PUBLIC HEARING

Presented by the US Army Corps of Engineers and the

Port of West Sacramento

In the Matter of:	)
	)
Sacramento River Deep Water	)
Ship Channel Draft Statement/	)
Subsequent Environmental	)
Impact Report	)
	)

WEST SACRAMENTO CITY HALL

1110 WEST CAPITOL AVENUE

WEST SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2011

5:31 P.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

US Army Corps of Engineers

LTC. Torrey DiCiro
Neil Hedgecock

Port of West Sacramento

Tom Scheeler

Anchor QEA, L.P.

Joshua Burnam
Katie Chamberlin

Also Present

Public Comment

Ellen Johnck, Bay Planning Coalition
Marc Holmes, Bay Institute of San Francisco
David Fullerton, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

I N D E X

1

P R O C E E D I N G S

MARCH 21, 2011 5:31 p.m.

LTC. DICIRO: Evening. My name is Colonel Torrey DiCiro. I'm with the— I'm the Commander of the San Francisco District of the US Army Corps of Engineers. On behalf of the Corps of Engineers, I welcome ya'll to the public hearing of the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel Draft Supplemental and Environmental Impact Statement Draft CEQA Environmental Impact Report. The Corps of Engineers is the lead federal agency for the project and the Port of West Sacramento is the lead state agency for the project. Federal actions are subject to compliance with a variety of federal environmental laws. Consequently, the Corps has a responsibility to evaluate the environmental impacts that would be caused by a proposed project. In particular, we have the National Environmental Policy Act that requires us to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, otherwise known as an SEIS, to evaluate the direct, indirect and cumulative environmental effects of, as well as consider, the alternatives to a proposed project. The Port is also required to prepare a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, otherwise known as an SEIR, as required by the California

Environmental Quality Act, CEQA. In order to efficiently use government resources, the Corps and the Port have worked together to prepare a single joint Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to satisfy both NEPA and CEQA requirements.

The purpose of tonight's briefing is to obtain comments from the public on the content of the draft SEIS / SEIR; which was released for public review on February 25. The draft SEIS / SEIR is available electronically at the web address shown outside and in hard copy format at the 6 libraries also shown on the poster outside.

I would like to emphasize that my staff and I will carefully and equally consider all comments that we receive, both orally and in writing. There are three ways to provide comments to the draft SEIS and SEIR: the first one is to orally state your comments at tonight's hearing, the second way is to write your comments on a comment card available at the sign-in table and submit it to the Corps tonight or by April 18, lastly, the third way to mail or email your comments to the Corps by April 18. All comments, oral and written, will become part of the project's administrative record. They will be considered and

responded to in the final SEIS / SEIR.

We'll begin tonight with an introduction from the Ports, after which our consultant will provide a 20 minute presentation summarizing the key components of the draft document. Following the presentation, we'll take oral testimony from the members of the public who would like to present their views as individuals. During the sessions, speakers will be given 10 minutes to make their comments. If you would like to speak during the session, you must fill out a speaker card and give it to one of the staff, plenty of them around, wearing a blue badge before the oral testimonies begin. In fairness, the order of speakers will be randomly determined. As you make your comments, please note that on this table, there is a speech timer. The light will be green when you begin; when you have one minute left, the light will turn yellow; and when your time is up, and the light will turn red. Please respect the time limit so that all who desire may appropriately speak.

Some of my technical staff members and consultants are here tonight and will be able to clarify some of your questions.

I would like to introduce some of them. Please stand up. Fari (Tabatabai), she's the Chief of

Environmental Planning for the San Francisco District. We've got Bill Brostoff, the Environmental Program Manager for the project. Josh Burnam and Katie Chamberlin are the consultants with Anchor who led the development of the draft SEIS / SEIR. I'll now ask the Port to begin with their introduction.

MR. SCHEELER: Good evening all. I'm Tom Scheeler, I'm the Port Engineer. Port Director Mike Luken is unavailable tonight; he's back in Washington D.C. And the Port CEO, Toby Ross, the City Manager is also unavailable, so you have me tonight.

Again, thank you all for coming. This deepening project is a very important project to the Port, both in the aspect of directly to the Port in terms of jobs but also to the region. This represents an enhancement of the Port to bring more ships to the Port, that we are able to load more deeply. This makes us more attractive to a larger breadth of the market. This is certainly the direction that ships are going. And so we really need this additional five feet of depth in order to bring these ships in and keep our business strong.

