Jones and Lower Roberts might be able to be used. The biggest issues on Hwy-4 are the bridges on Victoria Island. The team is figuring out how to optimize shaft locations to avoid the bridges.

Mr. Hubbard presented the project traffic to I-5. The project adds traffic to different portions of I-5. The highest volume in the north is just north of Hood Franklin Rd, while the highest volume in the south is north of SR-4, which already has recurring congestion problems. The main project traffic is worker auto trips before they switch to shuttle buses at the park-and-ride lots. Much of the material at the Twin Cities materials depot will arrive by rail, thus reducing the truck trips on I-5.

North of Hood Franklin I-5 has a LOS C without the project and would be a LOS C or D with the project, due to worker cars. LOS remains good throughout the day in both directions. Further north on I-5, there is more background congestion but project traffic would be going in the off-peak direction. Going northbound on I-5 in the morning will get quite congested. In the off-peak direction southbound it is better so there is room to absorb some traffic.

North of SR-4 in Stockton is LOS E; some places are LOS F. The project would add some traffic but very little compared to existing traffic, anywhere from 1%-4% depending on time of day. There is a daily variation northbound of 53% every morning with the project adding 3%. Southbound the daily variation is 40% with the project adding 4%.

Ms. Swenson said the traffic data is incorrect because the traffic near Elk Grove is insane no matter which direction. It's worrisome to hear that the project will not affect traffic because the data is wrong. The other idea that the people of Stockton will not notice the traffic from the project is disingenuous. Their traffic is already bad so increasing it would be terrible. The modeling isn't aligning with the people who live there; please get accurate representations for these areas. The Twin Cities connection is a bottle neck that will be made worse and needs to be addressed.

Mr. Hubbard said Twin Cities is one of several options being considered. DCA did say if it was selected, improvements would be made. In Stockton, the information is coming from data regularly collected from Caltrans and SJCOG. Existing conditions are bad in Stockton. The project would be adding anywhere from 1%-4%. The project would not be the cause of the traffic congestion but would be affected by it just like everyone else. DCA is not trying to be dismissive of the fact that the project too would be contributing to poor traffic conditions, but it would be adding relatively little traffic. At the north in Elk Grove, there can be congestion that is due to queuing from the sections further north towards US-50. Caltrans is already adding capacity with express lanes going north from the Elk Grove area into US-50. The desire to avoiding adding to congestion is why DCA is considering a rail connection for Twin Cities and park-and-ride lots.

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

Ms. Mallon said the SEC members provided a lot of feedback to the DCA team that has led to further analysis; therefore, there are a few topics that are planned for discussion at future meetings. The team is actively working on some information that will hopefully be included at the next SEC meeting. These topics include: logistics remedial actions feedback from SEC members as discussed at this meeting, the barge landing site on the San Joaquin River shore of Bouldin Island, borrow material mass balance across all construction sites, Glanville Tract site footprint size, remediation of temporary construction sites, and air quality in regards to truck traffic and equipment operating hours. The team is also reviewing shaft siting to see if it is possible to eliminate one proposed maintenance shaft on each of the alignment options in the Southern part, but that information will likely not be ready yet in time for the next meeting. At a future meeting, DCA will also discuss the Geotechnical Boring Plan, scheduled to start this year and hopefully into next year, that will enable the SEC to more fully discuss RTM characteristics and its usability for the Southern Forebay embankment, dewatering, ground improvements, and the possibility of reducing or eliminating the need for pile driving at construction sites including the Intakes.

d. SEC Questions or Comments on April 22nd Presentation

Ms. Mallon opened up the discussion for questions on the previous presentation regarding southern facilities. This included the pumping station, the forebay, and the outlet structure.

Mr. Cox asked why improvements on Clifton Court weren't being included in this project. The answer in the Q & A packet wasn't an answer at all. The answers are not satisfactory. The damage being done at Clifton Court has been happening for years. Nothing has changed since 1995. This subject needs to be approached. This is the worst part of the Delta but if it's operating the same, fish will still be killed, and all the problems with the current project will be experienced. This is dodging the most critical part of the project. There wouldn't be a hotspot if there wasn't flow in Clifton Court, and even cutting back down limits the problem. The biggest concerns in this project are being dodged. Part of the Act that created this said to restore the habitats of the Delta.

