

DELTA LTMS MULTIPLE TECHNICAL WORK GROUP MEETING

Department of Water Resources
1416 9th Street, Room 435
Sacramento, CA

Tuesday, December 2, 2008

9:00 am - 2:00 pm

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Attendees

Tom Scheeler – Port of Sacramento
Cal Fong – Representing Port of Stockton
Bill Brostoff – USACE SPN
Christine Boudreau – DCS
Phil Giovannini – CV Regional Water Board
Brian Ross – EPA
Cory Koger – USACE SPK
Kate Dadey – USACE SPK
Darryl Foreman – Land Planning + Entitlements
Gilbert Cosio-MBK Engineers
Steven Michelson – Environmental Risk Services
Ellen Johnck – Bay Planning Coalition
Nancy Ferris – USACE SPN

Craig Conner – USACE SPK
Bill Darsie – Kjeldsen, Sinnock, & Neudeck
Jack Malone – Anchor Environmental
Dan Fua – CV Flood Protection Board
Gilbert Labrie – DCC Engineering
Al Paniccia – USACE SPN
Neil Hedgecock – USACE SPN
Amy Simpson – DWR
George Nichol – ASCE Copri
Wayne Smith – USACE SPK
Doug Lipton – Lipton Environmental
John Headlee – concerned citizen

INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

- The next TWG meeting was scheduled for **Friday, January 30** and will be a joint Protocols, Alternatives, and Permitting TWG meeting from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m.
- The meeting location will be determined, but the preference will be for the CalEPA building. Because of greater availability, the meeting is likely to be held at the DWR building again.

- The Management Committee meeting is to be scheduled for late March (weeks of March 16 and 23 subject to Management Committee member availability).
- Potential Management Committee meeting agenda items include:
 - JPA-AI to forward JPA to Management Committee
 - DDRMT status-Kate to pursue charter revisions
 - General Order status-Phil continues to push draft maintenance dredging GO
 - Status of DWSC projects and their relationship to the LTMS
 - LTMS budget status
 - Delta Islands and Levee Stability

NMFS PARTICIPATION IN DELTA LTMS

- Bill explained that Dick Butler from NMFS will be participating in LTMS meetings in the future. Bill is still working to get USFWS to actively participate in the LTMS. Al and Bill explained that CDFG staff have participated infrequently in the past but they will certainly be involved in the DWSC projects more actively as they move forward.
- Brian suggested that perhaps Dick should be included as a member of the LTMS Management Committee rather than as part of a TWG. Dick participates in the SF Bay LTMS at the Management level.

PORT OF SACRAMENTO CHANGE IN NAME

- Tom explained that changes in the Port Commission membership resulted in the proposed change of the name to the Port of West Sacramento. For now it will continue to be called the Port of Sacramento.

FUNDING FOR FY09

- Al stated that the USACE is still under CRA and there have been no changes in status since last meeting. They have been told to expect CRAs for at least the first six months of FY09.
- Brian asked for clarification that the USACE and contractors are still funded to work on the Delta LTMS through the spring. Al confirmed that was the case through carryover funds.

- Brian asked whether the funding of the DWSC projects might come to a halt in the spring.
 - Neil stated that Stockton DWSC is not in the President's budget. The Senate proposed \$1 million and the House proposed \$1.8 million. They are operating on CRA through at least February 28, 2009 (received approximately \$200,000 so far).
 - Sacramento DWSC funded for all that they requested according to Craig and Tom, through FY09.
- Brian asked whether DWSC funds could be used to pay for Delta LTMS work if LTMS funding ran out. Al, Bill, and Craig stated that DWSC funds might be used for staff time directly related to the DWSC projects and other LTMS members could continue to participate as the LTMS is clearly related to the DWSC projects.

SACRAMENTO/STOCKTON SALINITY MODELING WORKSHOP

- Bill stated that the workshop will be held in the USACE S.F. District office December 3, 2008. He added that the goal of the workshop is to confirm the model that will be used to predict salinity changes and solicit agency feedback on the model as well as their concerns. Agencies and stakeholders were invited to the workshop.
- Craig elaborated that they want to use a 3D model that has been used Delta-wide previously and the USACE wants stakeholder input to address concerns proactively and engage resource agencies in advance. The USACE has contacted technical modeling staff from the resource agencies.
- Neil added that there will also be some discussion about water quality but the focus will be salinity.
- Bill stated that they expect preliminary data around April and a final report in June.
- Brian stated that he had heard concerns that other agencies might be using different models (RMA) and that communication, especially with DWR, should be maintained to ensure that modeling efforts are compatible among stakeholders
- Bill confirmed that Craig is the appropriate POC for the salinity workshop.