There's also an environmental benefit to the fact, obviously, that you're loading these ships to deeper depths. And that means then for an equal amount

of cargo, there's less ships transiting the shipping channel. So there's an environmental benefit of that. Enhancing the travel of cargo by the waterway, this is certainly an environmental enhancement in terms of moving trucks off the road. So, again, I think frankly I've been participating with the team here, with the Corps team, and also Anchor, and I think they've put together an excellent document. I hope you will agree. And we certainly encourage comments to be made. We're very anxious to hear what people have to say about it and comments to that. So, I will this back over to Anchor.

MR. BURNAM: Thank you, Tom. Thank you, Colonel. Going to begin now the roughly 20 minute presentation, PowerPoint presentation. Before I get started here, I'd just like to say that this is not an exhaustive overview of the entire project or the contents of the EIS / EIR. It's, obviously, a very detailed document. What we've attempted to do tonight in the 20 minutes or so here is summarize some of the key points of emphasis from the document and present them to you so that you can consider them as part of the public comment period. So, with that I'll get started.

Just a brief introduction to the

presentation. I'll give a project overview, talk a little bit about the background and the intent of the project, talk specifically about the project's purpose and needs and objectives under our NEPA and CEQA evaluation. The alternatives that we considered and, as important, the alternatives that we chose to not consider fully in the document. A summary of impact evaluations in some key areas of emphasis and then finally show where we are in the steps and what the estimated timeline is.

Here's just a little bit of project background for those of you who might not be completely up to speed on the channel-to-channels. The channel is 46 1/2 miles long. Provides access from San Francisco Bay to the Port of West Sacramento. It's bounded by New York Slough on the lower end and then the locks on the upper end by the Port. There's both a constructed, or manmade, portion as well as a natural portion. It is tidily influenced along the entire length. And, generally, the salinity is low but it does vary throughout the channel.

The purpose of what we're doing here is we would like to complete the construction of the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel Deepening Project. The project was previously initiated and then

stopped after only 8 miles or deepened. The channel is currently 30 feet deep. We'd like to bring it to a depth of 35 feet, plus two feet of over depth. That will generate approximately 10 million cubic yards of sediment. We intend to place that sediment at 10 carefully selected upland placement sites. And you'll hear some discussion of the effort we went to to select those sites throughout this presentation. We are intending to work six-month environmental work windows, which is longer than the typical three to four month windows for the channel. That's something we're actively consulting with the resource agencies on right now. And I should note that our estimated four year construction and related funding schedule is based on those six-month windows. So that is an important part of our planning.

And lastly, there are some PG&E pipelines, a couple, where PG&E will be required to relocate those as part of the project. And the Port and the Corps are actively coordinating with PG&E on that.

The stated purpose of the project, this is directly from the document, is to increase economic benefits associated with the reduced transportation costs of moving goods to, and should say to and from, the port; and then to provide safer navigation for

commercial marine traffic. And in lay terms, it's to accomplish exactly what Tom said before: We are trying to reduce the cost of moving goods in and out of the Port, which benefits the local, regional and national economy.

And to accomplish that, we've laid out four objectives for ourselves: To effectively and efficiently accommodate vessel traffic to the Port, Reduce maneuvering access problems in the channel, which is to say navigational safety issues, Optimize cargo capacity for the vessels calling at the Port, and then finally, to Maximize the potential for beneficial reuse of all that dredge material that we're going to produce.

And this last point is very important, it's definitely a goal of the Corps, it's a goal of EPA, it's something that we're very focused on and we're working very hard to accomplish.

We evaluated several alternatives in the document and then considered still several more. First, we of course have our environmental baseline, which is the rubric against which we determine the significance of our impacts; and we call that our Future Without Project Conditions Evaluation. Our proposed project is the course of deepening to minus

35 feet, mean lower water and then we have an alternative we've also evaluated which is deepening to minus 33 feet. Both of these alternatives also have two feet of over depth added to them. And then they both, you also include selective widening to address that navigational safety issues. There were several alternatives we looked at but ultimately dismissed and did not carry forward for co-equal evaluation. Those included things such as increasing the use of lightering aboard ships, which is the process of actually transferring cargo from ship-to-ship which is time consuming and expensive. Actually constructing locks was considered but that has a tremendous environmental impact as well as a tremendous cost. We looked at increased use of trucks, which increases costs and also has a big environmental impact associated with air quality with increasing trucking. And then we also thought about other depths, between 30-35 and you know, essentially to look at 31 or 32 or 34 was not any kind of incremental benefit so we elected to go with 33 and 35 as our primary options. And then, also, I guess you could say sorta nested beneath or above all this is this broad placement site evaluation, which I've mentioned once now, to figure out how we're going to locate those dredge material

placement sites.