Ms. Buckman said she looked into the Clifton Court Forebay issues and helped generate the Q and A packet response. There are two main issues with Clifton Court. There are concerns associated with the fish screens, but the fish screens are permitted under the ESA and the

permits include restrictions to make them work in a way that is satisfactory under ESA. Another issue is pre-screen loss from predation within Clifton Court Forebay, which is currently a subject of extensive study. DWR has a number of efforts to manage pre-screen losses and study additional ways to manage these losses.

Mr. Cox added that there wouldn't be a hot spot behind the screens if there wasn't the existing flow in Clifton Court. Even if there was cut back on usage, the same problems exist. The predation problem won't be solved by just moving fish around. Predators will always be there. Part of the law from the Act that created this said to restore the fisheries and habitats of the Delta. There has been no talk of habitat restoration when that was one of the reasons WaterFix was denied.

Ms. Mallon said it's not a part of this project at this point. Maybe Ms. Buckman can go offline with Mr. Cox and provide more information. However, this is not yet part of the engineering work.

Ms. Mann said she's waiting to hear what the benefits are for those who live near the Delta. She thanked Mr. Cox for bringing up fisherman concerns. She contacted part of her stakeholders which include people in business and government. 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 proximity of the shaft and tunnel; 600 ft from homes. Where this tunnel is planned, our only source for water is 400 ft away and our only waste treatment plant is on Hwy-4 which will be above the tunnel. The municipalities need to be aware.

Ms. Mallon said DCA discussed this with DWR, especially in regards to emergency response teams. The idea was to wait until the pandemic settled down to proceed with contacting municipalities. The DCA team has just begun to contact them; timing is the main issue there. DCA appreciates the comments on Byron Hwy. SEC members were asked to please send in all comments and DCA will take a look. It is DCA's job to reach out. Nothing is selected or confirmed at this point.

Ms. Buckman said in general, DWR is working to keep people informed and aware of work being completed as part of the CEQA process.

Ms. Martinez asked SEC members to please send input specific to this area to her or Nazli and Kathryn. DCA will move forward with setting up meetings.

Dr. Lytle said his review of the last SEC meeting's 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 can SEC members get the info on how that's being estimated?

Mr. Bradner said it is best to have the question submitted and DCA will provide a response back. The team will put the question on the matrix and make sure Mr. Bradner follows up with Dr. Lytle.

Ms. Swenson said on 4/22 she asked what the ongoing noise would be. Mr. Ryan answered noise should be minimal, but nothing can be minimal from 400-600 ft. Also, Suzanne Womack has been very active and is knowledgeable in that area. DWR should take a genuine swipe at discovering what personal toll will have on her and her family.

Ms. Mann said the domestic wells are close to the 150 ft down tunnel. What are you going to do about them?

Ms. Mallon said just for clarification in addressing Ms. Mann's earlier concern, the DCA team went back and checked; that shaft site is about 2,500 feet away from any residences. Where is the proposed tunnel path 600 feet away from residential? For the tunnel that is being bored 150 ft below ground, nothing should be felt or heard at the surface. The soil at that depth is pretty solid ground. Although DCA is still a little shy of data along tunnel alignment in regards to wells, that information is currently being acquired and will be part of the analysis.

Ms. Giacoma said given the issues with east Hwy-4, the proposed project should plan to build a safety center before Discovery Bay that includes more than tow trucks; ambulance and emergency personnel will be needed. The area is poorly served in this regard, so you will need safety to go along with this project.

Ms. Mallon said traffic on Byron and Hwy-4 can make emergency responses difficult. DCA will take all of it into consideration when the engineering plans are developed.

Mr. Cox asked about the tours of the fish screen manufacturing facilities.

