

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

\*\*\*\*\*

AGREEMENT AND DISCLAIMER REGARDING  
DIRECT-CONNECT/ROUGH DRAFT ASCII/ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

This agreement is made between  
CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC (hereinafter "California  
Reporting") and the CLIENT (hereinafter the "Client"),  
who is an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the  
state of California.

In consideration of the delivery to the Client  
of one or more rough draft ASCII disks, hard copies of  
the rough draft transcript, or direct-connect  
transcripts, the Client agrees to the following:

The Client recognizes that a rough draft ASCII  
disk, rough draft transcript, or direct-connect  
transcript provided by California Reporting is in rough  
draft form and does not represent an official  
transcript of the proceedings recorded by California  
Reporting in that the rough draft ASCII, rough draft  
transcript, or direct-connect transcript form may  
contain untranslates, mistranslates, conflicts,  
unresearched spellings, incorrect punctuation,  
et cetera.

Therefore, the Client agrees that the  
rough draft ASCII disk, rough draft transcript, or

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 direct-connect transcript shall be used only internally  
2 within the Client's law firm and practice.

3 Further, the Client understands that there may  
4 be technical malfunctions which affect the output of a  
5 direct-connect transcript and/or ASCII disk in any  
6 format, which include, but are not limited to the  
7 following: Computer memory lockups, power failures,  
8 Client's computer malfunctioning, acts of God,  
9 et cetera, which may be beyond the reporter's control  
10 and/or ability to immediately remedy.

11 In such cases, the Client will not hold  
12 California Reporting and/or the reporter liable for the  
13 production of said direct-connect and/or rough draft  
14 ASCII on the day of the proceedings. The Client will  
15 be forwarded a rough draft by California Reporting.

16 The Client further agrees that he/she nor  
17 anyone subject to his/her control will not submit any  
18 portion of the unofficial transcript contained on a  
19 rough draft ASCII, rough draft transcript, or  
20 direct-connect transcript made therefrom to any court  
21 of law, arbitration, or mediation proceeding and will  
22 not use a rough draft ASCII disk, rough draft  
23 transcript, or direct-connect transcript made therefrom  
24 in any other manner which would involve quoting from or  
25 submitting portions from the rough draft transcript to

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT



1 (Partial rough:)

2 **CO-HEARING OFFICER DODUC:** Miss Smith, how  
3 long is your testimony?

4 **WITNESS SMITH:** My testimony is about half  
5 hour.

6 **CO-HEARING OFFICER DODUC:** Okay. Let me ask  
7 Miss Morris:

8 Your very, very short cross-examination, are  
9 your questions directed to Dr. Wilder, Dr. Greenwood  
10 and Mr. Reyes -- or Mr. Reyes?

11 **MS. MORRIS:** No. And I was just trying to  
12 use -- I'm sorry.

13 I in I was thinking that this might be faster.  
14 So I was only trying to use time. I don't need any  
15 special accommodation. I was just saying I'm available  
16 to do cross-examine today if we got to it.

17 **CO-HEARING OFFICE DODUC:** And here I was about  
18 to not grant you special accommodation but thank you  
19 for clarifying.

20 Miss Smith, let's go ahead. If it's just half  
21 an hour, let's go ahead and get through your  
22 presentation and then we will adjourn for the day.

23 **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. Mr. Hunt, could you  
24 bring up DWR-1027.

25 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1           **WITNESS SMITH:** And good afternoon, Hearing  
2 Officers?

3           **WITNESS NO. 2:** Thank you for bringing that  
4 up.

5           **WITNESS SMITH:** I am the Chief of the Modeling  
6 support branch in -- in the Department of Water  
7 Resources and prior to my position, I was the Chief of  
8 the Delta modeling section. And I began working in the  
9 Delta modeling section in 1990, so I have extensive  
10 experience in the development, calibration, application  
11 and study results analysis of Delta hydrodynamic water  
12 quality and particle tracking models.

