

**Meeting Notes**  
**North Delta Agency Team**  
**February 5, 2002**

The following provides a summary of the North Delta Agency Team Meeting held on February 5, 2002. The group agreed to meet again on **April 2, 9:30 - 11:30**, at the Resources Building, Room 133.

Attendees:

Kerry Wicker - DFG	Chuck Vogelsang - CALFED
April Zohn - J&S	Ken Trott - CDFA
Aimee Dour-Smith - J&S	Shelby McCoy - RWQCB
Rob Cooke - CALFED	Collette Zemitis - DWR
Travis Hemmen - J&S	Jim Starr - DFG
Jeff Stuart - NMFS	Evelyne Gulli - SLC
Rosalie del Rosario - NMFS	Chris Kimball - DWR
Patricia Fernandez - CALFED	Ryan Olah - USFWS
Gwen Knittweis - DWR	Scott Cantrell - DFG
Mike Coleman - CALFED	

Members Invited but not Present:

Frank Wernette - DFG	Dennis O'Bryant - DOC
John Thomson - USFWS	Paul Bowers - USACE
Mike Aceituno - NMFS	Tony Frisbee - CALFED
Diane Windham - NMFS	Terry Mills - CALFED
Pete Rabbon - DWR/Rec Board	Steve Shaffer - CDFA
Dennis Majors - CALFED	Rod Johnson - CALFED
Bellory Fong - CALFED	Craig Stevens - J&S
Ron Ott - CALFED	Matthew Reischman - CVRWQCB
Margit Aramburu - DPC	Carl Werder - USBR
Marina Brand - DFG	Jeannie Blakeslee - DOC
Mike Finan - USACE	Mike Jewel - USACE

Notes:

- Aimee Dour-Smith provided the group with a project update. A map of the Regional Hydraulic Modeling was provided for an illustration of the project area and stream reaches covered by the model. The model will continue to be developed by MBK engineering. USACE's Comprehensive Study will provide inflow data for the Sacramento River and inflow at Georgiana Slough. Other inflow data will also be used as upstream boundary conditions for the model. The model will be calibrated to both the 1986 and 1997 flood events.
- We have prepared a "frequently asked questions" (FAQ) list for the Regional Hydraulic Modeling effort (See handout). This list includes issues, criticisms, and questions posed during previous hydraulic modeling efforts. For example, in a previous flood model, flow around Dead Horse Island was modeled as one channel instead of the two separate flows diverting around the island. The FAQ list will be updated throughout the model development process.
- Jeff Stuart (referring to Question #15 of FAQ handout) asked how build-out conditions would be accounted for during the modeling. Aimee responded that the model would assume full build-out based on community general plans, and she did note that some stakeholders have questioned whether or not build-out plans will be followed. In response to this concern, members of these communities have been invited to participate in the hydraulic modeling team.

- Jim Starr asked how the model would account for operation of the Delta Cross Channel (DCC). Specifically, if the operation of the DCC would change due to implementation of the proposed project improvements. Aimee commented that the DCC is generally triggered by the flows of the Sacramento River; however, it will be necessary to evaluate how the North Delta Improvements project could affect operation of the DCC. Operation of the DCC or possibly changes in DCC operations will ultimately be a policy decision.
- A scientific peer review of the modeling effort will be performed in the spring. Scott Cantrell asked if the Science Program will be involved in the review of the model. Gwen Knittweis explained that the Science Program does not necessarily provide peer review but will guide programs through receiving adequate peer review for specific projects. This review panel will analyze the science behind the model. Scott inquired whether NDIP alternatives would be reviewed by a Science panel. A decision on how or when to have Science review of the alternatives has not been made yet. The review in the spring is strictly for the hydraulic model.
- The Hydraulic Modeling Coordination Team will be meeting on March 13.
- Mike Coleman provided an update on the Ecosystem Restoration Program (ERP) Steering Committee. The Steering Committee has met twice in January. During a January Steering Committee meeting, a question was raised on whether or not the North Delta Improvements Project (NDIP) should be required to implement ERP actions. The NDIP is a flood control project developed to achieve ecological benefits. Chuck Vogelsang stated that it should not really matter which CALFED agency carries the ERP actions through the EIR/EIS process, and that the North Delta Project would be a good opportunity to help advance those ERP objectives. Aimee Dour-Smith also commented this is a funding and timing issue for CALFED. The Steering Committee will be working with Dan Castleberry to resolve this policy question.
- Aimee Dour-Smith reported that the Federal Lead agency for the project is still undecided. Members of the group were provided an organization and decision-making flow chart (see handout) that illustrates the overall structure of the North Delta Program and depicts how decisions are made for the project. Gwen Knittweis explained that the USACE Regulatory Branch has been targeted as the federal lead, but funding for the EIR/EIS is being contracted through the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). Therefore, BOR may be in contention as federal lead of the project. BOR and USACE are trying to determine their respective roles on the project. Scott Cantrell added that the Science Program should be included on the flow chart.
- Aimee Dour-Smith presented the revised permit flow chart (see handout). Comments were provided on this version and Jones & Stokes agreed to make the appropriate changes and finalize the table. Jim Starr asked if the Action Specific Implementation Plan (ASIP) for the project is required to have a public review period. It was assumed that the ASIP would have public review concurrent with the Draft EIR/EIS, but whether or not it is required has not been determined. Jones & Stokes will research the questions about ASIP public review and report its finding at the next meeting. Scott Cantrell asked if Jones & Stokes had completed the ASIP handbook. Aimee Dour-Smith will follow-up on the status of the handbook. Chuck Vogelsang recommended that a subgroup of the NDAT, consisting of the fish and wildlife agencies, begin work on the ASIP now with assistance from J&S staff (Pete Rawlings). Aimee will coordinate with the fish and wildlife agency representatives to meet to begin work on the ASIP.
- Aimee Dour-Smith reported that the first chapter of the EIR/EIS is nearing completion and will need review by members of the NDAT. Jim Starr requested that the DFG have 4 weeks to review chapters of the document. Chuck Vogelsang suggested that the EIR/EIS document have standardized tables for edits to organize the edits; this method was used on the CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR. Chuck will forward an example to Aimee.

**Action Items:**

1. Jones & Stokes will email a copy of the Purpose & Needs statement to NDAT members (per Jim Starr's request)
2. Jones & Stokes will revise the permit timeline chart and provide for NDAT review at the next meeting
3. Gwen Knittweis and Jones & Stokes will revise the organization and decision-making flow chart to include the Science Program, as appropriate

4. Jones & Stokes will research the public process of ASIPs
5. Jones & Stokes will check status of the ASIP handbook
6. Jones & Stokes will coordinate with fish and wildlife agency representatives to begin work on the ASIP.
7. Chuck Vogelsang will provide Jones & Stokes a template for EIR/EIS standardized comment tables.

**Next meeting:**

- Provide comments on first chapter of the EIR/EIS
- Review revised permit timeline chart
- Discuss lead agency
- Update on ASIP process and progress
- Update on relationship between NDIP and ERP Delta Implementation Plan