

Report from the
Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group

to the

Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force

**Addendum to the Stakeholder Coordination Group
Recommendations Report**

September 11, 2007



I. INTRODUCTION

On August 21, 2007 the Delta Vision Stakeholder Coordination Group submitted its Draft Recommendations Report to the Blue Ribbon Task Force. It contains a series of Guiding Principles, a framework for Action-Based Decision Making (especially for conveyance), principles for addressing environmental justice issues, a set of potential “Out-of-Delta” Actions, a summary of potential draft “Near-Term, Low-Regrets Actions” and a description of two potential visions for the future of the Delta following the guidance provided by the Governor’s Executive Order.

The report also contains a summary of the similarities and differences between the two visions. The similarities between the two visions are many. They contain similar views on land use, infrastructure and approaches to improve the ecological health of the Delta. The primary difference is that one vision builds around a water conveyance system that continues the current practice of water flowing through the Delta, whereas the second vision considers the potential long-term need for an isolated or peripheral conveyance system. They also differ around the potential for using Delta islands for in-Delta water storage and the extent to which some levees need to be strengthened.

This addendum builds on these initial visions, providing clarification on some elements of the visions as well as offering recommendations on additional issues related to these “visions.” This includes:

- A side-by-side comparison of similarities and differences between the two visions
- A list of 30-90 day actions that could serve as a transition between the visioning and strategic planning phases of Delta Vision
- A summary of initial SCG ideas about assurances, strategic planning and the concept of regional self-sufficiency (as directed by the Task Force)
- A summary of the Near-Term, Low-Regrets Actions considered by the SCG.

Many SCG members continue to express their desire to ensure that the “visions” emerging from their conversations are accurately portrayed. SCG members gravitated around two primary visions for the Delta as described above. They have articulated similarities and differences at a conceptual level. But some SCG members believe it is important to note that without the full blown analyses needed to assess these visions, and to explore possible alterations and revisions based on those analyses, the visions remain conceptual and an example of what should be considered in developing a vision for the future of the Delta.

II. SUMMARY OF SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VISIONS

The following chart reflects the work of the Stakeholder Coordination Group (SCG) at their September 4-5, 2007 meeting. The two emerging vision groups reviewed each of the elements of the other vision and suggested language that might allow for consensus. Where broad agreement between both groups exists, checkmarks appear in each column. Where there were differences an "X" is placed in the appropriate column for that group. Some of the continued differences were due to minor wordsmithing changes that were not acceptable to the other group for various reasons. Where the differences were more significant in nature, the elements have been explained below. It is certainly possible that with additional time and effort the areas of disagreement can be reduced further.

Despite the important difference of opinion between the two emerging visions with respect to the potential use of an isolated facility to accompany the Middle River Conveyance, the two emerging visions are primarily characterized by broad areas of similarity. Most fundamentally, both emerging visions represent a response to the uncertainty that pervades decision-making about the Delta. As already noted, SCG members collectively feel that critical information is currently lacking on numerous pivotal subjects, including the impact of particular conveyance strategies on the ecosystem and water quality for various parties, the ecosystem conditions necessary to recover threatened native species and many others.

There are some differences in the specifics of water export regimes between the two visions in addition to the potential isolated facility. Flexible Delta calls for the use of water storage islands to allow greater flexibility in the management of freshwater flows in the Delta for various purposes, such as local water supply, export water supply, ecosystem management, or salinity repulsion. Flexible Delta also calls for a return aqueduct from the California Aqueduct to the San Joaquin River to introduce higher quality export water into the San Joaquin slightly upstream of the Delta. This would improve environmental conditions in the river and enhance water quality for south Delta and central Delta irrigators. The Flexible Delta also calls for tying export levels to in-Delta hydrologic and water quality conditions. The Resilient Adaptive Delta vision makes no predetermination and leaves those specifics to the operational and regulatory requirements in place at any given time.

The SCG is nearly unanimous in its belief that there should not be substantial new urbanization in the primary zone, except perhaps in the Sacramento River legacy towns. These towns may be permitted to grow in ways consistent with their historic internal needs and with their economic and social sustainability. The Resilient Adaptive Delta vision also calls for prohibiting residential subdivisions in deep floodplains and potential floodways in the secondary zone. The groups differ in their willingness to approach re-designating the primary and secondary zones as a way to address land use issues in the strategic planning phase.

Additionally, the group approached protecting the Western Delta islands differently. Flexible Delta chose to be specific in its reference to the islands protected and feel that seismically stable and/or ring levees are appropriate. The Resilient Adaptive Delta group does not identify specific islands and would protect all of them with cross-levees if found to be most effective.

NOTE: A ✓ indicates that team has approved language for entire item as written. An X indicates team does not approve *italicized* language in that item.

A. Environment	Flex Delta	RAD
1. Restore floodplain along the main stem of the Sacramento River (upstream of the city of Sacramento) for the benefit of splittail and migrating salmonids, and to increase nutrient and organic carbon flows to Delta. Improve salmon spawning gravels in upstream reaches and tributaries of the rivers flowing into the Delta.	√	√
2. Enhance habitat along Old River and in west Delta with setback and vegetated levees. Explore appropriateness of setback levees on Sutter and Steamboat Sloughs.	√	√
3. Manage Yolo Bypass: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for the benefit of splittail and salmonids and other species, • to increase nutrient and organic carbon flows to Delta and • so flood conveyance capacity of the Yolo Bypass is maintained, • in a manner that does not negatively impact the water quality needs of the North Bay aqueduct. 	√	√
4. Enhance channel configuration and hydraulics of Elk Slough, Sutter Slough, and Steamboat Slough to provide alternative route for migratory fish that avoids Georgiana Slough and the Delta cross-channel.	√	√
5. Improve hydraulic residence time and tidal exchange between Cache Slough and the Delta to contribute organic carbon, nutrients, phytoplankton and zooplankton to the Delta, for the benefit of Delta smelt among others. Create a hydrologic and terrestrial connection between Cache Slough and Suisun Marsh.	√	√
6. Restore Mokelumne and Cosumnes River corridors. Enter into formal flood flow agreements with private landowners in the Stone Lakes area and other potential flood bypass areas. Explore opportunities to increase flood flow areas.	√	√
7. Implement the Suisun Marsh PEIR/EIS, which will call for some conversion of managed wetlands into tidal wetlands as habitat restoration in Suisun Marsh (currently a brackish water habitat). Restore tidal action in a portion of each region of the Marsh as follows, based upon Preferred Alternative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 500 to 2,250 acres in Region 1 • 460 to 2,070 acres in Region 2 • 860 to 3,870 acres in Region 3 • 180 to 810 acres in Region 4 The plan will also call for managed wetland enhancement (46,000 acres to 39,000 acres) including the development of a funded exterior levee maintenance program.	√	√
8. Restore tidal marsh on Decker Island and Dutch Slough.	√	√
9. Maintain existing managed wetlands and create new tidal wetland habitats.	√	√
10. Manage Bouldin Island and Holland Tract for habitat.	√	√
11. Create setback levees at opportune sites in west Delta and the lower Sacramento River to allow tidal marsh restoration.	√	√
12. Consider the feasibility of converting the west end of Sherman Island to managed marsh.	√	√
13. Purchase terrestrial habitat and wetlands easements from willing landowners.	√	√
14. Assist in the achievement of habitat acquisition, creation, and enhancement goals of Central Valley Joint Venture for seasonal wetlands, semi-permanent wetlands, riparian forests, and waterfowl-friendly agriculture.	√	√

