Final EIR/EIS Unresolved Comments – Meeting Agenda



**Affordable Water, Sustainably Managed**

|  |
| --- |
| Our Core Values – Safety, Trust and Integrity, Respect for Local Communities, Environmental Stewardship, Shared Responsibility and Shared Benefits, Accountability and Transparency, Proactive Innovation, Diversity and InclusivityOur Commitment – To live up to these values in everything we do |
| Meeting Information: |
| Date: | July 28, 2023 | Location: | Teams |
| **Start Time:** | 8:00 a.m. | Finish Time: | 9:00 a.m. |
| Purpose: | Meeting to discuss unresolved comments from SES/SOC review |
| Meeting Participants: |
| Marc Bruner, Perkins CoieMonique Briard, ICFAriel Cohen, HDR | Melissa Dekar, Reclamation Ali Forsythe, Sites AuthorityMelissa Harris, ICF | Allison Jacobson, ReclamationAllison Mitchell, DOILaurie Warner Herson, Integration |
| Agenda: |
| Discussion Topic | Topic Leader | Time Allotted |
| * 1. Introductions
 | Laurie/All | 5 min |
| * 1. EIR/EIS definitions for:
		1. No Project Alternative
		2. No Action Alternative
		3. Environmental Baseline
		4. Rationale for equating
 | Melissa H | 10 min |
| * 1. Unresolved comments from recent back check:

Chapter 2* Comments regarding equating No Action Alternative to existing conditions
	+ Clarify in 2.4
* Use of existing conditions and baseline conditions interchangeably (also global)
* Inaccurate characterization of the BiOps “the NAA for the current reconsultation is the 2019 BiOps, 2020 ROD and State ITP”
	+ Further discussion
* Clarification on the comments received on discussion of “obligations in the 2019 NMFS ROC on LTO BiOp to implement the Yolo Bypass Restoration Salmonid Habitat Restoration and Fish Passage Implementation Plan”

  Chapter 3 (interestingly, no unresolved comments on baseline discussion)* Discussion of pre-project (CVP) water rights
* Reclamation’s implementation of contracts

Master Response 1* “Would further NEPA be conducted, if necessary, if/when the VAs are solidified to a point where they could be analyzed with sufficient detail?”- litigation risk
	+ Not including at this point

Master Response 2* Explanation for future use of CALSIM 3 – “it sounds like you are doing analysis after-the-fact”
	+ Cite back to explanation
* Confirm deletion of “unless released from Shasta for flood flow purposes”

Global* Comparison of alternatives to the NAA
* Need to address all alternatives in impact discussions rather than “Project”
	+ Review
 | Melissa H/Melissa D | 30 min |
| * 1. Action Items
 | All | 5 min |