



FINAL
Approved by Advisory Committee on August 25, 2025
SUMMARY
Paradise Cut Bypass Expansion And Multi-Benefit Project
Advisory Committee Meeting
City of Lathrop
April 21, 2025 | 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM

Committee Members (Present):

Darren Suen, San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency
John Herrick, South Delta Water Agency
Sarah Puckett, American Rivers
Bob Pombo, Reclamation District 2095
Greg Pombo (Alternate for Alexis Steven), Reclamation District 2058, 1007
Nick Mussi, Reclamation District 1, 2, 544, 2089
Jesus Esparza, Department of Water Resources (non-voting)
Andrea Buckley, Central Valley Flood Protection Board (non-voting) (via Zoom)
Lauren Damon, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Conservancy (non-voting)

Committee Members (Absent):

Robin Kloepfer, City of Tracy
Susan Dell'Osso, Reclamation District 2062

Other In-Person Attendees:

Glenn Prasad, SJAFCA
Leanne Randall, SJAFCA
Petrea Marchand, Consero Solutions
Laura Duffy, Consero Solutions
Ric Reinhardt, Wood Rodgers
Melissa Weymiller, LWA

Zoom Attendees:

Betty Andrews, Central Valley Flood Protection Board
Dave Weisenburg, Banta-Carbona Irrigatino District
Phil Balmat, San Joaquin County Resources Conservation District
Daniel DeGraaf, RD 2085 and 2095
Scott Peterson, San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority
Steve Mayo, San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan
Taylor Reed, Office of Representative Josh Harder
J.W. Collins, Office of the Delta Watermaster
Tiffany Cacho, San Joaquin County
Jafar Faghieh, HDR
Avery Livengood, HDR

HIGHLIGHTS

Administrative Matters

- J. Herrick, Advisory Committee Chair, called the meeting to order.
- L. Randall called the roll and established a quorum. Advisory Committee members Darren Suen, John Herrick, Sarah Puckett, Bob Pombo, Greg Pombo, Nick Mussi, Jesus Esparza, Andrea Buckley (attended on Zoom), and Lauren Damon were present. Robin Kloepfer and Susan Dell'Osso were absent.
- L. Duffy read out the list of Zoom attendees.
- P. Marchand thanked everyone for joining the meeting. She introduced Darren Suen, the new Executive Director of SJAFCA as of January 2025. She said D. Suen is a member of the Advisory Committee and is replacing former General Manager Chris Elias. D. Suen introduced himself.

Approve 12/2/24 Meeting Summary (Attachment A)

- J. Herrick said the first item on the agenda is to approve the December 2, 2024 Advisory Committee meeting summary (Attachment A). Motion: S. Puckett motioned to approve the December 2, 2024 Advisory Committee meeting summary with the change that Leticia attended via Zoom; second N. Mussi Motion passed 6-0.

Recommend approval of updated Paradise Cut Bypass Expansion and Multi-Benefit Project Engagement Strategy to SJAFCA (Attachment B)

- J. Herrick said he will turn it over to P. Marchand for the next item, recommending approval of the updated Engagement Strategy to SJAFCA.
- P. Marchand provided an update on the engagement SJAFCA has completed since the last Advisory Committee meeting in December 2024. The Project Team has met with the State Water Resources Control Board staff and the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan staff. In February, the Project Team met with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. The Project Team also held a workshop for all reclamation districts to provide input on the seven preliminary alternatives. In April, the Project Team met with the Delta Stewardship Council. She said the item before the Advisory Committee is to recommend approval of the updated Paradise Cut Bypass Expansion and Multi-Benefit Project Engagement Strategy to SJAFCA and introduced M. Weymiller from LWA to describe the changes outlined in the staff report. P. Marchand said SJAFCA and the consultant team had one additional edit to the engagement strategy to request verbally. She said DWR requested to move the Delta Stewardship Council to the list of secondary audiences. She said currently, the Delta Stewardship Council is on the list of primary audiences. She said the Project Team met with the Delta Stewardship Council in early April to provide an update on the Feasibility Study. She said the Project Team will still provide updates to the Delta Stewardship Council, but no longer actively solicit feedback and incorporate feedback into the Study.
- M. Weymiller reviewed the definition of primary audience and secondary audience from the Engagement Strategy. She said it is a little early to engage with the Delta