15. Assist in the acquisition of water needed for seasonal and semi-permanent wetland habitat acquisition, creation, and enhancement under the Central Valley Joint Venture plan.	√	√
16. Develop a sequenced plan to prevent, control and eradicate undesirable non-native species.	√	√
17. Establish and track performance standards for all ecosystem programs and investments.	√	√
18. Enhance river channel habitat along the length of Old River.	√	√
19. <i>Explore habitat enhancement in numerous other channels, including Georgiana Slough and east side tributaries if dual conveyance strategy is built [the disagreement is about dual conveyance]</i>	X	√
20. <i>Manage flood bypasses for fish migration and rearing in low flows, and for flood attenuation in high flows. Maintain hydrologic connection between bypasses / floodplains and rivers during spring flows.</i>	√	√
21. <i>Explore creation of tidally influenced habitats on selected portions of Fabian Tract and Netherlands Tract. [the disagreement is that these Tracts represent prime agricultural land]</i>	X	√
22. Conduct flexible experimentation and adaptive management of Delta ecosystem, especially with respect to in-channel flow and salinity, with operable, channel gates	√	√
23. <i>Experiment with depths and forms of river channels to simulate natural conditions of aquatic habitat. [the disagreement is concern about the impacts on recreations]</i>	X	√
24. <i>Develop a sequenced plan for dealing with invasive species and fish problems without creating undue harm to other parts of the ecosystem.. [the difference is lack of clarity about what is meant by “ fish problems”]</i>	√	X
25. Create floodplain habitat on McCormack Williamson Tract, with proper mitigation for downstream impacts.	√	√
B. Land Use		
1. Concentrate tourism and recreation investments along Highways 160 and 12, in north Delta waterways, and in legacy towns. Permit legacy towns to grow at historic growth rates driven by internal, locally-driven needs to expand local economies.	√	√
2. In the westernmost islands, an assisted transition may be needed from irrigated agriculture to recreation, wildlife habitat, unirrigated agriculture or other land uses if salinity fluctuation impacts irrigated agriculture.	√	√
3. <i>Add buffers to protect activities in the primary zone wherever negative impacts are occurring. [the disagreement is about the utilization of buffers rather than other means for achieving similar outcomes.]</i>	√	X
3b. <i>Re-evaluate primary and secondary zone designations to permit growth in primary zone consistent with internally-defined historic needs of legacy towns, and to restrict urbanization in deep floodplains. [the disagreement centers around perceptions of the effectiveness of existing policies and practices and whether to open the door to changing these,]</i>	X	√
4. Provide incentives to landowners to willingly integrate agriculture, wildlife-related recreation and ecological enhancement on land throughout the Delta. Ensure this does not impact the reclamation district from assessing property.	√	√

5. Provide incentives to landowners to willingly manage land for multiple public benefits, including ecological enhancement. Ensure this does not impact the reclamation district from assessing property.	√	√
6. Create programs and research to provide incentives for farming that deals proactively with climate change and subsidence (e.g. carbon sequestration crops, rice, etc.).	√	√
7. Develop conservancy and/or use a land trust or easement approach to buy or protect agricultural and open space lands that are at risk of urban development in and around the periphery of the Delta, based on a willing buyer – willing seller concept which protects revenues.	√	√
C. Transportation, Utilities, and Infrastructure		
1. Rebuild Highways 12, 160 and 220 on top of levees designed to adequately protect targeted resources.	√	√
2. Protect critical infrastructure, including the water conveyance channel, and a South Delta infrastructure corridor (including Highway 4, the Mokelumne Aqueduct, and the BNSF Railroad) with levees designed to adequately protect targeted resources.	√	√
3. Protect Stockton and Sacramento ship channels and water conveyance channel with levees designed to adequately protect targeted resources. Promote the maximum use of beneficial dredge material.	√	√
4. Key electricity transmission lines and natural gas fields must be protected on Sherman and Brannan-Andrus Islands; repair other reaches on an as-needed basis.	√	√
5. <i>Improve and maintain Suisun levees to protect significant infrastructure in Suisun Marsh such as natural gas production, Southern Pacific Railroad tracks, petroleum pipelines, built structures and wildlife habitat. [the disagreement is primarily around language used to represent the concept.]</i>	√	X
6. Leverage investments in new highway construction (on levees designed to adequately protect targeted resources) with habitat and recreation benefits associated with setback levees. Road relocations should consider criteria for restoration and recreational opportunities.	√	√
7. Include a description for what constitutes an “adequately designed” levee, for example should the levee be: seismically stable, strong enough to protect life and property, a 100-200 year, an urban levee, etc., incorporating the concept that it does not always need to be the most protective.	√	√
D. Water Supply and Quality		
1. Ten-step plan for action-oriented decision making (see attached). <i>[the disagreement is about the content and timing of proceeding with this analysis]</i>	X	√
2. <i>Protect the existing island configuration but confine water conveyance to an armored channel along South Fork of Mokelumne and Middle River. [the disagreement is about the potential need for dual conveyance.]</i>	√	X

3. Partially segregate the water conveyance system and aquatic habitat with operable gates connecting Old and Middle Rivers, and siphon the Victoria Canal under Old River to deliver water to the Clifton Court Forebay.	√	√
4. Re-circulate some export water from California Aqueduct to San Joaquin River. <i>[disagreement exists about whether to do this or consider doing this.]</i>	√	X
4b. Consider re-circulating some export water from California Aqueduct to San Joaquin River. <i>[see comment on 4.]</i>	X	√
5. Link Delta export rates to hydrologic and water quality conditions. <i>[the difference is whether the vision focuses on this explicitly.]</i>	√	X
6. Assess whether water could be stored for release to the Middle River for in-Delta use and export, or to the Old River to augment flow and manage salinity and carbon levels. <i>[the difference is between whether and how.]</i>	X	√
6b. Assess how water could be stored for release to the Middle River for in-Delta use and export, or to the Old River to augment flow and manage salinity and carbon levels. <i>[see comment on 6.]</i>	√	X
7. Ensure that water delivered through Middle River conveyance channel to the pumps is of higher quality than today. <i>[the difference is whether to ensure or seek to ensure.]</i>	√	X
7b. Seek to ensure that water delivered through Middle River conveyance channel to the pumps is of higher quality than today. <i>[see comment on 7.]</i>	X	√
8. Explore water demand reductions that could reduce impact on Delta stressors.	√	√
9. Extend Contra Costa intakes to Middle River to avoid Old River.	√	√
E. Recreation, Tourism & Economic Dependence		
1. Enhance fishing, hunting and birdwatching by ecosystem changes described above.	√	√
2. Enhance opportunities for boating and other water sports.	√	√
3. Explore recreational trail development in eastern Delta transition zone between Delta and uplands	√	√
F. Flood Risk Management		
1. Protect Sherman, Twitchell, Brannan, Bradford, Webb, Jersey, and Bethel Islands with seismically stable levees. Explore whether they are best protected by a continuous ring levee or individual levees by conducting cost analysis and reviewing other considerations, such as boat access. <i>[disagreement stems from the need to focus on the islands named.]</i>	√	X
2. Reduce risk of failure of all critical islands to a reasonable level subject to DRMS further DRMS analysis and likelihood of seismic failure. Explore use of cross-levees to achieve this risk reduction by confining inundation in the event of exterior levee failure (with caution not to endanger existing residents), and to provide flexible management opportunities in different sub-sections of islands. <i>[disagreement stems from identification of islands and type of protection noted.]</i>	X	√

