BDCP June 29, 2011 Meeting Notes

ICF Presentation

Goals

1. Meet and manage the schedule
2. Tell a more effective story
3. Quantify models as appropriate
4. Improve habitat restoration analysis (something about DRERIP model)
5. Highlight reducing entrainment
6. Present conclusions by type of water year (dry v. wet)
7. Present information on per day basis, e.g., daily exceedences of temperature
8. Organize analysis by consistent geographic zones

ICF Team

- David Zippin is the Program Manager with support from Chris Elliot and Greg Ellis
- Chris Earle, Ken Bogdan, Greg Roy are on the EIS/EIR team
- ICF Role is completing the aquatic effects analysis and analysis of alternatives for NEPA/CEQA
- HDR will have some role that is to be determined
- ICF is reviewing the effects analysis and a 4/28/11 memo on findings and recommendations
- ICF goal is to integrate all technical work done so far (effects analysis into the EIR/EIS, NEPA work into permits).

Effects Analysis – 9 appendices

- Flow, salinity, and passage – effects associated with changes in flow.
- Water Quality – includes temperature, total dissolved solids, turbidity, metals, pesticides; trying to present daily data. Appendix predicted to be ready for review by end of November 2011.
- Ecological – non-species specific, predatory, food supply, SAV
- Fish population – consolidate effects in previous sections to evaluate overall effects of BDECP actions on species populations using life history models and quantifying a score for proposed actions.
- October through February chapters/appendices will be submitted to federal and state partners to review.

David Nawi Qs

- BDCP driven by BOR and DWR; EA is driven by four lead agencies; how will direction and review b e provided? Who will call the shots?
    - Dale HF – DWR can speak for the contractors
    - Nawi – that isn't acceptable to the four lead agencies
    - ICF & Dale HF – plan up until ~ 6 weeks ago was to have single plan/proposal go through

ED_000733_DD_NSF_00080254-00001

the effects analysis.
    - Now 9 or 10 different alternatives will go through the effects analysis
        - 6 proposed in December
        - Variation on intake locations
        - 3K CFS/CCWD/PCL alternative
        - SWRCB ~ 9K CFS w/ Delta Outflow up to 1.5 MAF
    - All will be evaluated through hydro modeling CALSIM & DSMII (must meet minimum water supply (what is this?)), go through water quality modeling, temperature, turbidity, etc.. before being identified as alternatives.
    - P.Idlof called this the "feasibility" level of analysis.
- Can you integrate CWA 404 analysis?
    - ICF – Schedule proposed by ICF does not consider cooperating agency needs.
    - CWA 404 can be included -- ICF has experience in the CWA Section 404 program, preparing alternatives analysis, sequencing, etc…
    - Need to evaluate operations impacts from the alternatives to identify LEDPA.
    - Robershotte confirms need for CWA 404, says will be a challenge, and happy to hear ICF can do it.
    - Foresman, ditto, reminds ICF that project-level specific information is needed, like a CWA delineation and LEDPA identification.

Mike Tucker, NMFS

- We need to actually understand the take that is going to occur
- Need to evaluate take and conservation measures that minimize take
- NMFS has not yet seen that level of analysis/information so far
- Where will that info be in this document
- ICF – David Zippin – says information will be in chapters and appendices.
- Mike T wants to see X amount of take during Y years and a list of conservation measures with their connection to limiting take.
- Will need to discuss actual construction of projects, pile driving, etc…

Scott Cantrell -- DFG

- wants a more detailed list of covered activities
- Plan and prep for monitoring
- Talk with IEP and other monitoring programs
- Articulate monitoring metrics & identify biological outcomes
- How will they inform adaptive management decisions

Patti Idlof – BOR

- We need to discuss mitigation. SAIC always discouraged that discussion saying the project is 'self mitigating'.

ED_000733_DD_NSF_00080254-00002

- AQ is a major issue. Cannot/does not meet AQ conformity, lots of diesel construction equipment.

Lenny – BOR

- We can add value to the conservation measures. There were about 30
- Need to provide descriptions of monitoring for each conservation measure

ED_000733_DD_NSF_00080254-00003