13           I work closely with and at times direct to DWR  
14 staff and consultants as related to the salinity and  
15 water level modeling I'm going to be presenting today.

16           And so DSM-II was previously described in  
17 exhibit DWR-66 so I'm not going to repeat that  
18 information.

19           And today, as I stated, the focus of my  
20 opinion's going to be on DSM-II salinity and water  
21 level modeling for the California WaterFix Project.

22           DSM-2 receives its boundary conditions,  
23 primarily flow boundary conditions, from CalSim, so  
24 those conditions that Eric -- or Mr. Reyes described  
25 early what DSM-II uses, and the results of California

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 WaterFix H3+, or CWF H3+ will be shown in comparison  
2 with the No Action Alternative. And as Mr. Reyes'  
3 today, the BA H3+, H3 and H4 are also shown in the  
4 plots for reference and to give context.

5           Could I go to slide number two, please,  
6 Mr. Hunt.

7           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

8           **WITNESS SMITH:** Thank you.

9           The first part of my opinion focuses on the  
10 compliance of CW -- CWF H3+ with K1641 fish and  
11 wildlife salinity objectives.

12           And as you're aware, these are the objectives  
13 for the protection of water fowl in Suisun Marsh and  
14 striped Bass spawning areas in the areas of the  
15 San Joaquin River.

16           And the second part of my opinion focuses on  
17 salinity at D1641M&I and agricultural objective  
18 locations, and also at water level -- I'll have some  
19 water level results at a few locations within the  
20 Delta.

21           And the primary purpose of the second part of  
22 my opinion is to provide information to address public  
23 interest as it relates to salinity and water levels.

24           Could I go to slide plea, please.

25           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1           **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. To give a summary of my  
2 opinion, for the Suisun Marsh fish and wildlife  
3 objectives, the results for CWF H3+ are similar to the  
4 No Action Alternative.

5           For the Fish and Wildlife objective on the  
6 San Joaquin River Reach which stretches from Jersey  
7 Point to prisoners point, the model results indicate  
8 that the majority of the reach located nearer to the  
9 ocean complies with the objective, but there is a  
10 smaller section of the Reach represented by prisoners  
11 point that shows modeling that at times does not comply  
12 with the objective.

13           And this is due to lower southern Delta  
14 exports in the spring, which are primarily a result of  
15 the higher March outflows.

16           And -- and also to more restrictive OMR  
17 constraints in April and May under the California  
18 WaterFix H3+.

19           Because of these lower exports land base salts  
20 in the San Joaquin River are not exported in the model  
21 and could not be diluted by the fresher Sacramento  
22 River water.

23           And this is a modeling anomaly or artifact,  
24 and it will be explained later in more detail.

25           Could I go to slide four, please.

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

2 **WITNESS SMITH:** At the D1641M&I and  
3 agricultural salinity locations -- objective locations,  
4 CWF H3+, the easy results generally fall between H3 and  
5 H4. And the modeling results so that the objectives  
6 are met the majority of the time. And exceedances are  
7 primarily due to modeling anomalies, and it's not  
8 anticipated that the exceedances would occur in  
9 real-time operations.

10 And any small percentage of probability of  
11 exceedance is equal to or less than the No Action  
12 Alternative, except at Emmaton, which has a slighter --  
13 slightly higher probability.

14 Could I go to slide five, please.

15 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

16 **WITNESS SMITH:** Exceptions to the California  
17 WaterFix H3+ results falling between H3 and H4 occur  
18 when the higher spring outflow requirements resulted in  
19 less exports and as a result higher interior salinity  
20 south -- occurring south of the San Joaquin River. And  
21 then also the removal of the export constraints in the  
22 fall results in lower net Delta outflow and, as a  
23 result, higher salinity come in from the ocean.

24 The -- Just to be a little bit clearer, the --  
25 the removal -- the No Action Alternative does not

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT



1 contain the export constraints that the H3 and H4 have,  
2 and so that's why some of the results are -- are -- are  
3 similar to California WaterFix H3+.