3. Explore dredging of Yolo Bypass and quarrying of Montezuma Hills as sources of fill material (delivered by slurry line) to rebuild key western Delta islands, particularly Sherman Island, to sea level over time.	√	√
4. Reuse all other dredged materials beneficially (e.g. for levee construction, island fill) whenever possible.	√	√
5. Explore the potential for floodways and additional groundwater and surface water storage to mitigate effects of global warming, including reduced snowpack.	√	√
6. Protect legacy towns with levees designed to adequately protect targeted resources.	√	√
7. Provide flood protection for Sacramento and West Sacramento with levees designed to adequately protect targeted resources.	√	√
8. Provide flood protection for Stockton/Lathrop area. with levees designed to adequately protect targeted resources.	√	√
9. Improve other levees to future 100-year flood protection as scientific knowledge of future hydrology emerges.	√	√
10. Protect Highway 84 Corridor with levees designed to adequately protect targeted resources.	√	√
11. Create seasonal floodplain on the lower San Joaquin River, including a flood bypass on Paradise Cut.	√	√
12. <i>Link south Delta flood bypass to tidally influenced habitat areas on Fabian Tract. Explore potential for additional flood bypass parallel to Sacramento ship channel. [disagreement exists based on the agricultural value of Fabian Tract.]</i>	X	√
13. Consider the feasibility of creating new flood bypasses south of Vernalis for San Joaquin River and in Stone Lakes region. Study water system and ecosystem management implications.	√	√
14. Continually maintain and improve agricultural levees to meet the drivers of change other than seismic.	√	√
15. Develop and implement a levee maintenance program for Suisun Marsh to support water quality, existing wetland values and functions and ecosystem restoration activities.	√	√
16. Maintain Sacramento and Stockton ship channel levees to protect channel use.	√	√
17. Explore infiltration of floodwaters upstream to reduce Delta flood risk and replenish C.V. groundwater aquifers.	√	√
G. Emergency Management		
1. Identify areas to store materials for emergency response (including temporary channel barriers) as soon as possible.	√	√
H. State and Local Economics (All are cross-listed from other sections)		

III. PROPOSED 30-90 DAY ACTIONS

As noted in the Introduction, the SCG believes several steps could be taken during the next 30-90 days to move the visions forward. In essence, they suggest a series of actions that could serve as a transition between the vision and strategic planning phases of Delta Vision. These recommended 30-90 day activities include:

1. Out-of-Delta Strategies: Floodplain Management. The following three activities should be initiated to continue progress on investigations of the value of improved floodplain management and strategies upstream of the Delta:

- Meet with Resources Agency Project Leaders of three key programs – Integrated Regional Water Management Planning, FloodSafe and the State Water Plan – to determine what knowledge and resources exist to help determine the potential for improved upstream flood management to benefit Delta flood issues, ecosystem health, water supply and water quality.
- Work with the Natural Heritage Institute and interested academic institutions to develop a work plan to evaluate the potential benefits from and issues associated with improved upstream floodplain management.
- Create an Advisory Group from among SCG members to help move these activities forward.

2. Ecosystem Health: Definition of a Sustainable Ecosystem. Most SCG members believe that until definitive targets are established for Delta ecosystem health little can be done to develop strategies to improve the Delta ecosystem. At least three questions need to be answered based on the best information available today: What does ecosystem sustainability mean today? What values are considered essential to health? What functions need to be restored?

SCG members are looking for the best answer available today to serve as the basis for further discussions and analysis which will be critical during the Strategic Planning phase of Delta Vision. The following immediate steps are recommended:

- Work with the Eco-Design team, representatives of the ERP and DRERIP, and any other experts considered necessary to provide an answer to the questions posed.
- Based on their response, develop a plan of action to evaluate the various operational considerations associated with conveyance through the Delta (as contained in the SCG Recommendations Report).
- Create an Advisory Group from among SCG members to help move this activity forward.

3. Integration of Environmental Justice Principles. The SCG believes that the Environmental Justice principles contained in its recommendations should serve as template to be applied to any vision that emerges from the Delta Vision process. This includes any near-term or low-regrets actions as well. The following steps are recommended:

- Identify a team of “experts” who can apply the template once a vision and/or near-term measures are agreed upon. This team should include individuals with expertise in planning, economics and public health at a minimum.
- Potentially use the existing emerging visions to test the environmental justice template.
- Create an Advisory Group from among SCG members to help move this initiative forward.

4. Reduce Constraints to Action. The SCG believes that many potential hurdles exist to making necessary short-term progress on activities germinating from the Delta Vision process. This includes implementation of potential near-term actions, implementation of the Action Based Decision-Making approach and testing of pilot projects, among others. SCG members acknowledge that many of these “hurdles” are intended to serve as an important component of the “checks and balances” necessary for good government. Under appropriate, transparent circumstances, however, it may be possible to improve communications and cooperation necessary to move projects forward more rapidly. To that end, the following should be considered to help reduce the constraints to action:

- Establish an “Executive Steering Committee” of top-level leadership from state and federal agencies responsible for permitting and oversight of activities in the Delta
- Executive or Legislative actions to reduce time constraints on permitting and contracting
- Given the dire state of fisheries in the Delta, employ emergency provisions that can help accelerate activities focused on improving the Delta ecosystem and fisheries
- Other?

5. Seek Opportunistic Ways to Leverage Existing Programs. The SCG believes that efforts to link with existing Delta programs may assist in achieving some of the immediate actions envisioned in its recommendations. For example, through the Delta Levees Program, there may be opportunities to achieve habitat restoration while at the same time meeting the goals of levee maintenance and improvement. These opportunities require further exploration. As such it is recommended an Advisory Group from SCG members, and other knowledgeable professionals and agency staff, be formed to develop a list of possible opportunities and a plan of action.

6. Evaluate Potential Use of Existing Bond Funds. The SCG recommends that appropriate State agency leadership consider immediately how existing bond funds from Prop 84, 1E and 1C could be earmarked for projects and goals associated with Delta Vision. This is highly time sensitive, but potentially provides an opportunity for an immediate infusion of funds needed to support Delta Vision investigations and outcomes.

7. Begin Focused Discussions on Outstanding Land Use Issues. Many SCG members believe a more detailed discussion of land use issues needs to be initiated, with particular emphasis on the effectiveness of current Delta policies concerning primary and secondary lands. Consensus does not exist on the focus of these discussions but the SCG did concur with the step of initiating discussions among those willing to do so. The recommendation is to identify those interested in focusing on the key land use issues and to provide the forum for initiating these discussions.

IV. SUMMARY OF ASSURANCES, STRATEGIC PLANNING AND REGIONAL SELF-SUFFICIENCY DISCUSSIONS

The Task Force asked the Stakeholder Coordination Group to begin a conversation on potential assurances, issues related to the strategic planning phase and regional self-sufficiency at its September 4-5, 2007 meeting. Although there are a number of issues envisioned for strategic planning phase that will need more detailed analysis, this section describes some initial thoughts on these topics. These are conceptual and initial and the SCG understands there will be more focus on this during the strategic planning phase.

A. Assurances Discussion

The SCG groups conducted an initial brainstorm of ideas that each group would want considered if either one or the other emerging vision elements were implemented. Both groups understand that a discussion regarding prioritization will need to occur.

Resilient Adaptive Delta Group

- If Flexible Delta is built, still convey water from Oroville and Shasta to San Joaquin Valley and Southern California
- There should be a commensurate level of analysis for all options.
- Water users don't pay for things that don't benefit water and ecosystem.
- Want commitment for the decision to be real. The group doesn't want to arrive at the decision moment and be told that status quo will continue. They also want the decision to be binding.
- Need pre-Judge Wanger decision on water supply to continue to reach all end users – source doesn't matter if quantity and quality the same.
- In-Delta farmers want assurance that the Delta will still be economically viable.
- All species important to the Delta ecosystem are considered, including migratory wildlife.
- Water operations aren't held responsible for species problems caused by factors other than water operations.
- Flexible Delta cannot give enough assurance.

Flexible Delta Group

- Improve survivability of out-migrating San Joaquin salmon and others such as steelhead trout/generally support California and Federal endangered species act.
- Safe yield export to support agriculture, recreation, ecosystem, wildlife, fish, etc.
- Respect and meet historical water rights, contracts, and water quality standards.
- Export pumping to be tied to hydrologic conditions with Delta ecosystem health the priority.
- Maintain water levels to federally authorized navigation depths.
- Increase storage capacity upstream for flood control and salinity management.
- All proposed channel barriers be operable/navigable.
- Protect and enhance recreation opportunities.