This is kinda one tabular way of maybe looking at the benefits of the project. What this table shows here is a comparison of our baseline to the proposed project or the minus 35 and our primary alternative, minus 33. And if you look at the years, as they go from 2011 up to 2053, what you see is a decrease in ship calls compared to the baseline. And what you're seeing there is the effect of the deeper and wider channel, where we can move more cargo on larger ships, thereby reducing the number of ships that are accessing the Port.

We do realize that developing all of that dredge material, comes with it a responsibility to avoid and minimize the impacts of placing that material to the maximum amount practicable. And to do that, we went through a great deal of effort to develop a study whereby we identified all the potential placement sites in the broader Delta and [inaudible] study that could accommodate this material. And what we came up with was an initial list of over 124 placements sites. Then what we did is we applied a number of primary screening criteria to start to whittle these sites down. And this is where we started to look at more of the logistical and cost

implications as well as environmental issues of course being very prominent. Things such as what is the adjacent land use and how might we affect it from placing our dredging equipment, things like prime farm land that could be destroyed by filling them with dredge material, would we need one or more booster pumps which are expensive and have their own impacts and then lastly, we did attempt to avoid the use of clamshell dredging equipment. Currently the document, the Environment Impacts Analysis is based on hydraulic dredging, which is the standard for a project of this nature. We ultimately came up with 10 selected sites out of the initial list of 124. And then we further refined those sites to avoid wetlands, riparian areas and then valley oak woodland to the maximum extent feasible. And it should be noted that the development of these sites, and I have an additional slide I'm going to get to right after this one, is sorta ongoing; and we do know that at least three of these 10 sites have already been harvested for beneficial reuse which is positive and certainly a direction we want to continue to go on the project.

Here's just a map of some of the proposed placement sites. There's also this map on the poster in the back there and if folks want to scrutinize this

map further, after my presentation we'll have a short break to look at posters and consult with the technical folks here. And we— you can certainly spend time studying this map in detail.

A couple of additional beneficial reuse opportunities have come up since the draft was circulated. This is certainly an ongoing process. One is a site called the Asta site, which is approximately 43 acres. We think it has a potential capacity between one and three million cubic yards and notably would not require construction of containment berms which is a benefit for a number of reasons. And then we have industry representatives and a couple are listed here that have begun approaching the Corps and the Port and we've been reaching out looking for people who might need the sediment, trying to identify the markets and the opportunities that are out there for the sediment. These are just a couple examples. This is by no means the complete list, you know we're doing our best as we speak to talk to folks in the broader market, find out what the market is for that sediment and then develop opportunities to reuse it as best we can. And if opportunities, such as this, are determined to be feasible then we will incorporate these into the final EIS / EIR.

Of course, with developing all of this volume and placing it in these dredge material sites, we also understand there comes the responsibility to plan for the future. Which means we needs to have a plan to manage these sites, recover the volume, beneficially reuse the material and make sure that we have the capacity for O&M dredging for this deeper, wider channel. We estimate that deepening and widening to 35 would increase the annual O&M volume on the order of somewhere between 10 and 15%. To address this, the Corps is currently developing a 20 year plan for ongoing navigational maintenance and long-term management of these dredge material sites based on the proposed post-project conditions as well as our beneficial reuse evaluation and this plan will be part of the final EIS / EIR.

So to get to more now of the Environmental Impact Evaluations, we did consider all of the standard CEQA and NEPA and Clean Water Act elements in developing the document. I think the big take home messages here are these next two bullets. The first one is that with consideration of all of the mitigation measures that we've proposed, we don't have any significant, or you might say significant residual impacts, meaning after mitigation, with the exception

of 1 which is a potentially significant impact to Delta smelt critical habitat, and we're going to talk about that in a subsequent slide. I just mentioned one slide ago, I believe, that we are also considering the need – the likelihood of O&M volumes going up by approximately 10 or 15% and how we're going to plan for the future with the use of our placement sites.