Ms. Mallon said DCA can look into the logistics and feasibility of these tours with the facilities. Tours were put on hold for COVID, but perhaps that could be a place where everyone could stay pretty far apart. The team will follow up and if there's interest, DCA can make the necessary arrangements.

e. Proposed Alignment Tours and Map Book

Ms. Parvizi said that in the last meeting DCA mentioned doing tours of the site facilities as well as the goals for those tours: to provide visual and geographical context for current proposed facilities sites, to create a tour that can be utilized safely by the SEC and members of the public, and to provide options for tours to allow for convenience and equity in how information is accessed. Members have different expertise and questions asked wouldn't necessarily be answered on the tour so that they can be answered by the person with that expertise. The DCA proposed that they create a virtual tour using aerial photography with the engineers including narrations so that the SEC can go on a tour without leaving their homes. This allows use of graphics, maps, and other visual tools to allow for better understanding of proposed site. SEC can collect questions and ask them during the SEC meeting so that all information exchanges are shared and public. DCA will provide map books, which have been sent out already, and audio versions of the tour so that SEC members can go on self-directed tours at their leisure to physically view sites. All sites are proposed only and subject to change; it is easier to amend videos than to redo tours. This is proposed not only because of COVID but also because there are barriers to viewing some

sites. The DCA does not have permission to enter some sites since they are on privately owned land. The views of some sites are obscured physically by tress, etc. The ability to pull over safely and/or get out of the car is limited because roadways are too narrow or there is too much traffic on certain roads. Also, members would need to own a car and drive to access most sites, which is an equity issue. For safety reasons, it would be better to do the tour with two people (one driving while the other is actively engaged), and DCA cannot be sure that everyone has that capability.

Ms. Parvizi provided a virtual tour video example, explaining that there would be narrations over the video, and would include graphics and photographs. Combining this with Google streets would give a reliable overall experience. Again, there also is the map book with allows you to do a self-guided tour. A few DCA team members toured the Eastern Corridor, going site to site, which took about 6 or 7 hours, which explains why doing a group tour with multiple vehicles isn't feasible. The map books are online for those who didn't receive it, and will show you how everything is organized. Pay attention to cautions regarding privacy and safety issues. Reminder that DCA is not trying to tell you or take liability for what you choose to do, but make sure to read signage, especially when going on private property and regarding the safety notes.

Ms. Parvizi displayed a proposed drawing of how the map book will look. It is split up between the northern and southern sites and the Eastern and Central Alignments, which are the main two proposed corridor options. She showed an example of an Intake site aerial, which are noted to be the hardest places to stop. The yellow areas are the proposed construction sites. She asked if there were any questions regarding this proposal.

Ms. Keegan added that issues or concerns provide them with opportunities. The idea of a virtual tours provides the opportunity for people unfamiliar with the Delta to get a better understanding of the issues the SEC members have with the proposed project. She likes this approach and wants to know if there are any comments from the committee.

Mr. Cox asked about the progress of the tours regarding the fish screen manufacturing.

Ms. Mallon agreed that that was a good idea and that they would look into it, noting that it was pushed back due to COVID. Phil will follow up to make sure they're open and that that is a place that can handle social distancing. She asked Ms. Martinez to follow up and arrange something if SCE members are interested.

Mr. Wallace noted a mistake of the title of the river on map 13.

f. Public Comment on Agendized Items

Ms. Keegan asked Ms. Martinez if they received any public comments, noting members of the public have 3 minutes to speak.

Mr. Barness is with the Friends of Stone Lake Wildlife Refuge, which has been involved since the beginning of building the tunnel to now. The DCA has gone from strong commitment to the fish and the terrestrial wildlife values to an environmental commitment to not knowing what commitments are coming out of this process. There is an increased concern of the

impact on the wildlife refuge, particularly with the haul roads as they cut through from the north/south direction which bisects the refuge. The comments from Mr. Wirth, specifically regarding traffic and the impacts were noted. It's useful to not just look at Level of Service for haul roads and roads used for this project, but to also look at the distribution of truck traffic over an 8-12 hour day during the peak periods and levels of sustained traffic. He urges the consideration of trying to avoid a community impact vs a wildlife impact and discuss alternatives. Start alternatives to meld some river roads from truck traffic.