Stewardship Council because they will have a formal role in Project review after the Feasibility Study is complete. D. Suen said he thinks this is prudent. He asked if the Project Team informed the Delta Stewardship Council about the change. M. Weymiller said not yet. D. Suen suggested updating the action to include making the Delta Stewardship Council aware of this change. S. Puckett asked if timing was the main reason behind this change. M. Weymiller said yes; she said the Project Team is not ready to engage regulatory agencies on some of the details of the Project. She asked if J. Esparza had anything to add from DWR's perspective. J. Esparza said DWR's desire is to proceed with engagement with the Delta Stewardship Council after the selection of a final alternative. D. Suen said he was part of a Delta Stewardship Council briefing; he said engaging again at a later step in the process sense and would be the best use of everyone's time.

- M. Weymiller said the other major update involves the schedule. She said SJAFCA and the consultant team recommends this update to allow the Advisory Committee to provide input on the Feasibility Study's Evaluation and Comparison of Alternatives earlier in the process. She said the major change SJAFCA and the consultant team recommend is to move the August 25, 2025 Advisory Committee meeting to July 14, 2025. She said because of this change, SJAFCA will not provide the Advisory Committee the full Evaluation and Comparison of Alternatives Memo for a 10-day review in August 2025 and will instead provide a summary of the Evaluation and Comparison of Alternatives results (not the full memo) to review at least five days before the proposed July 14, 2025 meeting. She said the Advisory Committee will see the full Evaluation and Comparison of Alternatives Memo as part of the draft feasibility report. She said this is a process change and schedule change.
- P. Marchand asked if there were any other questions. J. Herrick asked for questions from Zoom. He asked for public comments. S. Puckett asked for an update on Tribal outreach and the environmental justice engagement process. M. Weymiller said SJAFCA has contracted with ESA, who will support Tribal and environmental justice outreach. She said ESA is working on sending a Tribal letter out. She said ESA is also scoped for a site visit and virtual workshop for interested Tribes. She said after ESA sends out an initial survey, SJAFCA will be engaging with environmental justice audiences. M. Weymiller to follow up with S. Puckett when SJAFCA initiates Tribal and environmental justice outreach (ACTION). G. Prasad said SJAFCA opted to vet the Tribal outreach letters with DWR. He said the letters are now ready for distribution. J. Herrick recommended SJAFCA include Restore the Delta on Tribal and environmental justice communications.
- L. Damon said regarding M. Weymiller's comment about not being ready to engage regulatory agencies, it seems like the Delta Stewardship Council would be the only regulatory agency listed as a secondary audience. L. Damon recommended asking the Delta Stewardship Council if they preferred to be a primary or secondary audience. D. Suen recommended the language in the action be to inform the Delta Stewardship Council of SJAFCA's intent to move the Delta Stewardship Council from a primary to secondary audience and ask if they are opposed. He said this will move things forward. He said he was in the last briefing with the Delta Stewardship Council and he feels like they will understand this change. He said

the intent is not to exclude; rather, it would be to align engagement efforts for when the Project Team would have more information, which would be more productive. L. Damon asked if this was part of the conversation at the briefing. D. Suen said no, but he expects it will not be a surprise.

- Motion: S. Puckett motioned to recommend approval of the updated Paradise Cut Bypass Expansion and Multi-Benefit Project Engagement Strategy to SJAFCA once SJAFCA staff confirms the Delta Stewardship Council is okay with being moved from the primary audience list to the secondary audience list in the engagement strategy; second D. Suen. Motion passed 6-0.