4 And even with the lower net Delta fall -- the  
5 lower fall Delta outflow, the current D1641 objectives  
6 are still met.

7 And then, finally, water level results for the  
8 California WaterFix are similar to H3 and H4, and the  
9 differences in minimum water levels are greatest nearer  
10 the north Delta diversion location, which is expected,  
11 and occur during the higher flow periods.

12 Could we go to slide Number 6, please.

13 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

14 **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. Moving on to the  
15 details of my opinion.

16 I will start with the fish and wildlife  
17 objectives and then move to the results for public  
18 interest.

19 So on Table 1, this shows -- it's just a  
20 reference table, and it shows the objectives for the --  
21 the fish and wildlife salinity objectives. And I'm  
22 going to be focusing mostly on the Suisun Marsh  
23 objectives first, which are the -- the lower left-hand  
24 corner of the table.

25 So could I go to Page 7, please.

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1           (Exhibit displayed on screen.) or -- I'm  
2 sorry, yes. There we go.

3           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

4           **WITNESS SMITH:** So Figure L1 shows the  
5 locations of the Suisun Marsh objective locations.

6           I'm going to be starting with the Sacramento  
7 River at Collins villain then moving upward and left  
8 when I presenter the results.

9           So could I go to slide eight, please.

10          (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

11          **WITNESS SMITH:** Thank you.

12          Starting on Page 8, the results are presented  
13 as a probability of compliance graphs. Only the  
14 results for the time periods when the objectives are in  
15 place are plotted.

16          The Y-Axis are the difference between the  
17 modeling results and the D1641 objectives, similar to  
18 what Mr. Reyes Had presented.

19          And when the results are less than zero, where  
20 that dotted dashed line is shown, the salinity values  
21 are better or less than the D1641 objective.

22          And when the results are greater than where  
23 that dotted dashed line is shown, then the results are  
24 higher or worse than the objective.

25          The magenta line shows results for the CWF H3+

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 and the black line shows the results for the No Action  
2 Alternative.

3 So, for the Sacramento River at Collinsville,  
4 Figure C1, the majority of the time, I'd say greater  
5 than 95 percent, the CVP H3+ results are better or meet  
6 the objective.

7 For the times that the results may indicate an  
8 exceedance of the objectives, the results for the No  
9 Action Alternative and the California WaterFix H3+ are  
10 similar.

11 Go to Slide 9, please.

12 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

13 **WITNESS SMITH:** The results for Montezuma a  
14 slough at national steel, Figure C2, indicates that the  
15 results are better, better water salinity quality than  
16 the D1641 objectives.

17 Slide 10, please.

18 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

19 **WITNESS SMITH:** The salinity results at  
20 Montezuma Slough near Beldon's Landing, Figure C3, show  
21 that more than 97 percent of the time the salinity is  
22 better or meets the objectives.

23 For the small percentage of time where CWF H3+  
24 exceeds the objectives, both the No Action Alternative  
25 and the California WaterFix H3 plus results are

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 similar.

2 Could you go to slide 11, please.

3 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

4 **WITNESS SMITH:** At Chadbourne Slough near

5 Sunrise Duck Club, follow -- that also follows a

6 similar pattern and Montezuma Slough results.

7 Could you go to Page 12, please, or Slide 12,

8 please.

9 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

10 **WITNESS SMITH:** The results at Suisun Slough,

11 300 feet south of Volanti Slough, follow -- also follow

12 a similar pattern as the previous graphs, with the

13 small probability -- possibility of exceeding the

14 objectives.

15 So the exceedance in the Suisun Marsh salinity

16 objectives are primarily -- sorry, it's late in the

17 afternoon -- a result of modeling anomalies or

18 artifacts that Dr. Nader-Terani (\*) SKREUPB Page 65,

19 DWR-5 errata, and in DWR-66, Page 8.

20 DSM-II exceedances are more likely more

21 related to the differences between CalSim and DSM-II,

22 including the different time steps in each model.