- Maintain and continue to fund levee and channel maintenance (especially if peripheral canal built).
- If peripheral canal built, maintain net tidal flow of water in the pool.
- If peripheral canal built, protect Delta water quality.

B. Identification of Key Strategic Planning Issues

In the September SCG meeting, some members engaged in a preliminary discussion of the key issues that should be addressed in the strategic planning phase of Delta Vision. Though there will be much more time to discuss these issues more thoroughly in 2008, what follows is some initial thinking on issues of importance for that phase of the process.

1. Develop performance measures for all key Delta functions and services, especially the environment. Objective assessments of progress on key management objectives like water quality improvements and species recoveries require agreement on relevant performance measures before program activities begin.
2. Ensure that conveyance options have a fair chance to prove their benefits before final evaluation occurs. The Action-Based Decision Making approach relies on fair evaluation of different conveyance options. As Middle River conveyance is implemented in stages, it is essential that its full potential costs and benefits not be dismissed before all parts of it have been constructed.
3. A “beneficiary pays” principle is generally desirable, but different finance mechanisms will likely be appropriate for different types of investments. For example, bonds may be more suitable for projects that provide broad public benefits (like habitat restorations), whereas water conveyance facilities may best be financed directly by their users, either pre- or post-construction. Some SCG members believe that if beneficiaries pay, they should also have some measure of control over construction and operation of any new projects.
4. Coordination with the federal government is essential. Not only does the federal government operate the Central Valley Project, but its regulatory authority affects nearly all essential Delta functions and services. Some SCG members feel that Delta Vision implementation might benefit from being merged with a permit-acquisition process such as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.
5. Ensure that all easement, flood bypass, and open space acquisitions have good ongoing management and maintenance programs. Experience has shown that open space and easement acquisition programs can fail to achieve intended benefits – and even become liabilities – if attention isn’t paid to proper management of the land.
6. Consider allowing project contractors to create a Joint Powers Authority to construct any new conveyance facility. Also consider allowing non-governmental organizations (such as land trusts) to execute habitat acquisition and restoration projects. In each case, non-state agencies and organizations have considerable expertise and management experience that may be effective in achieving Delta Vision goals.

7. Strengthen oversight of water delivery under contract agreements. Some SCG members feel that, whatever conveyance arrangements are ultimately made, there must still be a greater effort to ensure reliable delivery of water under agreed-upon contract terms.

8. An effective governance structure is essential. In particular, any governance structure or entity must have the authority to implement a vision for the Delta to avoid the fate of CalFed (in which all parties could stop something, but no one party could make anything specific happen). Some preliminary ideas include:

- A Delta “tsar” who oversees and coordinates all state agency activities related to the Delta.
- A small, high-level entity (perhaps a single person), which directly advises the Governor on Delta issues. The Governor then acts as Delta “tsar” and directs existing institutions to carry out needed actions. This structure avoids having the advisory entity constantly embroiled in lawsuits.
- Don’t make a major change in existing structure; just give clear direction and reliable, dedicated funding to agencies to carry out Delta Vision.

As directed by the Blue Ribbon Task Force, discussions within the SCG on strategic planning aspects of Delta Vision will continue throughout 2008.

C. Regional Self-Sufficiency Discussion

The Stakeholder Coordination Group began a discussion about the concept of regional self-sufficiency and what impact it may have in the strategic planning process. Initially the two emerging vision groups, Flexible Delta and Resilient Adaptive Delta met separately to discuss the topic. Then the larger group reviewed some of the initial thoughts and agreed this issue needs further discussion.

Here are some preliminary thoughts on this topic:

Resilient Adaptive Delta group:

- Urban California has been regionally self-sufficient for 25 years in the sense that all new demand has been met without Delta water.
- Agriculture will have a difficult time achieving this goal. Urban customers may be able to afford higher water prices, but many farmers can't.
- In addition, it's about more than just the farmers. In areas that are agriculture-dependent, there could be major secondary economic ripple effects to higher water prices and potential lost productivity, including lost jobs.
- Groundwater recharge may be one way to get more regional self-sufficiency for agriculture, but it is energy-intensive. Also, water quality management is tough since water has to be conveyed to infiltration sites – these are all hard problems to solve.

Flexible Delta group:

- Regional self-sufficiency as a concept is a good one and conservation and incentives should be explored statewide.
- However, for communities that are truly unable to sustain themselves without help, efforts need to be made to support them. Also, plans should be in place to support areas after potential disasters.
- In general, no more water can be taken from the Delta so self-sufficiency needs to be part of any future planning process. The concept of developing water outside the Delta needs to be explored further.

V. NEAR-TERM ACTIONS CHART

The Stakeholder Coordination Group (SCG) considered immediate near term, low regrets actions that could be taken prior to completing a Delta Vision Strategic Plan. A variety of measures were proposed and a survey was conducted to discern initial support and priorities for these measures. Of the thirty-six measures proposed, nineteen measures already appear in the two emerging visions being prepared by the group.

SCG members were invited to participate in an online survey between July 27 and August 7, 2007. Respondents were asked to mark their level support for the 36 proposed potential actions as:

1. Support,
2. Potentially Support, or
3. Do Not Support.

Members were then asked to comment on their reasons of potential support or lack of support for each measure. It should be noted that each measure was at a different level of development when initially presented in the survey and further development is expected.

Table 1 is the results of this survey showing the six actions that had the most support, (in order - actions 14, 13, 8, 32, 3 and 2) as well as the actions that had more than 60% “support” with little opposition. (In order - actions 36, 6, 7, 23, 26, 31, 4, 11, 21.)

There were nine actions that had 5 or more stakeholders responding with “do not support” (Actions 12, 33, 20, 22, 28, 30, 25, 17 and 24) and these were not included in the table below, but are listed in Appendix A containing the full list of actions and comments received for each one.

Although there is wide agreement on many actions, stakeholders suggest more detailed analysis be completed for each action that includes project objectives, project design details and financial analysis, among other things, before any could be implemented.

TABLE 1:

Action #	Description (shortened)	Response					
		Support		Potentially Support		Do Not Support	

Most Supportive Actions:

Action 14	Prepare emergency plans to deal with threats to lives and property in the Delta as well as critical local, regional and statewide infrastructure.	26	93%	2	7%	0	0%
Action 13	Implement a basic emergency response program in the Delta	25	89%	3	11%	0	0%
Action 8	Increase Investment in Exotic Species Control (e.g. egeria densa)	24	86%	4	14%	0	0%
Action 32	Continue to provide regular levels of funding for Delta levee maintenance.	22	81%	5	19%	0	0%
Action 3	Expedite Implementation of the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project.	21	75%	7	25%	0	0%
Action 2	Restore Tidal Marsh in Suisun Marsh	18	54%	10	36%	0	0%

Potentially Supported Actions:

Action 36	Determine the water needs of the Delta, including what flow regime is needed under different conditions for a healthy Delta.	20	71%	6	21%	2	7%
Action 6	Acquire and Restore Decker Island.	19	70%	6	22%	2	7%
Action 7	Partition Sherman and and Jersey Islands.	18	64%	9	32%	1	4%
Action 23	Run experiments on subsidence reversal, agricultural practices, habitat restoration, carbon sequestration.	18	64%	9	32%	1	4%
Action 26	Aggressively increase water conservation, water recycling and groundwater cleanup/groundwater desalination to increase water supply reliability.	18	64%	7	25%	3	11%
Action 31	Identify and purchase lands needed for flood protection, (e.g. flood corridors, room for levee setbacks, etc.) and environmental restoration (e.g. shallow water tidal habitat).	17	61%	11	39%	0	0%
Action 4	Restore and Enhance the Cache Slough Region	17	61%	9	32%	2	7%
Action 11	Dredged Material Reuse	17	63%	8	30%	2	7%
Action 21	Implement demonstration projects at Franks Tract for salinity and fish protection and demonstration project screens at Clifton Court forebay.	17	63%	7	26%	3	11%

Appendix A. Full Near-Term Measures Chart with Comments

See Excel spreadsheet attached.