And these next slides, I'm going to detail some key areas of emphasis in the document, including the salinity, aquatic and terrestrial species, air and noise.

So, salinity. This has certainly been a big area of emphasis for the Corps as part of a development of the project. And we recognized that we needed to evaluate predicted changes in salinity and hydrodynamics that would occur as a result of this deepening and widening. So what we did, or I should say what experts from the Corps and their consultants did, was develop a three-dimensional hydrodynamic model, called the Untrimmed Model that does also include sea level rise. This model was selected partially because it is supported by DWR, Contra Costa and the EPA. And we consulted with those agencies in developing our model and analyzing the output. And one thing I should want to emphasize about this model is

that the way we ran the model was under very extreme conditions. We selected a very extreme drought year, so very much our analysis in the document is based on a worst case scenario and is far above what impacts would be during a typical year.

This next slide here, I include this just for interest. There's several posters in the back that focus on this issue. This is just an example of the modeling grid. You can see the whole system that is included in the model. And then, I think on the screen you can see all the individual cells that are part of the model. So this is a very, very detailed model and like I said, there are several posters in the back dealing with this and several experts here tonight.

The key results here is that what we find when we compare the baseline and the future conditions, is we don't see any significant change in water surface elevation or flow. We do see some minimal changes in salinity but generally we're talking the difference between .13 kilometers or 130 meters and .24 kilometers or 240 meters, which we consider to be a negligible upstream shift and a less than significant impact. And again, keeping in mind the context that this observation of upstream shift is under extreme worst case conditions.

Sediment quality. Obviously we need to consider the quality of the material we're dredging before we place it into placement sites. And then also the quality of the post-dredging surface in the river. So in 2009, we conducted a project specific sampling effort with a sampling analysis plan that was reviewed with the Delta SEM group [ph.] and then we had a number of results, primarily the overall result was that the sediment is very clean, is very suitable for the purpose we intend to use it for. We did want to note two small discrete areas that did have elevated level one single point with an elevated lead concentration in river mile 23 and one single sample with an elevated mercury concentration in river mile 31. And these would both be in the native material below the— in the— that would be exposed is part of the deepening project. But we did do bioaccumulation type analyses and literature review and we did determine that the levels we were seeing were well below levels that would be expected to cause any kinda of adverse impact to aquatic organisms.

Aquatic species and habitats. I mentioned earlier that the proposed project could result in one potentially significant impact which is Delta smelt critical habitat. The Corps and the Port are currently

coordinating, early in coordination with the Fish and Wildlife Service, CDFG, regarding these effects. And we are working actively to develop additional mitigation and compensation measures to incorporate into the proposed project. So that is an ongoing issue. Impacts to all other species and critical habitat are reduced to less than significant impacts through implementation of our mitigation measure such as controls on our dredging.

Terrestrial species and habits. We have about 10— somewhere between 10 and 12, I think currently 10 acres estimated impact from placing dredge material in the placement sites. I do want to note that that number is a result of our emphasis on the placements sites screening process. Previous plans had far more impact than that so we've done a very good job reducing that down to 10 acres. These 10 acres do include some loss of— some amount of wetland, Valley Oak Wood and riparian and we have a mitigation plan for those, which I'm going to give to you in a moment, which is a wetland preservation project on Prospect Island. And then also a number of other measures such as pre-construction surveys and then doing our best to constrain construction to outside breeding seasons as much is as feasible for listed

bird species.

This is the— a map showing the Prospect Island Wetland Preservation site. This is a 300 acre site that's under the ownership of the Port and is a site that is currently in a flooded condition, and what we propose to do as part of the project and part of what we're consulting with the agency is to preserve this site in a flooded condition in perpetuity which results in a permanent protection of about 300 acres of valuable wetland habitat, which more than offsets the approximate 10 acres of impact that the project has.

Air Quality. We did a detailed analysis of air quality and I do want to emphasize that the way we look at air quality is we did our evaluation based on the future without project condition levels. Again, our baseline is what will the estimated operational conditions be at the Port and along the river without the project, approximately 50 years from now. And that's based on the economics analysis done by the Corps of Engineers. And using that data we compare that to the width project scenario and we find that by implementing some very standard and reasonable construction mitigation measures such as diesel particulate filters and selective catalytic reduction,

or SCR, technology on our dredging equipment, with implementation of these very standard construction mitigations we are below significance for air quality on this project.