Ms. Meserve, Agencies of the North Delta, said the public shouldn't have to listen to a meeting for 3 hours and 15 minutes before given a chance a talk, understanding that stakeholders are more important but should still allow for some public comment throughout the meeting. It's a huge time commitment from the public and contradicts the statement that DCA welcomes public comment. The fish screen discussion is frustrating because the scope DCA asked the stakeholders to participate in doesn't include this but it's important. It's been required to improve the South Delta facilities that are going to be used since the CalFed ROD in 2006, and biological opinions in 2008, 2009 and 2019 require those improvements. It's disingenuous for the DWR and the DCA to say they're working on it. Those pumps are causing great harm in the Delta and is a driver for trying to have better pumps for somewhere else. You need to do something about the South Delta part of the system and shouldn't be delayed any longer when there are feasible things to do. The water contractors haven't wanted to spend time on this because they're focusing on getting better quality water from the Sacramento River but as long as the South Delta Intakes are considered for continuing use, they need to be improved. There are feasible means to do that. You need to be honest that you've had since 2006 to deal with this so you need to move forward on it and it has to be part of this package.

Ms. Martinez said that's all they have for agendized items and noted that no one wants to speak for non-agendized items which comes later in the agenda. Members of the public who wish to speak should send an email to Claudia Rodriguez.

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

There were no comments.

6. NON-AGENDIZED SEC QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

Ms. Keegan opened discussion for SEC members to provide information on outreach or questions and any other non-agendized items.

Mr. Hsia asked if anyone knows of the construction activities at the south part of Interstate 5 interchange and if it will make difficulties for this project in the future.

Ms. Swenson said it's being used as a staging area for the expansion they're doing on I-5 and will probably be there for a few years.

Ms. Tayaba said the tribes would like the presentations given to them. Where are the cultural resources reflected in all of the materials presented? The AB-52 meeting hasn't occurred yet and DWR hasn't had communications with them regarding concerns about the fish, the restoration,

and pollution. The maps presented during meetings contain important sites. Why aren't those being accounted for? The site locations must be known and yet are being overlooked. Tribes are awaiting alternatives to protect their sites and resources.

Ms. Buckman said that she has reached out to all of the tribes that have indicated that they want to consult on the project. DWR has met with all tribes to start consultation except for the tribes that asked to pause because of concerns about COVID. DWR continues to reach out and send updates to these tribes. They are sending frequent updates to tribes that have expressed interest and offered to speak offline about how to better communicate with tribes to get their input. Alternatives haven't been completed yet, but they will be shared once they are.

Ms. Martinez offered to continue to give the tribes zip drives with all of the files and information requested if that is helpful. DCA can also provide multiple printed copies of this information to ensure that there is constant communication.

Ms. Tayaba said that would be helpful. Before COVID-19, the DCA were looking into the fish screens and planned on participating in a tour. She asked if they have any information about the screens and how they have affected the fish as well as how any vibrations affect the fish.

Ms. Mallon offered to collect information on vibrations from general types of equipment since DCA has an idea of what equipment and trucks will be used. DCA cannot guarantee that the contractors will use the exact equipment.

Mr. Wirth said that he has continued to do outreach and has sent in comments by email to Ms. Mallon. The largest environmental impacts happen on lands that have been set aside for the protection of the environment. These lands should be completely avoided and suggests that they should return back to the Delta to get new aspects on what they can do to continue to protect these species.

Mr. Hsia asked how many more meetings are planned.

Ms. Mallon said that this is an ongoing process and would likely be monthly meetings for the next year. DCA plans to conduct these meetings regarding engineering through September; after that time, the SEC purpose and structure should be revisited.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS

Ms. Keegan opened public comment for non-agenda items.

Ms. Rodriguez said there are two comments from Deirdre Des Jardins and Osha Meserve.

Ms. Des Jardins said she sent a letter to the SEC and requested that everyone clarify with the DCA exactly which Delta stakeholder organizations they have agreements to represent. They have a legal memo. The DCA does not have the authority to appoint or remove representatives for classes of Delta stakeholders. This has been ongoing confusion. The application has a box that asks to be checked if you represent stakeholders, but there is confusion regarding continued use of the word "constituents." No one is represented unless there is an agreement with them directly to represent them. It is clear that plans have changed with liaisons; everyone had a plan

in their application with outreach, but it is obvious they have changed. We request that members clarify who they are able to liaison with because it is important as you are negotiating about mitigation for impacts on property and people. The SEC and DCA need to be clear. The SEC does not represent the entire Delta. It especially can't during a pandemic. A memo was sent to the members and the chair.