Potential Interim Actions
Summary of Responses

DV SCG Near-Term/Low-Regrets Actions Survey									
Action #	Description (shortened)	Response						No Response	Comments - Compiled from Online Survey and September 5, 2007 SCG meeting
		Support		Potentially Support		Do Not Support			
Action 14	Prepare emergency plans to deal with threats to lives and property in the Delta as well as critical local, regional and statewide infrastructure.	26	93%	2	7%	0	0%	1	Plans make sense. Who pays for what if something actually happens is a devilish detail. Private utilities should be able to manage their own risks.
Action 13	Implement a basic emergency response program in the Delta	25	89%	3	11%	0	0%	1	Include seed funding. If this represents the "melded" concept between MWD's prepositioning preference and at least looking at possibly moving ahead with armoring a few specially identified levees then it probably works. It is important to include the emergency planning and incident management and evacuation components somehow. Phase one of the "emergency response plan" currently being pushed by DWR is to stockpile rock and other materials to install barriers and fortify only levees related to protection of water supply. We will not support a plan that only goes this far; we need to stockpile materials in Antioch, Rio Vista and Stockton to fortify levees throughout the delta, not just river barriers to prevent salinity intrusion, or we will end up with a catastrophic situation with many levee failures.
Action 8	Increase Investment in Exotic Species Control (e.g. egeria densa)	24	86%	4	14%	0	0%	1	Would want to know to what extent the PPIC report recommendations would be included in the analysis. questionable success in such control. Viability of the challenge may mean the funding is not worth the investment. The goal is worthy, however. The level of funding is not specified here; it would be important to know how much is "significantly more funding". We may need to prioritize this against other short term issues dependant upon degree of funding. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend it on?"). Better/quicker enforcement and implmentation of existing ballas water regs. (SCC), staffing, etc.
Action 32	Continue to provide regular levels of funding for Delta levee maintenance.	22	81%	5	19%	0	0%	2	Vague. To what standard? what is funding source (regular implies state). State funding should be contingent upon farming practices that do not exacerbate the problem. What are regular levels of funding... not all levees can be protected. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend it on?"). Only for the levees that matter.
Action 3	Expedite Implementation of the Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project.	21	75%	7	25%	0	0%	1	Requires that the Contra Costa Canal relocation project, now proceeding, be funded and completed first, but assuming that is done, support. I would support this pending analysis of costs, benefits and uncertainties which may be illuminated in the upcoming EIR. Evaluate reported toxic conditions in spring of 2007 for delta smelt. Don't want to create conditions which draw smelt to problem areas. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend it on?")
Action 36	Determine the water needs of the Delta, including what flow regime is needed under different conditions for a healthy Delta.	20	71%	6	21%	2	7%	1	This statement is not an interim action. It is all about political posturing (i.e. nobody gets anything until we figure out how much water the Delta gets). You need to better screen the list of actions for real actions. How are "needs" determined? This assumes a "right" to a certain amount of water prior to any exports. That amount of water is not "all that we need as we determine we need it". The Delta should get what it has a right to under California law and water rights. It would be nice to know what the conditions in the Delta were without the projects during dry years and summer and fall months after the snowmelt would have passed through the system (maybe even flooding it in many years). not as interim no regrets action. Need to define what constitutes "healy delta" first and connect that desired condition with a flow condition. Alternative "healy delta" scenarios should be included. If the water needs include reliable exports. As long as it is balanced with human water needs! Not exactly an interim action. Good study with lots of problems. Not quick. What is a healthy Delta? Link to eco-design recs. 1. Water rights? Quantify in-Delta? 2. Legal needs only/legal water users.
Action 6	Acquire and Restore Decker Island.	19	70%	6	22%	2	7%	2	Don't have enough information. Again, if appropriate funding can be determined and found then it sounds good. I would support this pending analysis of costs, benefits and uncertainties. "The proposed action sounds good but isn't ready for prime time because: • It hasn't been sufficiently defined, or • Important environmental or other work is pending The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend it on?") Link to eco-design recs.

Potential Interim Actions
Summary of Responses

<p>Action 2</p>	<p>Restore Tidal Marsh in Suisun Marsh.</p>	<p>18</p>	<p>64%</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>36%</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Need to combine with a program beneficial to Central Delta farmers in order to gain support for additional wildlife improvements in the Delta. Any Restoration must be part of the Suisun Marsh Plan. If it is balanced with the Suisun Marsh plan. The idea is compelling, but I don't know enough about the marsh to provide specific conditions. Funding would be the only question. If this would take priority for \$\$ over in-Delta actions I might not be so inclined, unless it could be demonstrated that there was significant benefit to smelt or other key species. Impacts to water quality in the Delta need to be defined and mitigated. with that done, support. The question is how much tidal marsh restoration the Vision process would propose for Suisun Marsh 500 or 50,000 acres? SRCD supports tidal restoration consistent with the preferred alternative selected in the PEIR/EIR for the Suisun Marsh Plan. This question should not be presented as duck vs fish. The managed wetlands of Suisun has significant wetland diversity and supports wildlife species other than waterfowl, including many T&E species. The identification of parcels, such as Van Sickle Island, for restoration is inappropriate and must be careful</p>
<p>Action 7</p>	<p>Partition Sherman and and Jersey Islands.</p>	<p>18</p>	<p>64%</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>32%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>4%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Protecting half an island seems like a half-hearted effort. Would need to see some cost-benefit comparisons to determine support. Priority should be given to the reuse of dredge materials available from adjacent channel maintenance dredging. Where partitioning the islands seems to be a sound proposal, and would clearly have benefits, the question of what would happen to the exterior levee systems of these islands are not clear, and what would happen to the exterior levee systems is also not clear. We would not support this as the only levee rehab of western islands, but we could support this as a package; in addition to significant levee rehab on exterior levees of the 8 western islands. "The proposed action sounds good but isn't ready for prime time because: • It hasn't been sufficiently defined, or • Important environmental or other work is pending The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend it on?") Ambitious fo</p>
<p>Action 23</p>	<p>Run experiments on subsidence reversal, agricultural practices, habitat restoration, carbon sequestration.</p>	<p>18</p>	<p>64%</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>32%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>4%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>I would support depending upon the scientific work being properly overseen and targeted towards usable results. A lot of this is already happening. More is good. And, compensating private land owners for site specific experiments on their land is a good idea, too. It depends on existing land use. Additional lands may be necessary not already in public ownership. ownership of land should not drive decisions. Depends where lands is in relationship to the demonstration projects purpose. May also be good to show public-private partnerships and ag friendly projects. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend it on?") Integration with AB32/carbon markets and incentives/research and demonstration projects.</p>
<p>Action 26</p>	<p>Aggressively increase water conservation, water recycling and groundwater cleanup/groundwater desalination to increase water supply reliability.</p>	<p>18</p>	<p>64%</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>25%</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>11%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>This presumes it's not happening where it's cost effective to do so now. If there is additional funding provided to further support then that would help move to the next level. Again, conservation etc. won't solve the problem and water agencies already do a lot and are looking to do more. It's all part of the mix. This is already being done. Is the proposal to continue? How? Mandating non-economic decisions? Relaxing constraints on brine disposal? Reducing the authority of the Coastal Commission to consider indirect project impacts? The answers determine support. As is, it is inappropriate for inclusion as an interim, no regrets policy. The question seems to presume this is not being done already. It is. It is why Los Angeles uses no more water than they did 20 years ago despite over 1 million new people. But this is only a partial solution. 60 million people coming to the state (most being born here) cannot be adequately served with an infrastructure designed for only 25. What does "agressive" mean? Add seawater desalination tool! "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some</p>
<p>Action 31</p>	<p>Identify and purchase lands needed for flood protection, (e.g. flood corridors, room for levee setbacks, etc.) and environmental restoration (e.g. shallow water tidal habitat).</p>	<p>17</p>	<p>61%</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>39%</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Needs more study and specifics. Good idea. Where does the \$\$ come from? Beneficiary pays? needs better definition. ...if there is proper compensation to land owners. Willing seller - willing buy with public funds only. after confirming physical and financial feasibility. Where and at what cost. short term direction could be to find these areas, some expert oversight and peer review prior to purchase. If landowners are adequately and fairly compensated. Prefer land acquisitions be limited to willing land sellers. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend it on?"). Willing sellers only, flood easements first, impacts on adjacent landowners (flooding, levee maintenance, etc.) A creative flood easement program works better than outright purchase. If purchased - must protect tax base. Flood easements upstream of Delta.</p>