Lastly, noise. All impacts we feel would be reduced to less than significant or in other words, comply with applicable noise regulations through implementation of very standard noise minimization measures or BMPs. There's one interesting area which is in the area of the City of Rio Vista where the dredge prism sort of nicks, if you will, the official boundary of the City. Which means that we need to obtain a noise variance from the City of Rio Vista to work 24 hours a day because of the dredge prism comes in contact with the city boundary, but other than that we do feel that all noise impacts will be less than significant.

So, in terms of next steps we had the initial public scoping meeting for this project in June of 2008, a baseline conditions report or that's really the first part of the environmental document was completed towards the end of 2009. And of course, here we are now, with a draft document on the street in February. And our goal is to complete the final EIS / EIR, taking into account all comments by the summer.

The Port and the Corps' goal is to be able to get a contractor moving by the end of the current fiscal year, so it's certainly an aggressive schedule but one we feel we can meet.

And with that, that concludes this portion. I think what we're going to do now is give folks a 15 or 20 minute break to go back to the posters, talk with the technical folks that are in attendance and then we'll resume and begin the public testimony portion. I think right now we have only three people who've turn in speaker cards so I'll randomize those three folks appropriately and give ya'll 10 minutes. So we'll take a short break. Thank you.

[Short break. Meeting reconvenes.]

MR. BARNUM: We do have three, we do definitely have three questions. Ellen is already ready to go. By random chance, Ellen is going to go first. So, with that, we'll proceed. We do have the reporter over here, so if you could please spell your name out for the reporter when you get started. And 10 minutes on the clock, thank you.

[Discussion about if the microphone has been turned on.]

MS. JOHNCK: Hello. My name is Ellen Johnck, J-O-H-N-C-K. And I'm former Executive Director of Bay

Planning Coalition and am consulting back with the Coalition for awhile while we have a transition. Our new Executive Director is in Washington D.C., helping advocate for projects and ports navigation around the U.S.

The Bay Planning Coalition, just a brief word about the Coalition, we were founded 28 years ago. We're a consortium, a non-profit organization, 501 (c)(4) representing a couple hundred maritime industry related shoreline businesses around the Bay and Delta, including the ports and both the government, labor unions, recreational marinas and a broad group of professional services assisting those businesses. And we're dedicated to insuring that commerce, recreation and the environment thrive in the region.

I wanted to say some very, how shall I say, thoughtful and helpful words on this project, on the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel Project. The Coalition is tremendously excited about this project. It is a project whose time has come. We see it as the bellwether for an increasing stellar performance of the Bay Delta Region for navigation and shipping. And stellar performance as our legacy in international trade and commerce.

1990, the Bay Planning Coalition got together with the state and federal agencies that have jurisdiction, regulatory jurisdiction, over San Francisco Bay and we formed a planning program called the Long Term Management Strategy for Dredging and Dredge Material Disposal. Our implementing project for that plan was the Port of Oakland's 42 foot deepening project. And some of the concepts, or some, one major concept we had in that Long Term Program was how can we beneficially reuse dredge material from that project; and we've continued on with the planning program and the Port of Oakland and other projects in Central Bay.

Several years later, we saw the need for a similar program up here in the Delta region. And we created the Delta Long Term Management Strategy for Dredging and Beneficial Reuse. And finally, we have an implementing project for this planning program and that is the project before you tonight.

I want to congratulate the Port of West Sacramento, Anchor and the Corps for your work thus far on the Environmental Impact Report. We think the work you've done on the salinity, the endangered species evaluation, the habitat issues and the continuing work on the methyl mercury has been really

good. And, in fact, should serve as a model for, in a broader umbrella capacity, for further studies on the Delta and the Bay Delta conservation plan.

And finally, I want to encourage the Corps and the Port and Anchor to complete this document in a thorough manner, and timely. You all know that the current budget climate is very precarious. And the dollars that this project has already been authorized, we must spend those dollars otherwise they will be taken away from this project. And it would be wonderful, as I heard this afternoon, let's get a dredging contract issued awarded before the end of the fiscal year to make sure we retain those dollars. So, as I remember back several years ago when Mr. Clinton was President and he said to the Port of Oakland, "Let's get on with it." We say, "Let's get on with it." Thank you.

MR. BURNAM: We'll call Marc Holmes next and then after Marc, our last speaker will be David Fullerton.