DELTA ISLANDS AND LEVEES FEASIBILITY MEETING

- Bill explained that Russ Rote has been running a meeting in the Sacramento District with DWR on the Delta Islands and Levees Feasibility Study. It was a presentation

of all of the activities that the USACE and DWR are doing in the Delta. Bill presented the Delta LTMS project to the group.

- They are planning to have an open kickoff meeting next month. (The initial meeting only involved the USACE and DWR.)
- Tom asked to be notified of the next meeting so that the Port can participate.
- Brian asked Bill and Al to provide detailed notes from the meeting to the LTMS group and asked how it is coordinated with Delta Vision. Bill suggested that Russ Rote should be invited to an LTMS meeting to brief the group.
- There was general discussion about the need to communicate with Russ's group, especially with regard to dredged material reuse. Craig and Neil confirmed that the DWSC project folks have been engaged in the Delta Islands and Levees initiatives.

ACTION ITEMS

- Anchor will prepare meeting request for Al to submit to the Management Committee.
- Anchor will invite Russ Rote to attend the next LTMS meeting and will coordinate with Bill and Al to obtain the notes from Russ to post on the LTMS website.
- Anchor will update the LTMS email list to include Dick Butler, Neil Hedgecock, and Craig Conner.

PROTOCOLS WORK GROUP ITEMS

PEAT CAPPING PROJECT UPDATE

- Brian asked for an update on the status of discussions with Walter regarding the proposed peat capping project.
- Tom replied that he had met with Bob Yeadon, Steve M., and Amy S. regarding implementation of the overall vision of how to move dredged material around the Delta for reuse. Tom expressed concern with the practicality of actually implementing it because they have had difficulty with getting approval for such work in the past.
- Tom would like to send a letter to multiple Reclamation Districts to suggest proactive testing of potential placements sites in the vicinity of the DWSCs to help facilitate RWQCB approval of reuse of dredged material. Tom is concerned that

Phil's vision for the GO and its implementation might meet resistance from the RWQCB management.

- Brian clarified his understanding that Phil's vision is to perform several large (similar to Roberts Island in size) projects to establish baseline information to be used for specific projects for which NOIs would then be prepared.
- Tom stated that he thinks the Port of Stockton is skeptical of that approach and both Ports would like to assist Phil and Victor in pushing the GO concept at higher levels.
- Brian stated that Phil has repeatedly requested that the USACE, Port, and DWR develop a draft NOI to submit to the RWQCB. Tom said that they had not met to pursue NOI development yet.
- Steve M. explained that the NOI would be drafted within the framework of existing GOs and that the Port of Stockton has tried this approach but the RWQCB has required background information on the proposed placement site even though they acknowledge that the NOI itself is acceptable, specific, and the dredged material itself has been characterized.
- Brian reiterated that he thinks that the RWQCB feels that the ball is still in the Port's court to start the discussion by drafting an NOI as a starting point. He further expressed the view that the meeting and draft NOI need to proceed before the topic of the GO goes to the LTMS Management Committee.
- General discussion ensued about this strategy for addressing the GO/NOI issue. [Phil was not present during these discussions so the views of the RWQCB were not represented at the meeting.]
- Tom committed to set up a meeting with the RCDs in December and will invite the USACE. The Port of Stockton would be welcome to the meeting as well. The goal would be to have a draft NOI to submit to the RWQCB by January.
- Steve M. stated that he would like to pursue a policy in which background water resource and sediment data, once collected for a particular area, would facilitate use of a GO to authorize sediment placement throughout that area. The Reclamation Districts will usually be the end users of the sediment so they would be submitting the NOIs. In the short-term the Reclamation Districts might have to fund efforts to characterize existing conditions but the long-term benefits from cost-effective sediment reuse would make up for it.