Potential Interim Actions
Summary of Responses

Action 4	Restore and Enhance the Cache Slough Region	17	61%	9	32%	2	7%	1	This proposal is not specific enough for support. If it requires flooding existing reclamation districts it would require a lot of study and an act of congress to decommission levees of the federal Sacramento River Flood Control Project. It would also cause local irrigation intakes to be subject to more scrutiny due to the presence of more delta smelt. If no private land is part of the restoration. If existing pumps and pumping capacities are negatively impacted. If all restoration is on currently inundated property. Need more information. If determined to be so valuable fine, but more than the PPIC report is needed to do that. I would support this pending analysis of costs, benefits and uncertainties. This proposal must consider impacts to the water diversion point in Cache to the North Bay. Evaluate reported toxic conditions in spring of 2007 for delta smelt. Don't want to create conditions which draw smelt to problem areas. Biological, \$\$, and water issues. Also, need clear understanding of potential local conflicts with existing and future land and water use plans. "The proposed action sounds good but isn't ready for prime time because: • It hasn't been sufficiently defined, or • Important er
Action 11	Dredged Material Reuse	17	63%	8	30%	2	7%	2	Need more info. Support in principle, results of pilot project needed. There is already an existing project with permits, Montezuma Wetlands (which our group owns), that is already up and running to accomplish what the proposed pilot project would do. Use should also be considered for Suisun Levees and habitat and salinity concerns should be minor. "As a pilot project only. As a full scale project, the proposed action sounds good but isn't ready for prime time because: • It hasn't been sufficiently defined, or • Important environmental or other work is pending. On a limited basis, yes
Action 21	Implement demonstration projects at Franks Tract for salinity and fish protection and demonstration project screens at Clifton Court forebay.	17	63%	7	26%	3	11%	2	This is not a high priority under certain conveyance options and therefore may not be appropriate as an interim action. Definition of Franks Tract improvements must be broad enough to include actions near Franks Tract that have similar and perhaps less expensive results. Fish screens at Clifton Court are very expensive. Need to be sure that cheaper alternatives aren't viable and that it is the best use of limited financial resources. Salinity project experiments at Frank's tract make sense. Screening Clifton Court is a waste of money. There is nowhere to screen the fish to - no bypass flows. Full screening was estimated by Calfed at over \$2billion. If pumping is a fishery problem then the pumps need to be moved to the Sacramento River. not interim actions. We have an idea of potential benefits, but we do not know the cost or the potential environmental and ecosystem impacts to make an unbiased decision in my opinion. Cost vs benefit? Timeline for pilot? "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use d
Action 12	Cumulative Impact Analysis	17	61%	5	18%	6	21%	1	Isn't this DRMS to great extent? Also, we don't need to study development in the primary zone -- it should basically be prohibited from a public safety standpoint. Secondary zone is more problematic and some development will need to be allowed it seems. Need to keep potential conveyance option alignments open as well. There is already a large amount of data available that could reduce the scope of such a study. near term, not immediate, thanks to market conditions. I would need to know why current information on this subject is not persuasive enough to protect primary and secondary zones. DWR and the DPC would need to do this in very close consultation with the local jurisdictions and their flood control agencies through a JPA or other mechanism; and the consultant doing the study would need to report back to all parties. This is a completely biased approach with conclusions reached before any study is conducted! The Delta Protection Commission and DWR flood managers have no interest in a balanced look at land uses in the Delta! It would be better to study and identify environmentally significant areas of the Delta and areas needed for flood protection and water conveyance purpose
Action 5	Implement the McCormack Williamson Tract Flood Control and Ecosystem Restoration Project.	16	55%	12	41%	1	3%	0	I do not support channel dredging of the Mokelumne River for flood control unless I first see data and analysis that demonstrates that the channel has aggraded and that removing this material would actually increase flood conveyance. The cost of the project \$70 million is high. It may be best to wait on this project to better integrate it into a larger plan for the north Delta and water conveyance. This proposal pulls the environmental portion of a larger program out of context. Opening McCormack-Williamson will cause downstream impacts, thus requiring substantial improvements. Would support this projects if all downstream impacts mitigated and dredging performed on the North and South Fork Mokelumne River to improve flood capacity. This project must have a flood control component. I would support this pending analysis of costs, benefits and uncertainties. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend
Action 35	Provide increased protection for one or two infrastructure corridors (e.g. rail, road, aqueduct).	16	59%	10	37%	1	4%	2	Need more details. Which ones? Why not all? Utilities should pay for their own improvements. They can and are used to making economic risk based decisions. Highways should be the same but aren't. It is probably up to the legislature to decide what level of risk reduction is appropriate. Beneficiary pays applies here. need to see costs and cost allocations. "I cannot support the proposed action as an interim, no-regrets action because: • It is too controversial • It is too speculative Private utilities should be able to mitigate their own risks. Must be part of a longer range plan.