Paradise Cut Feasibility Study Update

- J. Herrick said G. Prasad from SJAFCA and R. Reinhardt from Wood Rodgers would provide an update on the Feasibility Study.
- G. Prasad said this item is an update and requires no action from the Advisory Committee. He said Attachment C is a staff report and Attachment D is Chapter 5 of the Feasibility Study, the Formulation of Preliminary Alternatives. He said the staff report describes some of the changes that took place between the February 21, 2025 meeting with reclamation district representatives and now. He said on February 21, 2025, the Project Team met with reclamation district representatives to receive input on seven preliminary alternatives and the screening and evaluation criteria to reduce the seven alternatives to three alternatives for further technical evaluation. He said the Paradise Cut Management Team (PCMT) had discussions at the March 6, 2025 meeting about including an alternative in the final array with an expanded weir and more ecosystem restoration. He said at the March 13, 2025 SJAFCA Board meeting, Advisory Committee Vice-Chair Puckett requested SJAFCA consider replacing one of the alternatives in the final array with an alternative with an expanded weir and more ecosystem restoration. After subsequent discussions with the Advisory Committee Vice-Chair and Chair, SJAFCA's Executive Director decided to remove Alternative 4 from the three alternatives and add a combination of Alternative 6 and 7. He said the Technical Team updated Chapter 5 to reflect this change and sent it to the Advisory Committee and reclamation districts for review on April 2, 2025. He said this information is preliminary and is not part of a CEQA framework at this time. He said additionally, the alternatives SJAFCA has laid out follows the guidelines in DWR's feasibility study framework. He introduced R. Reinhardt.
- R. Reinhardt from Wood Rodgers said in the past several months, the Technical Team got great feedback on what people did not want to see. He said in a feasibility study, it is important to look at all the options. He said you still need to look at something even if some are opposed to it; this does not mean you have to select it. He said it is not a good study unless you look at all the alternatives. He said the Technical Team has done this and has landed with a good mix. He said A. Livengood will walk through the preliminary alternatives and then he will share more about how the team arrived at the final array and the work the team is doing now to position the Advisory Committee, SJAFCA, and DWR to decide on what the preferred alternative is going to be. He asked for questions. There were no questions.
- A. Livengood from HDR provided an overview of the seven preliminary alternatives

in Chapter 5 (Attachment D). A. Livengood said there are several management actions common to all preliminary alternatives: 39 miles of dredging (at the downstream portion of Paradise Cut, Tom Paine Slough, Middle River, Western reach of Old River, the Eastern reach of Grant Line Canal, and the Four Corners area) and restoration opportunities at 12 sites on the right and left banks of the San Joaquin River. She said the restoration opportunities are considered separable, meaning any of the 12 options could be added to the selected alternative later.

- A. Livengood asked for questions. D. Suen asked what effect a 1,000 ft vs. a 2,000 ft weir would provide. A. Livengood said a greater weir expansion would take more of the flow off the San Joaquin River and routes it through Paradise Cut, so it would result in a reduction in peak stages on the San Joaquin River. L. Damon said in Alternative 5 (also referred to as the Modified Central Valley Flood Protection Plan alternative), upstream of the weir, it looks like there is a new levee setback that would run along the length of the flooded area. She said on the other alternatives there is no levee there. A. Livengood said Alternative 5 was carried forward from Phase 2 and was evaluated as part of the Phase 2 study. She said Phase 2 team identified the Modified Central Valley Flood Protection Plan alternative as promising, but noted the additional setback levee segment would come with significant additional cost. R. Reinhardt said the reason Alternative 5 was evaluated as part of the preliminary alternatives was because when Banta-Carbona, who owns some of the land where the setback levee would be, met with the Technical Team, they requested the Technical Team consider this option as they want this area to be protected. L. Damon asked what happens to the water if there is no levee there. R. Reinhardt said the land slopes up as you head to the West, so eventually water would be contained. He said the Technical Team is just getting preliminary hydraulic modelling results from Alternative 3; he said for the 100-year, the DVI levee would have to extend to Kasson Road. He said above the 100-year, water would overtop Kasson Road. He said he has not seen those results yet. He said the Technical Team will have this information (what the floodplain looks like without the levee segment) when they present the final array to the Advisory Committee. J. Herrick said depending on the results, would the Technical Team know whether the levee would be a mitigation levee? R. Reinhardt said yes; the potential options would be flowage easements or building a new levee.
- A. Livengood reviewed the seven evaluation criteria from Chapter 5 (Attachment D). A. Livengood reviewed the results of the evaluation of preliminary alternatives from Chapter 5 (Attachment D). She said in this stage, some of the evaluation is qualitative, but in the next stage the Technical Team will be analyzing quantitative data to evaluate the final three alternatives.
- R. Reinhardt provided an overview of the three alternatives in the final array of alternatives after application of the criteria to the seven preliminary alternatives. He said at a high level, the evaluation and comparison of preliminary alternatives helped the Technical Team understand how the alternatives might be tweaked in the final array. He said this evaluation helped the team understand how the preliminary alternatives could and should be modified into a slightly different