- Steve M. pointed to 1.5 million CY of sediment reused at Rough and Ready Island through multiple NOIs. He explained that he had discussed the possibility of characterizing multiple sites throughout the Delta so that broad generalizations for large Delta regions could be made to help with GO development and implementation.
- Brian stated that this discussion ties in to the SQO data as well as other initiatives like the DWSC sediment sampling and Delta RMP, which would presumably help to characterize potential placement sites. Steve M. replied that the data would not necessarily be helpful because the RWQCB wants groundwater resource data from the placement sites rather than additional data from the dredge sites.
- Craig asked for clarification of the RWQCB's data needs with regard to placement sites and characterization of dredged material for placement. General discussion ensued that the RWQCB makes site-specific determinations about suitability for specific dredged material placement at specific sites.
- Doug L. suggested that obtaining background data from placement sites and engaging the RWQCB in decisions about analyses is important.

SACRAMENTO DWSC PROJECT UPDATE

- Craig stated that they will perform a recalculation of the maximum capacity of the existing sites and then subtract potential volume based on sensitive habitat limitations through discussions with the USFWS. After that exercise they will have a better estimate of the additional volume needed. Craig provided a map of proposed placement sites to Anchor and committed to coordinating with Anchor to provide more information.

SACRAMENTO DWSC SEDIMENT TESTING UPDATE

- Cory stated that Cal Test in Sacramento will be doing the methyl Hg analysis and that sediment sampling should start next week.
- Craig asked for confirmation that the holidays won't interfere with the sediment holding times and Cory replied that they would not.
- The current plan is to use the existing O&M placement sites. Craig thinks they will need an additional 1 million CY of placement volume.

- Cory stated that the geotechnical testing plan has been revised to focus on dredging equipment planning rather than for reuse planning (i.e. they are not testing for things like sheer strength and Atterberg limits).
- Doug L. asked whether the appropriate sediment testing is being done to accommodate reuse. Tom and Cory stated that it was.
- Brian asked whether the sediment data would be placed on the LTMS website. Cory and Bill said that decision hasn't been made but that they would include a data summary with their NOI. Brian expressed the desire to include the sediment data on the LTMS website.
- Christine asked Cory whether the data will be compatible with Peggy's database and Cory confirmed that it will.
- Dan asked Tom and Craig about the status of the environmental and design documents. Craig responded that the target date for the public release of the draft EIS is late 2009.

STOCKTON DWSC PROJECT UPDATE

- Neil provided a brief description of the project. They are currently trying to identify additional disposal locations because the existing O&M sites are not sufficient. The total dredging volume is expected to be approximately 31 million CY (13 MCY under SF Bay LTMS jurisdiction and 18 MCY within the Delta LTMS jurisdiction). They are interested in working with the LTMS to identify beneficial reuse alternatives like levee repair and especially habitat restoration. Neil expressed interest in understanding the actual level of need for dredged material in the Delta.
- Neil said that the Draft EIS is expected at the end of calendar year 2009 but that schedule will likely be slipping. Their goal for the SAP (approval and testing) is calendar year 2009 if funded fully. They need to perform significant geotechnical design work because of concerns about adjacent levee stability after channel deepening.
- Neil said that they have a preliminary list of potential disposal sites, some of which have expansion potential.
- Doug L. asked whether Montezuma is on their potential list and Neil explained that it is. It was pointed out that the Montezuma site is technically within the SF Bay LTMS region.

ACTION ITEMS

- Anchor will contact Craig to coordinate addition of sediment placement site information and locations on the existing draft maps and tables.
- Anchor will ensure that the DWSC projects will remain standing items on TWG agendas and will ensure that Craig and Neil are included on the LTMS distribution list.
- Tom will set up a meeting with stakeholders including the USACE, RCDs, and DWR to initiate production of a draft NOI for submittal to the RWQCB in January, 2009.

ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT WORK GROUP ITEMS

MULTIAGENCY MEETING TO IDENTIFY REUSE OPPORTUNITIES

- Tom discussed this topic in the previous portion of the meeting.