Potential Interim Actions
Summary of Responses

<p>Action 15</p>	<p>Fortify the levees in the Western Delta that we already know are the most vulnerable to the greatest risk - seismic failure.</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>57%</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>32%</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>11%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Only support if it is in the context of a larger plan to protect and restore the western Delta islands including partitioning Sherman and Jersey Islands, large scale subsidence reversal wetlands, and green levees. Want to know more about costs and benefits. If it makes sense to spend limited \$\$ resources then ok. Haven't heard a lot of consensus on this yet. If determined to be a broadly shared priority then fine. Can we build seismic safe levees? It may not be fiscally feasible to reconstruct these levees to withstand a maximum credible earthquake. There may be more economical ways to protect statewide assets. Not enough information regarding how this fits into long term program. I would like to know what the DRMS recommends. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend it on?") Only if this is part of a longer term plan.</p>
<p>Action 18</p>	<p>Create additional bypass capacity in the North Delta and along the San Joaquin River.</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>56%</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>37%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>7%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>I think this question was incorrectly worded. I support additional bypass capacity in both the North and South Delta. If this is for flood attenuation and possible habitat benefits, seems reasonable. Would have to be coordinated with other uses/needs etc. Support idea. Details are important. I would need an environmental analysis that assessed the costs and benefits, impacts and advantages to this proposal. "The proposed action sounds good but isn't ready for prime time because: • It hasn't been sufficiently defined, or • Important environmental or other work is pending The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you would spend it on?") Link to ecosystem and ops and eco-design recs. Below Vernalis? And to the west of Vernalis. Stone Lakes area.</p>
<p>Action 16</p>	<p>Allow dredging to provide lower cost material for critical levee protection & Preserve navigation channels</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>56%</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>33%</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>11%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Only support on a site specific basis. The people who want to dredge must first demonstrate with data that the channels have aggraded and that the aggraded channel actually causes a problem. Proponents must also demonstrate that dredged material would actually be a cheaper source of levee material than on-island borrow. Highly doubtful. Want more info. on the impacts of dredging. Dredging is already allowed, but subject to various federal and state permits. I am not sure what specifically is being asked here, except to develop perhaps new dredging/reuse projects that would then be taken through the permits. This should include the Suisun Marsh Levees. Dredge materials would need to be suitable for levee construction. Shipping into Stockton is likely responsible for transmission of invasive species and there are still inadequate controls on international vessels and ballast management. Deep channels in the Delta have led to anoxic conditions in the deep water ship channel. Impacts of this have never been mitigated by the Port or the Army Corps of Engineers. Not without dealing with the potential negative effects from dissolved O2. Water quality impacts would have to</p>
<p>Action 1</p>	<p>Restore Floodplain Habitat and Fish Migration Through the Yolo Bypass.</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>46%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>4%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The levees of the Yolo Bypass are not designed for annual flooding. Therefore, this proposal must be flood neutral, and include improvement on the Bypass levees. Would support if there is no negative impact to the flood control structure, no negative impact to the flood holding capacity, no negative impact to the existing ag. and wetland pumping plants, and no impact on the surrounding private property. More detail on weir operations and how such a program would affect other objectives for the flood control system, namely, protecting urban areas. This should also consider Colusa Drain re-routing to provide water to this area and improve water quality. With that provision, support. Why is the PPIC report a consideration in this Survey? Consider impacts to Ag. and other wildlife habitats, fish are not the only consideration. Flooding the Yolo bypass would flood the waterfowl habitat created to off-set wetland loss in Suisun. Each of these actions must be considered in conjunction with other proposed actions. with a clear: biological basis and anticipated result, water and dollar cost. source of water and \$\$ also needs to be clear. also, need clear understanding of relationship be</p>
<p>Action 9</p>	<p>South Delta Floodway</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>46%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>4%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Needs more study. The floodway property must be publicly owned and or already be used as seasonal wetlands. ie Fish and Game and U.S.fish and wildlife property. DWR should only purchase from willing sellers. If it really has multiple benefits and not primarily flood control then again, sounds good. Funding will be a key issue though, especially if only weak multiple benefits and mainly flood protection -- if that, then locals should pay significant share. I think there needs to be a feasibility study before this is undertaken to determine the potential benefits of a floodway in the South Delta. DWR should be instructed to look for a willing seller situation: DWR should do the study, and come back with options before embarking upon a final configuration (consistent with Delta Vision)and purchasing (or eminent domain as the case may be). "For studies. Based on results of studies, the proposed action will need: • Specific objectives • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you wo</p>

Potential Interim Actions
Summary of Responses

<p>Action 19</p>	<p>Restore wetlands/riparian areas would lend added environmental stability to the Delta and the watershed and restore some measure of ecosystem health</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>52%</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>41%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>7%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Need more information. On publicly owned lands only! All about the \$\$ and potential unintended consequences. On the surface seems reasonable though. Details such as impact on land owners are important. The proposal to restore tidal wetlands in Suisun Marsh will destroy some of the remaining 5% of California's wetlands. I wonder if this should be considered more in light of priorities. I thought it was the pelagic organisms and fish that were the hardest hit and in the most danger of collapse. Shouldn't we be targeting fixing their habitat first, then working on peripheral habitat following pelagic recovery? wasn't millions of dollars put forward through the CALFED process to do just this? Funding would have to be quantified, evaluated in accordance with other priorities. In addition to all of the specific restoration proposals earlier in the survey? Wetlands and upland riparian habitat restoration can be challenging. This should be prioritized and confirmed through specific proposals and analysis by the biologists. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that th</p>
<p>Action 27</p>	<p>Implement the fish screen pilot project for the pumps in the South Delta.</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>52%</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>41%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>7%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>May not be appropriate as interim action since it might be designed differently under different conveyance configuration. Since it would be so expensive, it makes sense to take time to design it carefully. Need more info. There is not enough scientific evidence to say that ag. diversions in June, July, and Aug. contribute to the delta smelt problem. Under what kind of pumping conditions? Who pays? Not clear what pumps we are talking about - if CVP/SWP this is a waste of money. If it is individual delta diversions, this may be worth doing as there are bypass flows. focus on diverting water where there are no fish. may be very expensive and have little value for fisheris compared to alternative investments. Is the current plumbing the best? Do we spend all this money to take care of this system vs building a better one? Not sure of feasibility and timing on fixing current vs building new. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you would ever get, is this what you</p>
<p>Action 10</p>	<p>Create a new Delta Conservancy</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>36%</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>14%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Institutional reform is important in so many ways, but it is really hard to say that it would be good unless a detailed plan were provided. Would need to assure that reclamation district assessments will be made through a trust account in perpetuity since lands may be taken out of production, this eliminating the farm income. So long as limited to dealing with land-use issues, and part of its charge was to incorporate in-Delta water quality protection then might be a good idea. Not clear what the scope is that is being proposed. This could also be helpful in Suisun. Opportunities are often lost. Too broad of a mandate indicated. Need additional information before I can fully support this. would need a lot more information to support this; detail as to why it was vetoed, how it would work with the existing conservancy and the delta protection commission, how it would be funded, structure of organization, etc. I would be very supportive if restricted to "willing sellers." I oppose this approach if it will dictate land uses without land owner involvement and agreement in the process and decisions. "The proposed action has significant promise, but I cannot support the propos</p>
<p>Action 33</p>	<p>Develop a plan for the phased conversion of selected islands over time in response to sea level rise.</p>	<p>14</p>	<p>54%</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>27%</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>19%</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Conversion to what? This question is way to vague to serve as the basis for an interim action, but I support the idea of developing a to change the Delta and its islands overtime to better accomodate the drivers of change. That is why I am participating in the Delta Vision process. Need additional information. If determined to make sense in particular locations. conversion to what? Who pays? not an interim action. need to understand before we start planning. a report on the effects of sea level rise is in order, and additional detail is good in the short term. Conversion of islands is a longer -term issue and some oversight is warranted. Not sure what phased conversion means - raise levees or not? Planning OK.</p>
<p>Action 20</p>	<p>Cease agricultural practices that continue land subsidence, begin land use practices that would gradually increase island elevations.</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>46%</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>32%</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>21%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Do not support because subsidence is not as widespread as depicted in recent accounts. In addition, this is occuring and will continue to occur in areas where subsidence is a problem. The land will naturally go out of production. Allow same crops with new management systyems. Encourage wildlife friendly farming. Encourage new technology and new irrigation systems. Coordinate with agricultural interests to determine the viable alternative causing the least amount of financial damage to farms. Much of the Delta is in private ownership. Not all subsidence is bad. Development of better land use alternatives is important and if they are not obviously beneficial to the land owner, incentive programs must be included. Cease is strong language. not an interim action. Generally agree, but at what expense? too much uncertainty in this statement. I need to see a incenitive base strategy that works with landowners and encourages their participation and not one that compells their efforts. Good in theory, but would like to have more details, supporting information. "I cannot support the proposed action as an interim, no-regrets action because: • It is too controversial • It is too speculative State</p>

