

1 Spencer Kenner (SBN 148930)  
James E. Mizell (SBN 232698)  
2 Emily M. Thor (SBN 303169)

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES**

3 Office of the Chief Counsel  
1416 9<sup>th</sup> St., Room 1104  
4 Sacramento, CA 95814  
Telephone: 916-653-5966  
5 E-mail: jmizell@water.ca.gov

6 Attorneys for California Department of Water  
Resources

7  
8 **BEFORE THE**

9 **CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD**

10 **HEARING IN THE MATTER OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES**  
12 **AND UNITED STATES BUREAU OF**  
13 **RECLAMATION REQUEST FOR A CHANGE**  
14 **IN POINT OF DIVERSION FOR CALIFORNIA**  
15 **WATER FIX**

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF**  
**WATER RESOURCES' RESPONSE**  
**TO THE CALIFORNIA STATE**  
**WATER RESOURCES CONTROL**  
**BOARD JULY 9, 2018, RULING**

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 In response to the Board's July 9, 2018, Ruling on Save the California Delta  
22 Alliance's motion for continuance the Department of Water Resources ("DWR") has  
23 reviewed the descriptions of barge operations for the Approved Project and the Proposed  
24 Project in the Administrative Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS. This information is summarized  
25 below.  
26  
27  
28

1           **I.       Summary of Barge Descriptions**

2           **Final EIR**

3           Commercial barges will be used under Alternative 4A to transport tunnel segments and  
4 other materials to Bouldin Island and Clifton Court Forebay. (SWRCB-102, Final EIR/EIS, page  
5 19-360.) "Approximately 11,800 barge trips are projected to carry tunnel segments from  
6 existing precast yards to project sites via the Sacramento River and other waterways,  
7 averaging approximately 4 roundtrips per day for approximately 5.5 years." (SWRCB-102, page  
8 19-360.) There would be seven barge unloading facilities. (SWRCB-102, page 19-368.) The  
9 potential effect of these barge trips is not considered adverse under NEPA and less than  
10 significant under CEQA for Impact TRANS-4: Disruption of Marine Traffic during Construction.  
11 (SWRCB-102, page 19-360.)

12           **Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact**  
13 **Report, July 2017**

14           Under the approved project, the frequency of barge trips would be restricted based on  
15 the time of the year as detailed below. (SWRCB-108, Developments after Publication, page  
16 104.) Between November through February only trips between Stockton and Bouldin Island  
17 would be allowed. (SWRCB-108, page 104.) Between March through May only critical heavy  
18 construction equipment would be moved. (SWRCB-108, page 104.) Plans will be developed  
19 regarding surface transportation. (SWRCB-108, page 104.) These limitations could increase  
20 the need to use surface transportation. (SWRCB-108, page 105) This potential increase in  
21 surface transportation "would not require disclosure of a new significant impact and no  
22 additional mitigation measures would be needed to reduce these additional potential truck  
23 traffic effects." (SWRCB-108, page 105.)

24           **Administrative Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS**

25           Under the modifications in the Administrative Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS there would  
26 only be 5 barge landing sites: Venice Island, Bacon Island, Victoria Island, Bouldin Island, and  
27 Mandeville Island. (SWRCB-113, Administrative Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS, page 19-36.)  
28 Most of the barge traffic would occur "outside of the morning and evening vehicle commute

1 periods." (SWRCB-113, page 19-36). The Administrative Draft Supplemental EIR/EIS estimates  
2 that number of barge trips to be 11,800 to carry tunnel segment liners "averaging approximately  
3 4 roundtrips per day during construction of the water conveyance features for up to 5.5 years."  
4 (SWRCB-113, page 19-37.)

5 **National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion for the California WaterFix Project**

6 The NMFS Biological Opinion for California WaterFix evaluated barge traffic in Section  
7 2.5.1.1.1.2 Barge Traffic. (SWRCB-106, NMFS Biological Opinion for California WaterFix.) This  
8 evaluation was based on having seven barge landing locations, the two main ones being Clifton  
9 Court Forebay and Bouldin Island. (SWRCB-106, page 151.) The total number of barge trips  
10 was approximated at 9,400. (SWRCB-106, page 152.) The number of barge trips for each  
11 barge landing location is detailed in Table 2-33 and Table 2-34 of this document. (SWRCB-106,  
12 pages 153 and 154.)

13 **II. Information Requested by the Board's July 9, 2018, Ruling**

14 Upon review of the descriptions in these documents, DWR recognizes that there are  
15 some inconsistencies in the number of barge trips. The information requested by the Board in  
16 its July 9, 2018, Ruling is addressed by the testimony of John Bednarski, who will be available  
17 for cross-examination. (DWR-1212, Testimony of John Bednarski.)

18 **Clarification regarding the number and distribution of estimated barge trips**

19 Regarding the number of barge trips estimated at 5,500 in the summary beginning  
20 Chapter 19 of the Final EIR/EIS, this should have been clarified as to be for barge trips for  
21 tunnel segments only. (SWRCB-102, page 19-1; DWR-1212, page 14, line 26 to page 15, line  
22 5.) The number of barge trips used for analyzing potential effects in the Final EIR/EIS was  
23 11,800, which would include all barge traffic. (SWRCB-102, Figure 19-0 and page 19-360;  
24 DWR-1212, page 14, line 6.) After consultation with NMFS the number was reduced to 9,400.  
25 (SWRCB-106, Section 2.5.1.1.1.2.; DWR-1212, page 14, lines 7-9.)  
26  
27  
28

1 **Any changes to barge routes in light of the elimination of barge landing facilities**

2 The barge routes remain the same as those detailed in the NMFS Biological Opinion,  
3 with one exception. (DWR-1212, page 14 lines 12-16.) The deliveries that originally were going  
4 to go to Clifton Court Forebay are now going to go to the Byron Tract Forebay site. (DWR-  
5 1212, page 14 lines 12-16.)

6 **Information regarding any redirected construction-related impacts stemming from**  
7 **changes to barge landing facilities, barge routes, or the number of barge trips**

8 Under the Approved Project there is the potential for increased truck traffic resulting  
9 from a reduction on barge trips, however this change would not result in a new significant  
10 impact nor would additional mitigation measures be needed. (DWR-1212, page 15 lines 6-12.)  
11 Reduced impacts are anticipated from the project modifications in the Administrative Draft  
12 Supplemental EIR/EIS. (DWR-1212, page 15 lines 12-14.)

13 **III. Conclusion**

14 John Bednarski's testimony addresses all questions raised in the Board's July 9, 2018,  
15 Ruling and he will be available for cross examination.

16  
17  
18  
19 Executed on this 10th day of July, 2018 in Sacramento, California.

20  
21   
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 Emily M. Thor  
24 Attorney  
25 California Department of Water Resources  
26  
27  
28