23 In DWR-4 errata, Page 18, Mr. Leahigh showed

24 that STWAERP, Central Valley project objectives have

25 met the objectives 98.9 percent of the time. Both

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 Mr. Leahigh and Mr. Miller explain -- or Mr. Miller  
2 will explain how the TPHA\*EUPBLGTS tides, inflows,  
3 diversions, exports, meteorological effects and water  
4 quality stations, and adjust operations accordingly to  
5 avoid exceeding the objectives.

6 This cannot be fully approximated by the  
7 models.

8 Could I go to the next slide, please.

9 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

10 **WITNESS SMITH:** The next objective I will  
11 cover is the San Joaquin River fish and wildlife  
12 quality -- wildlife water quality objectives.

13 The objective is along a segment of the  
14 San Joaquin River stretching from Prisoners Point to  
15 Jersey Point. Figure L2 on Slide 18 shows the  
16 objective.

17 The difference between prisoners point and  
18 Jersey Point is about 11 and three-quarters mile. The  
19 distance between San Andreas Landing and Prisoners  
20 Point is approximately 3 miles. The water in that  
21 segment can be a combination of swabbing flow flowing  
22 from the south to the north then west, could not  
23 assumes and Mokelumne River flow flooring down for the  
24 north and south fork of the Mokelumne and then into  
25 little put slough. Sacramento River water through the

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 cross channel when opened to the north and south forks  
2 of the Mokelumne. And the Sacramento River flowing  
3 through Georgiana Slough and Sacramento River back east  
4 with the tides, and then water flowing from the ocean  
5 and also Delta sources. So that can make up the water  
6 in those locations (\*).

7 I'll show results from Jersey Point first and  
8 then I'll move which is ward to the San Joaquin River  
9 at San Andreas Landing and then to the San Joaquin  
10 River at Prisoners Point.

11 I will focus on CWF H3+ as the results to the  
12 No Action Alternative, and the results are shown for  
13 the period that the objective is in place. So the .44  
14 Millie modes per centimeter is in place, which is in  
15 April and May.

16 Operations have shown, as in Mr. Reyes'  
17 testimony, DWR-1028 and DWR-1016, for both the No  
18 Action Alternative and the WaterFix H3+, the cross  
19 channel is closed, so there is no flow from the Sac  
20 moving into the north and south forks of the Mokelumne,  
21 and the S -- San Joaquin River i.e. ratio is included.  
22 And then for the California WaterFix H3+ as compared to  
23 the No Action Alternative, there are updated spring  
24 outflow criteria not contained in the No Action  
25 Alternative. And to me, the outflow requirement, as

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 Mr. Raise described previously, Delta H(\*) exports are  
2 curtailed at times in the California WaterFix H3+, and  
3 we're seeing that primarily in March.

4 California WaterFix H3+ has a Head of Old  
5 River Gate that assumes 50 percent flow that would  
6 normally flow into Old River moving into Old River, and  
7 there is no barrier for the No Action Alternative.

8 So what I'm going to show is that the results  
9 at Jersey Point and San Andreas Landing, they contain  
10 more of the Sacramento fresher water. And that's --  
11 Those station results reflect water coming in from  
12 Georgiana Slough and then moving around through  
13 three-mile slew and into the San Joaquin River.

14 Prisoners Point modeling results will more  
15 reflect the flows from the Mokelumne, a San Joaquin  
16 River, the could not assumeness and possibly other  
17 in-Delta sources.

18 Southern Delta exports downstream of the  
19 San Joaquin River at the head of Old River, if high  
20 enough, will normally move the higher salinity  
21 San Joaquin River water throughtout Old River Turner cut,  
22 middle cut, and Old River (\*). Without that movement,  
23 a portion of the water that would have been exported  
24 remains in the San Joaquin River.

25 So, sorry, I went on a bit with that. But

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 let's move on to Slide 14, please.