UPDATED TABLE OF REGIONAL DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT SITES

- Jack presented the updated Dredged Material Placement Site table and solicited feedback on the structure of the table, additional information that would be useful to add, and a request for information about specific placement sites from the group.
- Brian suggested several additional types of data to add to the table and refinements of the existing data types.
- Phil and Brian conferred regarding including regulatory/approval issues related to WDRs and CEQA.
- Phil suggested documenting available capacity for DWSC projects and strategic planning for potential new placement sites if needed.
- Brian suggested adding a column denoting whether sites are proposed for use in DWSC projects.
- Doug L. suggested that the SF Bay LTMS might have useful template documents for summarizing placement site information. He expressed surprise that more information in a central repository for the LTMS doesn't exist. Christine explained that the table and accompanying placement maps really are the first attempt in the Delta to consolidate placement site information.

- Brian emphasized that we are trying to gather initial data to identify the sites and develop site information.
- Kate stated that there might be a new USACE employee who could chair the Alternatives Group.

DRAFT MAPS OF REGIONAL DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT SITES

- Jack provided a brief description of the revised map and requested that the group review the map and provide feedback about the placement sites. A PDF version of the map will be distributed with the revised draft placement site table.

ACTION ITEMS

- Anchor will contact individual LTMS members to collect information about placement sites that have been identified for the DWSC projects as well as any others.
- Anchor will send out the revised table to the LTMS group for comments due by mid-January for discussion at the January 30 TWG meeting. A PDF version of the placement site map will be sent out to the group along with the table.
- The USACE will identify the proposed placement sites for the DWSC projects and communicate them to Anchor for inclusion in the map and table.

PERMITTING WORK GROUP ITEMS

UPDATE ON STATUS OF DRAFT GENERAL ORDERS

- Phil stated that he submitted the draft GO for maintenance dredging to Victor. Victor will finish his review and then send it up to his supervisor's review and then have the draft GO available for review and discussion at the January TWG meeting.

STATUS OF JPA

- Jack explained that the revised form and transmittal letter to the Management Committee have just been transmitted to AI, or will be imminently, for submittal to the Management Committee.
- Kate clarified that they are waiting to develop the JPA instruction sheet until after the JPA itself has undergone review by agency staff.

- Brian asked for clarification of what we the Management Committee will be asked to do with the JPA. Al and Kate explained that they were envisioning a “soft deadline” for agency management to review the JPA, but the transmittal letter currently does not explicitly state that the March Management Committee deadline.

STATUS OF DDRMT FORMATION

- Jack briefly explained that it was his understanding that the DDRMT formation process was on hold pending development of the RWQCB dredging GOs to determine whether formation of the DDRMT is still something that should be pursued.
- Bill stated that the DDRMT or something like it should be a part of the LTMS process and that the DDRMT charter language needs subtle changes to enable the signatory agencies to agree to it.
- Phil suggested that RWQCB would not have time to revisit the DDRMT charter before the January TWG meeting and that they would focus their efforts on the GO. Once the GO is completed they might be able to consider the DDMRT charter.
- Al asked the group whether everyone still wants to form the DDRMT even if the GOs are developed and work successfully.
- General discussion ensued in which multiple people expressed the view that such a DMMO-like body would be useful because resource agencies like USFWS could be brought to the table and it could potentially provide a framework for streamlining project approval.
- Kate stated that there appeared to be general consensus that such a group would be useful. She reviewed the proposed group membership, which could consist of regulatory and resource agencies and stated that it would be an ad hoc group.
- Bill stated that it was his understanding that the primary points of contention in the DDRMT charter were RWQCB comments and concerns.
- Tom expressed concern that the DDRMT not become an additional layer of bureaucracy instead of a streamlining process.

STATUS OF PROPOSED DRAFT NOI DEVELOPMENT MEETING

- This topic was discussed earlier in the meeting with an action item that Tom will organize the meeting.

- There was general discussion regarding the GO or WDR/NOI/NOA process. Phil explained that the intent is to streamline the reuse approval process by developing a broad NOI that would be used for a range of sediment instead of employing multiple NOIs. The GO itself would state the general conditions of reuse.

ACTION ITEMS

- Kate will address the comments and revisions to the DDRMT charter with the goal of completing it in time for the January TWG meeting.
- Phil will continue to pursue development of the draft maintenance dredging GO with the goal of presenting it at the January meeting.