



**Reach 4B, Eastside Bypass, and Mariposa Bypass
Channel and Structural Improvements Project
Landowner Meeting
Thursday, September 27, 2012, 1 – 4 p.m.
San Luis Canal Company
11704 Henry Miller Avenue, Dos Palos
Meeting Notes**

Attendees:

Michelle Banonis	Bureau of Reclamation – Mid Pacific Region
Carrie Buckman	CDM Smith (Consultant)
Kim Forrest	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Richard Harman	Harman Bros, Landowner
Reggie Hill	Lower San Joaquin Levee District
Chase Hurley	San Luis Canal Company
Zac Jackson	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Lance Kiley	California State Lands Commission
Steve Lehman	California State Lands Commission
Jeremy Lorberau	Bureau of Reclamation – Denver Technical Services Center
Dan McNamara	Landowner
Leslie Mirise	National Marine Fisheries Service
Dave Mooney	Bureau of Reclamation – Mid-Pacific Region
John Netto	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Alexis Phillips-Dowell	California Department of Water Resources
Joe Porter	California State Lands Commission
Andrew Raabe	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Paul Romero	California Department of Water Resources
Brent Stearns	Nickel Family, San Juan Ranch
Ben Swann	CDM Smith (Consultant)
Gina Veronese	CDM Smith (Consultant)

Introductions

Ben Swann, facilitator, opened the meeting with introductions and reviewed the agenda.

Reach 4B Project Powerpoint Presentation

General Program Update

- Michelle Banonis presented an update on all San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP) activities.
- The Program Record of Decision should be released any time now.
- Interim flows for next year are scheduled to start on October 1, 2012.

- It is likely that the State Water Resources Control Board will issue a temporary change petition this year for interim flows.
- John Netto provided an update on the SJRPP Chinook Salmon Reintroduction.

Field Activities Update

- Carrie Buckman presented an overview of the field activities associated with the Reach 4B Project.
- Biological and cultural resource surveys are ongoing and surveys teams are scheduled to be in the field from in increments from October 1 through November 9. Biological teams are expected to survey in the beginning of October and cultural teams are expected to start in mid-October.
- Traffic surveys are currently being planned in October for 1-2 weeks to measure traffic counts at two intersections, Henry Miller Avenue and Turner Island Road intersection and Washington Road and Harmon Road intersection on the west side of the bridge.
- An updated field activity tracker was distributed.

Reach 4B Project Initial Alternatives

- Carrie Buckman reviewed the four Reach 4B Alternatives that were presented at the last landowner meeting in February.
- Carrie reviewed the potential bypass levee alignments, developed after the February landowner meeting in response to recommendations from the Value Planning team. One option would be to set back the east levee, another option is to setback the west levee, and a third option is a combination of the two. Carrie explained that the environmental document would likely evaluate the first two options because they capture all potential resource area effects of the combination option. In response to a stakeholder question, Carrie clarified that the combination alternative would not set back levees on both sides throughout the length of the bypass, but would set back one levee on the south end and the other levee on the north end.
- In response to the Value Planning recommendations and discussions during the previous landowner meeting, the project team is considering ways to incorporate a variation of Alternative 2 in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) that does not include restoration in Reach 4B1.
- A stakeholder asked if the alternatives still included planning vegetation in the bypass. Carrie responded that fish passage through the bypass requires revegetation to provide a food source and cover for the fish.
- A stakeholder asked if vegetation is planned for both adults and juveniles and whether water temperatures in the bypass will be low enough to allow fish passage. John Netto briefly described adult and juvenile fish needs for passage through the bypass. The group also discussed that the bypass is a flood control project that requires flows to move through it. Revegetation holds back water, which can also result in more seepage.
- A stakeholder asked if Reclamation has done modeling on revegetation and flow movement in the bypass. Reclamation is working on flow modeling.