2 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

3 **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. So the -- the salinity  
4 modeling results for the San Joaquin River at Jersey  
5 Point are shown here in Slide 14. And as you can see  
6 based on my description before, the California WaterFix  
7 H3+ and the No Action Alternative are better than the  
8 observe so they meet or better than the objective.

9 So -- and also the difference between the No  
10 Action Alternative and the California WaterFix H3+, so  
11 you're looking at the magenta line for the California  
12 WaterFix H3+ and the black line for the No Action  
13 Alternative, are reflective of increased land salts  
14 contained in the San Joaquin River.

15 So let's go to Slide 15, please.

16 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

17 **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. C7, San Joaquin River  
18 at San Andreas Landing. Again, the results are  
19 generally fresher than Jersey Point due to fresher  
20 water source moving in from Georgiana Slough, and the  
21 objective at San Andreas Landing is met for all  
22 alternatives.

23 Can we move on to Slide 16, please.

24 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

25 **WITNESS SMITH:** At Prisoners Point, Figure C8,

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT



1 Page 16, the modeling results indicate that the  
2 California WaterFix H3+ alternative meets or better  
3 than the objective more than 87 percent of the time.

4 The No Action Alternative meets or is better  
5 than the objectives more than 97 percent of the time.

6 And since Prisoners Point is upstream of the  
7 San Andreas Landing and Jersey Point, it contains less  
8 ocean water, so the higher salinity values are  
9 reflective of land -based salts.

10 The difference between the No Action  
11 Alternative and the H3 eye California H3+ results is  
12 primarily due to the reduction in southern Delta  
13 exports to meet higher outflow requirements, and also  
14 stronger OMR constraints.

15 The exceedance occur primarily in dry years  
16 whether the San Joaquin River salinity is higher, and  
17 it is my opinion that the removal of water at the  
18 northern intake locations is not the reason for the  
19 higher salinity on it Prisoners Point.

20 Approximately 93 percent of the objectives  
21 segments show results that meet or better than the  
22 objective all of the time.

23 If looking at the objectives when they're --  
24 they're met, it's about 2 miles of between San Andreas  
25 and Prisoners Point that -- where there would be

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 exceedance the way the modeling is done.

2           So about -- the other 7 percent or about  
3 2 miles, meets the objectives more than 87 percent of  
4 the time.

5           So this exceedance shown by modeling can  
6 primarily be addressed by -- in real-time operations.

7           Mr. Munévar and DWR-71, Page 5, described how  
8 CalSim II meets salinity requirements in the Delta.  
9 Prisoners Point is not one of the locations that has a  
10 flow salinity relationship simulated and, therefore,  
11 was not captured by the modeling.

12           So this completes the part of my presentation  
13 of my opinion concerning the fish and wildlife  
14 objectives for salinity.

15           And so now I'm going to move on to results for  
16 public interest.

17           So if you could go to the next slide, please.

18           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

19           **WITNESS SMITH:** And these plots are going to  
20 be shown to demonstrate the general changes to salinity  
21 in the Delta.

22           So Figure L3 shows the locations of the  
23 salinity results that I'm going to present, and they're  
24 going to be -- I'm going to present both monthly  
25 average salinity results and probability of compliance

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 plots.

2 I will start in the west at the Delta at  
3 Emmaton. I'll move over to Jersey Point, then to  
4 San Andreas Landing, eastward to Terminous, then south  
5 to Old River at Tracy Road and Brandt Bridge, then to  
6 Contra Costa Canal, conclude south and finally north to  
7 Barker Slough.

8 So could I go to slide 18, please.

9 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

10 **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. Figure EC1, Page 18,  
11 shows the monthly average results for Emmaton, and we  
12 left the shaded area in as in Part 1, and that's just  
13 represents a period without the D1641 objectives.

14 The first black bar is the No Action  
15 Alternative. The second light blue bar is H3. The  
16 third green bar is BA H3+. The fourth magenta bar is  
17 the California WaterFix H3+. The fifth darker blue bar  
18 is H4.

