

# **Delta Long Term Management Strategy Interagency Working Group October 5, 2005**

## **Draft Meeting Summary**

The Interagency Working Group (IWG) of the Delta Long Term Management Strategy (Delta LTMS) met at the California Bay-Delta Authority in Sacramento at 12pm on Thursday, October 5, 2005. Purposes of the meeting were to:

- review the revised Process Framework
- discuss next steps and “roll out” of Delta LTMS
- discuss initial technical working group

Participants included:

Eric Nagy, USACE  
Sue McConnell, CVRWCQB  
Sergio Guillen, CALFED  
Bob Yeadon, DWR  
Brian Ross, USEPA (on phone)  
Charles Gardiner, CirclePoint  
John Clerici, CirclePoint  
Sonja Wadman, CirclePoint

### ***Revised Process Framework Review***

Before reviewing the document, Charles asked the group to consider the true focus of the LTMS and how it should be packaged. Sue had stated that she was reluctant to overstate the importance of levees. Brian suggested alphabetizing the problems, challenges and opportunities listed on page two so that levees are not prioritized first. Charles asked the group to review two study purpose statements, one focusing on dredged material management (in the revised document) and the other focused solely on regulatory process improvement (in previous versions). The group agreed that the true purpose of the LTMS is to address dredged material management and regulatory improvement, thus the broader revised statement is more appropriate.

Eric told the group he had been researching the Corps’ Guidance documents, which he also forwarded to CirclePoint. The Guidance documents state that every authorized project should have a dredged material management plan (DMMP) associated with it, primarily stating where dredged material should be disposed. He didn’t think one had been established for the Delta, yet. Brian cautioned that if there is one, it could restrict what the LTMS can do. Sue commented that disposal sites along the San Joaquin are all full and many more disposal sites are needed now.

Charles asked the group to suggest ways in which the purpose statement, goals and objectives could be shortened. Brian recommended moving some language to the introductory purpose paragraph and putting the purpose statement into three bullet points. It was suggested to change

the beginning of each study goal to read “Manage dredging activities...” to tighten them up. It was recommended to add to the fourth bullet of objectives so it reads “facilitate beneficial reuse of dredged material for levee stabilization or other use.”

Bob commented that the Corps, DWR, DFG, and others are fully engaged in furthering the Delta Risk Management Study (DRMS). The flooding in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina has resulted in a great desire to manage the risk of levee breaks in the Delta. Sue commented that she has found that dredged material is primarily being used by construction companies and not for levee stability. Bob said that Port of Stockton material is too far to haul and sometimes has the potential to threaten water quality (Jones Tract). They use primarily material from Sacramento River and Decker Island. He commented that Port of Sacramento has lots of material, but much of it has habitat growing on it thus it can't be used (or its reuse is more complicated because of permits). Charles asked about potential links between DRMS and LTMS. Eric commented that DRMS will serve as a master priority list for managing dredge material—these are the areas where money is best spent. The two studies will benefit each other.

The group offered no comments on the small changes made to the Structure portion of the document. Brian commented that the Authorities section seems slightly redundant to previous sections and might appear obvious to many readers. Perhaps it is not needed in this document? Charles explained the benefit of including it. Do agency executives have a clear idea of what's involved in the Delta dredging disposal and permitting process? If this is to be used as the basis for a “marketing/shopping” document, agencies/stakeholders would see where they fit into the process and why they should get involved (pay into its further development). The group agreed that while some agency executives know the whole picture, staff turnover is huge, thus there will always be a need for briefing and educating managers. With rotating jobs and priorities, this issue is simply off the radar of many managers. It was suggested to remove the Authority table and move the paragraph about the National Dredging Team to the Related Programs section under dredging. Brian recommended adding a description about the SF LTMS to the dredging section. Sue said she would provide a more accurate description about the DDRS.

Charles commented that the Study Phases section is purposely vague so as to comply with the USACE guidance with DMMP while allowing flexibility. Brian and Sue suggested listing short or interim actions and long term objectives, and wondered how linear the framework should be. Brian commented that the SF LTMS primarily progressed in a linear fashion, but the DMMO looks every 2 weeks at each proposed dredging project and a comprehensive review of the LTMS is to happen every 3-6 years. He suggested adding to the introductory Phases paragraph text that implies the LTMS will be constantly revisited and revised. The group agreed to include a graphic that shows the phases occurring in a loop.

In Activities, Sue commented that the regulatory process has already been identified in the DDRS—it may be dated material but serves as a starting point. Brian suggested adding “identify opportunities for improved coordination” to the first bullet to make it more action-oriented. He recommended adding “and on-going long-term capacity” to the second and third bullets. Bob suggested including a bullet about the channel deepening projects. He also said that emergency procedures are a big issue for DWR and others. The group discussed this and agreed that emergency powers would not be removed from the Corps, rather extra emergency procedures

would be developed or existing ones clarified. Eric commented that the consequences of invoking emergency authority should be examined—what is justified? This activity should invest some forethought and through prudent planning, build support.

The Schedule section of the document remains to be completed. Eric said that he preferred to hold off on projecting activities too far into the future. It was suggested to list milestones. Brian commented it should be noted in this or the previous section that the framework process has already started.

**Action Item:**

- **IWG members to provide written comments to Sonja by Monday October 10.**

***LTMS Next Steps, Roll Out***

Eric announced that the CA Marine Affairs and Navigation Council is meeting next week in Stockton. In addition to two very-high level Corps executives, the District Engineer will be addressing the Council on immediate, local topics. Eric and CirclePoint will be developing talking points on the LTMS for the DE.

Sergio informed the group that he will be leading a meeting for all CALFED staff on October 17. He plans to discuss the LTMS and DRMS. Sergio asked CirclePoint and Bob to provide him with bullet point or PowerPoint slides on the respective studies. CirclePoint agreed to develop slides and a one-page summary document of the LTMS for initial roadshow presentations. The group discussed ways to engage DWR management. It was agreed that the Corps should contact Les Harder and then Lester Snow to request a sit-down to discuss the Delta LTMS. Each of the other IWG participants will use the one-pager, slides, and revised framework to brief their management before the beginning of November.

Other venues identified for initial roadshow: CALFED Levees Subcommittee (11/4), Delta Protection Commission (11/17), and the Reclamation Board (11/18). The IWG participating agencies would also begin outreach to other agency executives in November (to be discussed at the next IWG meeting).

**Action Item: CirclePoint to develop PowerPoint slides and one-page summary document.**

***Technical Work Group***

Eric has funding remaining from FY 2005 and part of funding for FY 2006 that he'd like to use to initiate a working group in advance of the LTMS. He distributed a one-page document describing the proposed background, purpose, organization, and participation of the dredging working group for the IWG to review. Charles commented that the IWG should provide more details on the specific charter of this group. Time and purpose boundaries need to be established. Sergio commented that the language should be re-written: the technical aspects of dredging are simple (just scoop it out), it's the testing or regulatory issues that are complicated.

Sue explained the testing complications related to dredged material. This group should determine what conditions are currently in the Delta, and what the best tests are for those conditions. Eric commented that this group should get into the real scientific and technical questions—it should be comprised of water quality engineers and technical experts, not general staff. Charles commented that this sounds like the beginning of a testing protocol work group. Bob speculated that this will result in recommendations for pilot programs. Sue said that the Port of Stockton is anxious to conduct/fund pilot studies. It was suggested to add DeltaKeeper and DWR to the list of potential participants.

**Action Item: Eric will make changes and email the revised paper to the IWG for comment.**

### ***Meeting Wrap Up***

The next meeting of the IWG will be on October 26 at CALFED from 12-3. The primary agenda topic will be developing a strategy for briefing agency executives and others.