Ms. Rodriguez informed the group that Ms. Meserve dropped off the call.

8. NEXT MEETING

Ms. Martinez said the next meeting is anticipated to be June 24 at 3:00pm and DCA will be discussing the items Ms. Mallon presented earlier. At this time, the SEC should identify the sub-committee member(s) that will provide a report out at the next DCA Board meeting and asked Ms. Keegan to provide her perspective as a Board member on how that report-out was received.

Ms. Keegan thanked all SEC members who spoke. The DCA Board was very complimentary of the input received and expressed interest in continuing to hear from SEC members. The next group of SEC members are needed for the ad-hoc committee that will report to the Board at the June meeting.

Ms. Parvizi asked if SEC members wanted to email her if they were interested in participating; it can be 1-4 members.

Ms. Martinez said DCA has offered to assist with presentations, but the last group opted to give their own individual presentations. There are options about how to vary the report-out from the SEC.

Ms. Parvizi said that SEC members may not need or want help from the DCA staff, but help is available if it is desired, whether it is presentation materials or some other need. Any member interested should email nazliparvizi@dcdca.org; if more than 4 members volunteer, the additional members will be signed up for the next meeting.

Ms. Mallon asked if there were 4 volunteers who would like to sign up now.

Ms. Swenson volunteered to serve on the sub-committee for June. Mr. Gloski volunteered to serve on the sub-committee for July. Mr. Wirth volunteered to cover terrestrial species for the June meeting. Ms. Keegan asked the team to reach out to Mr. Cosio to ask if he would be willing to join the June sub-committee.

Mr. Gloski asked if there were one or two points to take away from the first SEC member report-out to the DCA Board. Did anything resonate? Was anything particularly helpful?

Ms. Keegan said one take-away was that the first presentation made evident that SEC members were kind of feeling their way and most of their comments included providing context for why they were serving on the SEC. Board members also received an overview of what has been discussed in SEC meetings. The first report-out seemed to almost serve as an introduction to the SEC process, although some specifics were shared. There was a sense that subsequent presentations would get more into substantive discussions rather than setting the stage.

Ms. Mallon said one big take-away was the whole idea of benefits to the Delta and a focus on that, which is what the team is going to begin formulating. It doesn't fall on deaf ears that a lot of the impact of the project is in the Delta, while many benefactors are outside the Delta. There was also an issue around the fact that this is an SEC of 20 members, yet the Delta is a very diverse place. Another takeaway was to do more outreach and help members more with their outreach. Once COVID starts to go down, it will be a focus to go out into the community to conduct outreach outside of the SEC.

Ms. Parvizi said that the desire is to give SEC members a voice in what happens in the meeting. The report-out gave helpful feedback into the process of the actual meetings, which is not something there is usually time to reflect upon during the meetings due to the need to cover such dense technical topics. The take-away was how to do better, be better, and make the exchanges more impactful.

Ms. Keegan said that SEC members that spoke seemed to say that the process could be better, which is something that could be articulated in the meeting to recap what worked well about the meeting and what could be improved. That type of feedback is important.

Mr. Gloski asked if the SEC members who attended could share their perspectives.

Mr. Nelson noted that this topic was not agendaized and advised adding it to a future meeting agenda for a more in-depth discussion in order to avoid a potential Brown Act issue.

Mr. Hsia asked for clarification on whether SEC members would be providing a report to the DCA Board monthly.

Ms. Parvizi clarified that the idea is for SEC members to provide a report-out about the SEC meetings on their own behalf in a similar way that she provides a report to the board of the monthly outreach activities undertaken by the DCA in general. It is up to the SEC members whether the report-out is provided by one person or up to four people. It is important to note that this report-out is not about talking to all the other SEC members, as that ventures into Brown Act issues. Rather, it's about working as an ad-hoc committee to develop a presentation to the board.

Ms. Martinez asked members to email Nazli if they wished to speak. The goal is to provide a report-out to the DCA Board about the last meeting in a public setting that is in the words of SEC members and not coming through the filter of the DCA team.

Ms. Keegan thanked SEC members for their patience and participation.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Keegan adjourned the meeting at 6:44 pm.