19 And the purpose of these graphs is to show  
20 comparison of the results on a monthly basis. There is  
21 no indication in these plots on whether or not the  
22 alternatives are meeting the D1641 objectives.

23 So, again, the magenta bar is the CWF H3+, and  
24 the black bar is the No Action Alternative.

25 And generally the California WaterFix H3+

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 results are similar to the No Action Alternative.

2           During July, August and September, the  
3 California WaterFix H3+ is higher than the No Action  
4 Alternative, closer in salinity values to H3 and H4.

5           There are differences for the California  
6 WaterFix H3+ as compared to H3 and H4 in October and  
7 November, which reflect changes in the export  
8 restrictions described by Mr. Raise that resulted in a  
9 reduction of the Delta outflow.

10           The pattern between the California WaterFix  
11 H3+ and the No Action Alternative are similar as the No  
12 Action Alternative also does not contain the export  
13 constraints.

14           Could I go to Page 19, please.

15           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

16           **WITNESS SMITH:** Thank you.

17           Okay. Figure EC2 shows results for Jersey  
18 Point.

19           The California -- the results for California  
20 WaterFix H3+ are similar or better than the No Action  
21 Alternative. For July, August and September, the  
22 California WaterFix H3+ results are better than the No  
23 Action Alternative.

24           October and November results reflect a change  
25 in export restrictions with H3 and H4 and BA H3+.

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1           Again, the pattern during the October,  
2 November, is similar for California WaterFix H3+ and  
3 the No Action Alternative due to both simulations not  
4 containing the export constraints.

5           Can I move on to Slide 20, please.

6           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

7           **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. The Figure EC3 shows  
8 the salinity results for San Andreas Landing, and as we  
9 move inland into the Delta, EC scale is smaller. There  
10 are small differences between California WaterFix H3+  
11 and the No Action Alternative EC results. For example,  
12 the difference is less than 50 microsiemens per  
13 centimeter in October and November.

14          Next slide, please.

15          (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

16          **WITNESS SMITH:** Figure EC -- EC4 shows the  
17 results for the monthly average EC at south fork  
18 Mokelumne River at Terminous.

19          And, again, the scale is -- is finer than what  
20 we were seeing before. Results are similar for  
21 California WaterFix H3+ and the No Action Alternative.

22          Next slide, please.

23          (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

24          **WITNESS SMITH:** Figure EC5 shows the EC  
25 results for Old River at Tracy Road in the southern

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 Delta.

2 The EC results are, again, similar.

3 Next slide, please.

4 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

5 **WITNESS SMITH:** Moving just upstream of the  
6 head of Old River on the San Joaquin River at Brandt  
7 Bridge, Figure EC6 also shows that the results are  
8 quite similar.

9 Next slide, please.

10 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

11 **WITNESS SMITH:** Figure CL1 shows chloride  
12 results for Contra Costa Canal, and you'll see  
13 differences within these results. Results in November  
14 and December for CWF H3+ and the No Action Alternative  
15 show generally similar monthly average values.  
16 California H3+ is slightly higher than the No Action  
17 Alternative in November, and in December, the  
18 California WaterFix H3+ is slightly lower.

19 The difference in November and December  
20 between CWF H3+ and H3 and H4 and the BA H3+ reflect  
21 the removal of the export constraints for California  
22 WaterFix H3+.

23 Can I go on to Slide 25.

24 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

25 **WITNESS SMITH:** Thank you.

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1           These are the results to the monthly average  
2 chloride concentration at Old River at Clifton Court.  
3 The results basically follow a similar pattern, as  
4 conclude -- or as Contra Costa.

5           Next slide, please.

6           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

7           **WITNESS SMITH:** The results for Barker Slough  
8 in the north Delta are similar as expected.