alternative in the final array. He said when he started on the study, there were concerns about the cost estimates for the Phase 2 alternative. He said the team wanted to look an alternative that would be less expensive than the Phase 2 alternative, which is why the team recommended Alternative 2 (Minimum Plan B) be carried forward. He said one of the key differences between Alternative 2 (Minimum Plan B) in the set of preliminary alternatives and the slightly modified version the team recommends today is that there would be two setbacks instead of one. He said the other change is adding the Kisst Dairy setback and the setback at Bend 16, which was a decision the team made after getting input from the landowner. He reviewed the slide outlining all features of the alternative.

- R. Reinhardt said the next alternative in the final array is the modified Phase 2 Plan. He reviewed the slide outlining all features of the alternative. He said the cost of the railroad opening was such an uncertainty, the team decided to accelerate the development of that cost estimate. He said during the preliminary evaluation, the team developed cost estimates for a 250-foot opening and a 500-foot opening and learned there was not a significant difference in cost. He said this was because the significant cost related to the railroad is the shoefly that needs to be built, rather than the openings themselves. He said the cost estimate also demonstrated the opening needed to be pushed farther to the west, so the setback is in a slightly different place. He said this alternative also includes a levee setback at Kisst Dairy and Bend 16. He said the team is looking at developing a cost for moving water under 1-5, which would require building new bridges. The initial cost estimate is over \$100 million but the team will come back to the Advisory Committee with an update after further evaluation. He said there would also be traffic impacts. He said for all of the alternatives, there is a high bench that goes under I-5 and 205 and there may be a hydraulic benefit and habitat value if the bench was lowered.
- R. Reinhardt said the next alternative is Alternative 6 (Phase 2 Plan Plus Modifications). He said G. Prasad touched on this change earlier. He said there was a lot of dialogue with Vice Chair Puckett about having a larger scale alternative in the final array. He said this alternative is a modified version of Alternative 6 with elements of Alternative 7 from the preliminary alternatives. He said the team has thought about all of these alternatives as being expandable, particularly given the funding sources the team would likely be pursuing, which would make it difficult to build a large project like this all at once. He said this alternative is a larger alternative but could act as a roadmap for where we are heading. He said Alternative 6 (Phase 2 Plan Plus Modifications) includes replacing the 1,000-ft weir with a new 2,000 ft weir. He reviewed the slide outlining all features of the alternative. R. Reinhardt asked for questions.
- D. Suen said the comment R. Reinhardt shared about Caltrans emphasized how important the conversation about cost will be. He said all of us need to keep in mind we will all have to compromise to make this feasible. He said he appreciated the inclusion of a scalable alternative. He said it is important to recognize cost constraints.
- J. Herrick asked for other Advisory Committee comments. J. Esparza said from DWR's perspective, the Technical Team did a good job capturing the bookends of the project, specifically comparing smaller-scale cost-effective projects to larger

scale, more expensive options. J. Herrick said this has been an idea for many years and now the group can get into more detail on costs and other changes. He said he appreciated the Technical Team's work. J. Herrick asked for online comments. There were no online comments. J. Herrick asked for public comments. There were no public comments.

Operations and Maintenance (O&M) discussion

- R. Reinhardt said as the Advisory Committee is aware, how operations and maintenance (O&M) of the Project would be funded is a significant issue, as is how to help the districts that would be smaller or have a lower assessment base because some of their lands will go into the floodway. He said the alternatives include either an extended Paradise weir or a new weir that would have to be maintained. He said he started looking into what is known about the existing system and who has responsibility for it. He said it is clear the Paradise weir, called the Paradise Dam in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer 1956 design memorandum, was part of the federal project turned over to the State of California at the time there was a reclamation board for O&M. He said interestingly, it is not identified in the State Plan of Flood Control descriptive document which describes everything that was part of the State Plan of Flood Control. He said Paradise Weir is not in the document. He said the Project Team has been working with DWR to understand why. He said he pulled one of the assurance agreements. He said the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers requires the nonfederal sponsor to agree to operate and maintain; the State turns around and passes many of those responsibilities on to a local agency. He said an interesting clause from one of the assurance agreements says the State was intending to turn over all O&M of the system to locals. He said this appears to be the intent; whether they did it or not is another story and is a question that is not possible to answer today. He said that is where some of the loose ends are.
- R. Reinhardt read a section of an assurance agreement for the Lower San Joaquin River and Tributaries Project: "to maintain and operate, in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, all levee and channel improvements together with all other project works within the jurisdiction or boundaries of [the RD]." He said one of the questions is, do the reclamation district's boundaries end at the levee? Or do they end at the channel? He said if they end at the levee, it seems like the reclamation district does not have responsibility and that needs to be sorted out with the State, who signed the assurance agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He said if they go to the center of the channel, there is a whole other debate; this has not been the case. He said this has not been the practice, this does not show up in inspection reports, and the reclamation districts are not funded to do it.
- R. Reinhardt said the O&M manual has a generic description of the channels. He said there is detailed description of what maintenance is required of the levees but almost no information of what needs to be done with the channels. He said where this becomes an issue today is the Paradise weir is not functioning as intended. He said whether there was a design deficiency or an O&M problem is unresolved, but the physical solution is there is a bench downstream of the weir that could be lowered and there is some riparian vegetation in the channel between the Union

Pacific Railroad East and I-5 that could be thinned. He said if you did those two things, it would restore the design capacity. He said a more immediate concern is someone probably needs to take that action. He said he knows the Central Valley Flood Protection Board is interested in resolving the question of who has authority.

- R. Reinhardt said one of the SJAFCA deliverables is the Paradise Cut Land and Easement Acquisition Strategy Memo. He said as part of this effort, what the Technical Team concluded is the South San Joaquin Drainage District (SSJD), the entity that holds the easements for the State, does not have easements for most of Paradise Cut. He said even if it is determined the jurisdictional boundaries of the reclamation districts go to the center of the channel, they do not have the land rights to allow them to do that maintenance. He said the Project Team turned the memo over to Central Valley Flood Protection Board staff to verify this is the correct conclusion. He said this is likely as far as the Project Team can take this issue for the Feasibility Study. He said the Project Team will document what they have learned. He said as far as the original question, he thinks there are three options: 1) the reclamation districts fund O&M, though they do not have the assessment base to do this; 2) the urban areas go out with a 218 election and try to convince the people of the urban areas to pay for maintenance of this feature; or 3) pursue State legislation and try to get the State to fund this in perpetuity out of the General Fund or some other State funding stream. He said all those options are difficult to pursue. He said if this Project goes to Phase 4, the Phase 4 team will need to help answer the question “how will O&M be paid for?”
- J. Herrick asked if the federal documents included maps of what Paradise Cut looked like before the federal project, because he was thinking the jurisdiction of the Paradise Cut might turn on how big of a channel it was before they made the cut. R. Reinhardt said the Paradise dam existed in 1956; he said it was a local feature incorporated into the federal project and was not something the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers constructed.
- J. Herrick asked if there were questions. S. Puckett asked if the O&M manual language on the slides was from the U.S. Army Corps O&M manual. R. Reinhardt confirmed. S. Puckett asked if this was different than the design memorandum. R. Reinhardt confirmed and said the design memorandum laid out the elements for the federal project and the basis for selection of it; the O&M manual is what is required to maintain those features. D. Suen said as the group moves forward and coalesces around an alternative or two, the O&M conversation will become more relevant. He said he expects the group will engage with DWR and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board; he said the State needs to be part of the conversation. He said the capital cost, the cost to operate and maintain, and how to partner to do this will play into which alternative is eventually selected. J. Esparza said the Project Team has reached out to DWR. He said DWR has reached out to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board and wanted to communicate this collaboration is ongoing. S. Puckett asked what the SSJD stood for. R. Reinhardt said the Sacramento San Joaquin Drainage District. S. Puckett said she thought the Paradise Cut Land and Easement Acquisition Strategy Memo was a strategy for which easements the group needed to acquire if any. R. Reinhardt said the maintenance would not be able to occur if an entity does not

have the right to do that maintenance. He said this is sort of unrelated to the Feasibility Study, but the Technical Team is trying to understand what easements are out there. He said the Technical Team needs to understand which properties the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan has easements on. He said as part of Phase 2, they learned there was a farm conservation easement near Kisst Dairy that had to be dealt with. He said the idea is to understand what is needed to move the project forward from a real estate standpoint. He said regarding the SSJD easements, there would need to be completion of those easements so the maintenance of the channel could occur.

- J. Herrick asked if there were other questions. J. Herrick asked for public comments. No public comments.
- J. Herrick asked for online comments. No online comments.

SJAFCA Update

- G. Prasad provided an update from SJAFCA. He said since the last Advisory Committee, SJAFCA has engaged with the Delta Stewardship Council and prepared Tribal correspondence letters. He said SJAFCA has an almost brand-new Board. He said the Project Team presented to the SJAFCA Board about Paradise Cut in March. He said the Advisory Committee Chair and Vice-Chair attended. He said the Board did not provide specific direction for any one of the alternatives, but the Board made general remarks about Project funding and the need to pursue additional funding to make the Project a reality. He said the Board stressed the need for climate resilience projects like Paradise Cut as part of the State's portfolio as well as SJAFCA's portfolio. He said on April 24, 2025 the Board will tour Paradise Cut. He said SJAFCA is pleased to serve as the lead agency for the Project and is in coordination with DWR working to recover expenses that have been incurred over the course of the Project. He said certain administrative and overhead tasks may not be recoverable so SJAFCA is working with the State on these items. He said as the Project progresses, it will be important to think about robust governance and administrative O&M. He said he will bring this up as a more refined item in a future Advisory Committee meeting.
- G. Prasad thanked the South Delta Water Agency and the Central Delta Water Agency for providing generous additional funds to support the feasibility study.
- G. Prasad thanked T. Reed, Senior Legislative Assistant for Representative Josh Harder, for attending on Zoom and for her support. He said Representative Harder's office has provided robust support for SJAFCA's other projects. He said he looks forward to more discussions with Representative Harder's office.
- D. Suen thanked S. Puckett and J. Herrick for attending the SJAFCA Board meeting in March. He said the Board reinforced the past governance decisions. He thanked T. Reed for joining the meeting and shared his appreciation for Representative Harder's support. He thanked Central Valley Flood Protection Board Member B. Andrews for joining the meeting.

Department of Water Resources, Central Valley Flood Protection Board Update, and Delta Conservancy Updates

- J. Esparza (DWR) provided an update. He said DWR is working with the State Water Project and there is interest in the Projects' potential effects on downstream

sedimentation. He said DWR is working with SJAFCA to increase the funding available for the Feasibility Study and extend the timeline. He said he wanted to recognize the Technical Team's hard work on the Project. J. Herrick said the Delta Group is pursuing the Permit Barrier Project and have had long discussion about how projects work together and impact sedimentation changes. J. Herrick said there are limited amounts of funds for small amounts that need to cover people; he said this takes a vote of different boards. He said if there are issues where something can't move forward because of funding, please contact him.

- No updates from CVFPB.
- L. Damon (Delta Conservancy) provided an update on Proposition 4. L. Damon said voters approved Proposition 4 in November. She said this was a \$10 billion bond. She said agencies are starting to put out solicitations soon. She said the Delta Conservancy received \$26 million in funding from the bond. She said the Delta Conservancy's plan is to put out a solicitation for concept proposals in the summer or fall. She said the pot of funding the Delta Conservancy has is relatively small and will be split among three programs over two years. She said the Delta Conservancy is looking to combine funding with other agencies, such as DWR or the Wildlife Conservation Board, to maximize impact and make the project whole. She said this is her plug to start thinking about implementation funding.
- R. Reinhardt said J. Esparza mentioned working on a SJAFCA-DWR amendment. He said one of the items in the amendment is a scope for Phase 4 which could be used to pursue funding.

Advisory Committee Member Comments

- J. Herrick asked if there were any comments from the Advisory Committee.
- L. Damon recommended Consero provide suggested motion language for future Advisory Committee meetings (**ACTION**).

Public Comments

- J. Herrick asked if there were any public comments in person.
- J. Herrick asked if there were any public comments online. J.W. Collins shared the Office of the Delta Watermaster is working with federal, State, and local agencies in an attempt to put together a draft framework and hopefully streamline permitting processes going forward. J. Herrick thanked the Delta Watermaster's office. He thanked the Advisory Committee and all meeting attendees.

Adjournment

- J. Herrick adjourned the meeting at 12:59 PM.