MR. HOLMES: Good evening, LTC. DiCiro, Mr. Scheeler and Mr. Burnam. My name is Marc Holmes. I'm here on behalf of the Bay Institute of San Francisco. We're a non-profit organization, established in 1981. I'm here on behalf of my colleague who's actually the

expert on this project and other matters who was unable to make it tonight. I'll be very brief. The comment refers to something that Mr. Burnam you raised in your presentation. And that is that we believe that the EIR / EIS fails to address, as it should at this point, impacts particularly on Delta smelt and long-fin smelt specifically not addressing mitigation measures on impacts on spawning habitats, life history for this project and the channel, and also, hydrological impacts that affect both of those species. We understand the explanation of why that information is not there yet but think it's improper for the DEIR / EIS not to have that information before the public comments on it. So, we'll be submitting detailed written comments that elaborate on this and so that's it for my presentation tonight. Thank you very much.

MR. BARNUM: David?

Mr. FULLERTON: Thank you. My name's David Fullteron, F-U-L-L-E-R-T-O-N. I'm a principal research specialist with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. I've personally been involved in water policy for about 25 years now; studying California water and Delta issues for the entire period.

I have, basically, two areas that I would like to address. One is a comment very similar to Marc Holmes and another on the salinity impacts of the deepening of the channel.

The first one has to do with impacts to critical habitats from this project, which I think personally, is my main concern here. I think it's very important that you go on to the Fish and Game website and look at the historic Delta smelt distributions over the last five years, over even perhaps over the last 10 years. If you look at the 20 millimeter survey, which is very young smelt, they're just starting that survey right now. Or if you look at the spring Kodiak troll, which is the troll for adults right before they lay eggs. Or if you look at the larval surveys what you find is that a significant fraction of the entire population of Delta smelt is to be found in the artificial portion of the ship channel.

During the first spring Kodiak troll this year, I think it was in January, more fish were caught in the ship channel, the artificial portion of the ship channel, than were caught in the entire estuary. In other words, I think, they actually had to curtail the troll because so many were being caught. For some

reason, the ship channel is very attractive to Delta smelt. There's a lot of speculation why that might be, a lot of the biologists feel that it has a nice sandy bottom and that smelt need to lay their eggs on either cobble or sand and that may be a limiting factor in the ability of smelt to reproduce. And so, that the current kind of bathometric structure of the ship channel is extremely favorable to smelt right now, such that perhaps a sizable fraction of all the smelt in the estuary that lay eggs are doing so in the ship channel.

The concern I have is that deepening and widening of the artificial portion of the ship channel could destroy this as a spawning zone for the fish. I can't guarantee that it will destroy it but I would like to feel more confident than the comments that I saw in the document, which were basically of the effect that you thought there might be a temporary problem while the work was going on, a temporary effect on critical habitat. The concern I have is that this could be a permanent impairment, a permanent and serious bit of damage to Delta smelt critical habitat. And I think that you really can't go forward with an EIR until you've dealt with this issue. You need to figure out what the impact is going to be, how you

propose to mitigate it, assuming that you can mitigate it, and what kind of unmitigated impacts remain afterward. So, I think it's essential and even required that this be done and that the document be re-circulated so that public has a chance to look at this because this is the major impact of the project and it's not in the EIR.

My second comment has to do with the water quality. And this has to do with salinity and intrusion caused by effectively increasing the cross section of the Sacramento River due to the widening farther downstream near the confluence. I've looked at some of the technical work that was done in the appendices of the document and it looks like in normal years, there isn't a major impact to salinity. However, in dry years there does appear to be an impact. I thought I saw movement as far as a kilometer upstream, but I will need to check that. That's a higher value than what I saw in the presentation. But speaking for Metropolitan, which is one of the export water contractors; this is not a trivial thing to us. A movement of [inaudible] upstream by a kilometer could involve us having to release additional Delta outflow to compensate for the higher salinity levels, even one- or two hundred CFS increase in Delta outflow

could cost millions of dollars worth of water during critically years to the water projects. And so this will be something we have concerns about as well.

So those are the main concerns I just wanted to highlight. And we will also be presenting written comments. Thank you.

MR. BURNAM: Well, that's it in terms of people who filled out speaker cards, unless anybody else would like to say anything. I think we can conclude the hearing. Is there anybody else who wants to say anything? No? Well, with that I would just thank everyone for your attendance and participating in this public process. And we appreciate your comments.

[Meeting adjourned.]