9           Next slide, please.

10          (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

11          **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. The next group of  
12 figures starting with Figure C9 at Emmaton show results  
13 from the same locations that I just showed with the  
14 monthly average plots, but these results are presented  
15 as probability of compliance graphs for D1641. And,  
16 again, only the results that fall within the D1641  
17 objective compliance periods are plotted. And the  
18 Y-Axis values are the objective values subtracted from  
19 the results. And any model results that are below the  
20 line, the red dotted dashed line, indicate better water  
21 quality or that they're meeting the objective.

22          So at Emmaton, the CWF H3+ model results meet  
23 the objective more than 80 percent of the time, and as  
24 stated previously, these exceedances are a result of  
25 modeling artifacts similar to what I stated previously.

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1           And then Slide 28.

2           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

3           **WITNESS SMITH:** Thank you.

4           At Jersey Point, Figure C-10.

5           Delta modeling results meet or are better than  
6 the objective more than 90 percent of the time. And  
7 the -- the California WaterFix H3+ meets the  
8 objective -- actually, more than meet oh, no action  
9 alternative.

10           Can I go to Slide 29, please.

11           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

12           **WITNESS SMITH:** For Figure C11, San Andreas  
13 Landing, the California WaterFix H3+ shows results that  
14 the objective is met 100 percent of the time.

15           So can I go on to the next results -- or the  
16 next slide, please.

17           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

18           **WITNESS SMITH:** At Terminous, the California  
19 WaterFix H3+ are better than the D1641 objects  
20 100 percent of the time.

21           Could I go to the next slide, please.

22           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

23           **WITNESS SMITH:** For Contra Costa Canal,  
24 results for CWF H3+ and No Action Alternative are  
25 similar, meeting or better than the objective more than

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT



1 92 percent of the time.

2 Could I go to the next slide, please.

3 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

4 **WITNESS SMITH:** Thank you, Mr. Hunt.

5 Figure C14 shows the number of days in a year  
6 meeting the mean daily 15-milligram per liter chloride  
7 objective at Contra Costa Canal pumping plant number  
8 one.

9 The blue area plot shows the D1641 objectives.  
10 If the lines are above, the objective is met. If the  
11 lines are below, then the objective's being exceeded.

12 The DSM-II modeling results for CWF H3+ meets  
13 the objective except in the critical year 1977 along  
14 with the other alternatives plotted. And, again, as  
15 previously explained by Dr. Nader-Terani in Part 1, the  
16 exceedances are mostly a result of differences in model  
17 assumptions and STWAERP CVP operations have been able  
18 to meet the regular -- regulatory obligations and  
19 achieve a high degree of compliance as testified by  
20 Mr. Leahigh in Part 1.

21 Could I go to slide 33, please.

22 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

23 **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. This is the final area  
24 of my testimony. And Figure L4 shows the water level  
25 results that I'm going to present. The plots I'll be

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 showing are probability of exceedance plots, and I'm  
2 going to begin with the results from the locations that  
3 are closest to the northern Delta intake. That's the  
4 arrows pointing from the purple box there. And then so  
5 I'll go just downstream south, then into Georgiana  
6 Slough, where the largest differences are anticipated  
7 to occur. I'll then show results from Rio Vista, then  
8 Terminous and then finally Tracy Road.

9 So next slide, please.

10 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

11 **WITNESS SMITH:** Figure W1 shows the results at  
12 the Sacramento River downstream of the intakes.

13 The magenta line is the line with the other  
14 alternatives, H3, H4, BA H3+. The black line, the No  
15 Action Alternative is separate from the other lines.

16 The largest difference, as you can see, occurs  
17 in water levels when the stage is greater than two  
18 Pete. So during the higher flow periods.

19 And then during lower flows, the values shown  
20 towards the ride of the graph, there's a much smaller  
21 difference in water levels.

22 So could I go to slide 35, please.

23 (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

24 **WITNESS SMITH:** Figure W-2 on Page 35 shows  
25 results for the Sacramento River downstream of

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1 Georgiana Slough.