Potential Interim Actions
Summary of Responses

<p>Action 22</p>	<p>Work towards (1) market based water distribution, (2) encouraging communities to make cost effective investments in groundwater storage, and (3) incorporating the flexible project operations</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>48%</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>22%</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>30%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Need more details. Provided that all in delta water needs are met before water exports begin. This is a too simplistic attempt to propose options that are impossible to assess in a vacuum. Do all 3 come as a package? Not sure what is meant by 1. Don't favor market based allocation if it trumps water rights and public trust uses of water. Encouraging "market based" allocations is vague. Natural economic incentives exist for sensible groundwater storage. Local agencies are pursuing these where feasible and much state grant money is assisting in same. Limis on groundwater storage have all to do with water rights disputes and limits on put and take capacity. Flexible operations with B2 and the EWA is what we have now and while useful it is limited with the 19th century infrastructure in the Delta. existing conditions in the delta are already driving these activities. No "extra" mandates are necessary. I have no idea what "market distribution" means. not sure what this means. could be very good or very bad depending on details.... need a little more information on B2/ flexible ops. 1. Support incentive based water conservation rate structures. 2. We need more than</p>
<p>Action 29</p>	<p>Begin screening in-Delta diversions.</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>46%</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>50%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>4%</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>This may not be cost effective. May be other more cost effective strategies. Not ready for prime time as interim action. Farmers can't fund construction and maintenance of fish screens. There is no science to show that in delta irrigation pumps during the normal irrigation period of June, July, and Aug. are creating a problem for the Delta smelt. In this survey, I voiced support for a pilot project to do this, and we would have to see the results and analysis to support screening all export water. Need more info. Screening is typically cost prohibitive, with minimal benefits to fish. Investment in habitat restoration would be money better spent. If a diversion has significant impact to fish, screen it. if demonstrated bio value. who pays? Calfed paid for a lot of in Delta screens and in the tributaries. We would need to sure top unscreened diversion were appropriately ranked and that priority screens were the first target. "The proposed action needs: • Specific objectives • Cost estimates • An estimate of confidence that the objectives will be achieved • Some form of scientific consensus that the proposed action is the highest priority use of limited funds (i.e., "if this was the only money that you</p>
<p>Action 28</p>	<p>Reduce contamination entering the Delta by eliminating the agricultural waiver, eliminating drainage from drainage impaired lands in the San Joaquin Valley, and reducing runoff from urban areas</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>39%</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>25%</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>36%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>More work should be performed to pinpoint where contamination is generated. The agricultural waiver drainage program must be given an opportunity to work. Best management practices will solve any ag. drainage problems. Can this be couched in a more controversial way? Eliminate the ag waiver? Please. That's not to say the issue of upstream source water quality control is not a legitimate one. It will likely be needed to be pursued with collaborative rather than confrontational methods. Appropriate financial and regulatory assistance along with timing will be necessary to politically achieve this goal. Our support would depend upon the specifics involved, and would be more limited to targeted reductions where they make sense. Not in this context. Elimination is not a solution to problems. 1. Elimination of the Ag waiver does nothing to reduce drainage. It merely substitutes another permit system which the RWQCB says it is completely understaffed to administer effectively. 2. There are very few economical stormwater capture opportunities available in existing urbanized areas due to the large amount of land that would be needed to temporarily interrupt flows. Where areas are develop</p>
<p>Action 30</p>	<p>Create a new Delta Conservancy to fund restoration and oversee land use in the Delta.</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>36%</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>32%</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>32%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>How does the funding happen? Who pays for what? If the conserqncy can tackle the hard issues it would be great. If it is looking for public dollars for everything I do not support it. Just amend the charge/authority of the DPC. Should not create an additional regulatory layer requiring additional permitting. Fund restoration yes, land use no. Subject to review of make-up, governance, and funding. Potentially a very important idea. So much detail to be developed. Shouldn't be included in this list. It's all about details. not an interim action. Do we need another governmental entity. too simplistic of a statement. No land use authority.</p>
<p>Action 25</p>	<p>Retire (through purchase or otherwise) Westland Water District's water contract in order to leave more water in the Delta for ecosystem improvement</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>42%</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>17%</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>42%</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>The purchase must be from willing sellers only. Even if this were to occur, it wouldn't solve our problems, it's dubious as to how much "wet water" would actually be freed up in dry periods, the cost is high. Perhaps such a deal can be shaped to be worth pursuing but it's not there yet I don't think. Coordinate with Westlands water users to best identify appropriate action items/purchases. This proposal won't get enough water to make a difference of the kind that is needed. Bay Area Council supports market-based solutions to find more water for urban and environmental uses; although we have not concluded that Westlands is the only (or first) place to look. Hard to know how this is conceived as a "no regrets" action. Inappropriate at least in this context. 1. This proposal will not do what it purports to as retirement of Westlands only reduced unmet demand in average to dry years, and no reduction in Delta pumping would result. The proposers, and most people simply do not understand how the CVP and SWP operates. 2. The cost of this is at least \$9billion and would not address any Delta stressors. 3. If demand reduction affecting water flow to the Delta is desired, there are more cost effectiv</p>

Potential Interim Actions
Summary of Responses

Action 34	Provide funding to bring flood management for already urbanized areas up to a 200 year standard.	8	30%	17	63%	2	7%	2	Why do not they pay for their own flood protection. We who live near the Hayward fault are not asking to be bailed out after the big quake comes. Potentially a very large cost. Need cost-benefit analysis to determine support. Who pays for that? Provide a funding plan first. Areas within such zones should be willing to fund a portion of these needs. Subject to definition of "already urbanized" and in some areas this may be infeasible or too costly. I need to know that local urban areas were matching the cost of such an effort were ever feasible. The approach should be to get areas up to the national 100-year flood protection first and then to plan and finance a higher level of flood protection for vulnerable urban areas. The state does not have enough money to bring everyone up to a 200-year standard, and there is no justification to do so throughout Southern California. We don't even know what a 200-year storm is! Residents/developers should pay for this not the public at large. If the urban residents pay for it and that flood insurance becomes required. 200 year standard is problematical and will soak up \$ that may be needed to get to 100 year standard. Too expensive and may
Action 17	Employ South Delta movable barriers.	7	25%	16	57%	5	18%	1	Depends why and where and under what conveyance configuration. The devil is in the details. Environmental assurances are important to me. Not sure exactly what this means. The hydrology studies must show that the barriers will not cause additional salt intrusion. Sounds too costly to build and operate. Seemed like a good idea, unless some reasons develop not to, don't see why you wouldn't do operable/removable barriers to at least experiment as to their efficacy. Make sure such barriers are compatible with in water recreational uses and marine transportation need/opportunities. Which ones? Before I could support this proposal I need to know the location and nature of the barriers. Also I need to know thier effects on boating access. ... to what end? Purpose needs to be identified, effectiveness of barriers established, and S. Delta interests protected. provided that it can be demonstrated that the South Delta Movable Barriers will result in ecosystem benefits. I would need to know what are the expected environmental impacts to fishers and the Delta ecosystem and what the anticipated benefits would be. need to double check with the south delta folks. How do they affect
Action 24	Operate under the Moyle-Swanson recommendations.	7	29%	6	25%	11	46%	5	Need more information. There are other operating criteria being developed as part of the litigation so let's wait and see what happens. No reason for our group to endorse any particular scheme. It's not in our hands. While there is a scientific basis for some of the Moyle-Swanson proposal, they have stretched the Jan-Feb reverse flow data way beyond its basis to a larger time period. They have missed the mark on those causes with a basis (SWP winter take of adult Delta smelt) and focused on areas that do not show a trend with population (spring take for example). I'm having trouble remembering what they are. Concern with a lot of the environmental recommendations is that they appear to be the latest attempt at an educated guess as to what would work. Ideas need to be as fully developed as possible and the degree of confidence that they will work needs to be assessed. This proposal would impose devastating water shortages in California - an export cut of 50% in all year types - without any guarantee of success. There are better and more flexible ways of avoiding ESA jeopardy to the Smelt. very drastic actions recommended with no assurance of success. I do not believe th
New Proposal from September 5, 2007 meeting	Assist in the achievement of habitat acquisition, creation and enhancement goals of the Central Valley Joint Venture for seasonal wetlands, semi-permanent wetlands, riparian forests, and wildlife-friendly agriculture								Link to eco-design recs. More pintails!