State Land Commission Update

- Steve Lehman presented an update on California State Lands Commission (CLSC) progress to identify Public Trust lands.
- Steve presented the best available evidence used to identify the high and low water lines of Reach 4B. The evidence for the high water line included a Miller and Lux Survey, 1914 California Debris Commission Mapping, and 1937 Fairchild Aerial Photographs. The evidence for the low water line included the 1914 California Debris Commission Mapping.
- A meeting attendee asked if 1914 was a wet or dry year. Steve answered that it was a normal year.
- An attendee asked if the 1937 aerial photographs were only taken once that year. Steve responded “yes.”
- A stakeholder asked if the Public Trust easement gives the public access to the land. Steve responded yes, but only where the easement is; the public cannot cross private property to get to the public trust land.
- Based on a combination of the best available evidence, CSLC developed administrative maps for the high and low water lines.
- The CSLC brought large maps of the high and low water lines results along Reach 4B. Meeting participants took a break and reviewed the maps individually. The CSLC staff answered questions one-on-one with the meeting participants.
- Steve outlined the process for the public trust lands. The CSLC completes the administrative maps and files them with the appropriate counties. The counties provide comments, if any. After the county comments are addressed, the maps go to the CSLC for approval.
- Low and high water lines are subject to reconsideration if better or more reliable data is made available.
- A stakeholder asked the timeline for the Public Trust lands along all reaches of the River. Steve provided the following timeline:
 - Reach 2B – administrative maps complete, filed with counties, approved by CSLC
 - Reach 4B1 – draft administrative maps complete (which is what they brought for review today), not yet filed with counties
 - Reach 3, 4A – working on draft administrative maps, expected to be complete in January 2013
 - Reach 4B2 – field work complete, maps expected June 2013

DEC Review Findings

- Reclamation conducted a Design, Cost Estimating, and Construction (DEC) independent review in July 2012. Jeremy Lorberau reviewed the primary recommendations of the DEC Review with the group and current Reclamation efforts to address DEC review findings.
- An attendee asked if sedimentation was included in the DEC review. Jeremy responded that sedimentation is an important issue and considered with multiple DEC review findings, including subsidence, revegetation, and operations and

maintenance (O&M). O&M cost estimates need to consider sediment capture and disposal.

- An attendee asked who will operate the proposed Alternative 1 headgates. Jeremy responded that the headgates would likely be locally operated and would be designed to be run remotely. The group discussed that remote operations could be difficult, based on past experience, and on-site operations work better because of varying conditions, including seepage. Operations of the headgate will be included in the O&M cost estimates.

Group Discussion

- For the next landowner meeting, the group is interested in sedimentation analysis, revegetation analysis, and a timeline for selecting alternatives.
- A stakeholder asked if the landowners can see the alternatives again or if they are finalized. Reclamation answered that they are still under refinement and will be reviewed again with the landowners at a future meeting.
- A stakeholder asked if Reclamation is considering land values on each side of the bypass when evaluating bypass levee alignment alternatives, whether landowners would be mitigated for lost revenue, and if cost estimates include the actual costs of the alignments, rather than only the design costs. Reclamation responded that all costs will be considered in the cost estimates and alternatives evaluation.
- A stakeholder asked if Reclamation has identified the facilities affected under the new bypass levee alignments. Reclamation has not done this yet and it is one of the next steps.
- A stakeholder asked if Reclamation is considering the impacts to the refuges of changes to the bypass levee alignments. Reclamation is evaluating effects to refuges and has a meeting with the refuges in October to discuss the project.
- A stakeholder asked if Reclamation is taking seepage into account in the bypass levee alignments. The Reach 4B team is working with the Seepage Management Group to incorporate seepage issues into the levee design.
- A stakeholder asked if the EIS/EIR for Reach 4B Project will be site specific or encompass the entire project area. Reclamation responded that the EIS/EIR will include the entire project area including Reach 4B and the Eastside and Mariposa bypasses.
- A stakeholder asked if there could be a study using the CSLC's historic maps and aerial photographs to determine whether Reach 4B1 could have historically conveyed flows over 475 cubic feet per second (cfs). Reclamation explained that the Settlement does not include conveyance of 475 cfs based on historic channel capacity, but a variety of other factors, including fish needs. Based on Settlement requirements, Reclamation must evaluate alternatives that allow a minimum of 475 cfs in Reach 4B.

Action Items

- Distribute copies of Landowner Meeting minutes.
- Send San Luis Canal Company the GIS files for new bypass levee alignments.