2           The No Action Alternative is the black line,  
3 and the other alternatives show similar results.

4           Again, the largest differences occur in water  
5 levels when the stage is greater than 1 or 2 feet. And  
6 then when the stage is below zero, the alternatives are  
7 similar to the No Action Alternative.

8           Can I go to the next slide, please.

9           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

10           **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. For Figure W3 at  
11 Rio Vista, it's California WaterFix H in re: three plus  
12 as similar results to the No Action Alternative.

13           Slide 37, please.

14           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

15           **WITNESS SMITH:** And then for the location at  
16 Terminous, again, CWF H3+ is in line with the No Action  
17 Alternative.

18           And then Page 38 or Slide 38 JoAnn.

19           **WITNESS SMITH:** And for Old River at Tracy  
20 Road, TPHA\*EUPBLG No Action Alternative results.

21           And I think I probably got through it a lot  
22 quicker than a half hour, so that concludes the -- my  
23 opinion.

24           **CO-HEARING OFFICE DODUC:** Thank you very much.

25           Miss Nickel.

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1           **LEFT2:** Meredith nickel on behalf of north  
2 Delta Water Agency.

3           I'm going to move to strike but I would love  
4 to be approved wrong.

5           When Miss Smith as discussing or testifying on  
6 Slide 16 regarding Prisoners Point --

7           **CO-HEARING OFFICE DODUC:** Let's wait and let's  
8 go back to slide 16, please.

9           **LEFT2:** And I apologize for the delay but I  
10 was checking my notes, so . . . and the written  
11 testimony.

12           (Exhibit displayed on screen.)

13           **LEFT2:** I heard Miss Smith to testify  
14 regarding 93 percent compliance in an area 2 miles  
15 above San Andreas as well as 7 percent and 83 percent  
16 of the time, and I didn't see that in her written  
17 testimony, so I would -- I would move to strike on the  
18 basis that it's improper surprise testimony unless I'm  
19 incorrect, and I would love to be proven wrong.

20           **CO-HEARING OFFICE DODUC:** Miss Smith.

21           **WITNESS SMITH:** It was not in my written  
22 testimony. I did not put the distance between the  
23 locations within my written testimony.

24           Is it the outgrowth of information elsewhere  
25 in the record?

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1           **WITNESS SMITH:** It . . . I'm -- I'm not --  
2 I'm not sure. I mean, it's just -- It's information  
3 that is probably available in the modeling results.

4           **LEFT2:** I'm not actually referring to the  
5 2 miles. It's the percentages, and the compliance  
6 percentages that I didn't see in the written testimony.

7           **WITNESS SMITH:** Okay. Well, the compliance  
8 presented -- percentages --

9           **CO-HEARING OFFICE DODUC:** Are on the chart.

10          **WITNESS SMITH:** -- shall on the graphics so  
11 I'm reporting what I see in the tables.

12           Miss Nickel, are you contesting the  
13 percentages Miss Smith cited as to not be effective in  
14 the chart.

15          **LEFT2:** They're different than in the written  
16 testimony. But if the -- if the testimony is that it's  
17 just -- she's interpreting the chart --

18          **CO-HEARING OFFICE DODUC:** That's my  
19 understanding.

20          **LEFT2:** -- then that clarification is helpful.

21          **CO-HEARING OFFICE DODUC:** Miss Smith.

22          **WITNESS SMITH:** That's correct, yes.

23          **LEFT2:** Okay. Thank you.

24          **CO-HEARING OFFICE DODUC:** You are withdrawing  
25 your objection?

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

1           **LEFT2:** I'll withdraw the motion.

2           **CO-HEARING OFFICE DODUC:** Thank you very much.

3           All right. Let's go ahead and stop before  
4 anyone else comes up with anything else.

5           Thank you, everybody. We will see you in  
6 Rancho Cordova at 9:30 on Monday.

7           (Proceedings concluded at 4:24 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ROUGH DRAFT - NOT A CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT