

Meeting Summary

Day 1: January 12, 2012

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m., January 12, 2012, by the Chair of the Delta Independent Science Board (ISB or the Board), Dr. Richard Norgaard. Five members of the Board were present for the meeting: Brian Atwater, Tracy Collier, Edward Houde, Jeffrey Mount, and Richard Norgaard. Five members attended by phone: Elizabeth Canuel, Michael Healey, Judy Meyer, Vince Resh, and John Wiens. No members were absent.

None of the Board members reported new conflicts or disclosures.

Delta Science Program Staff in attendance: Cliff Dahm, Lauren Hastings, Sam Harader, Joanne Vinton

2. Delta ISB Chair's Report – Dick Norgaard

The Board drafted two memos, the first about stable funding for the Delta Science Program (DSP) and the second about what the Board learned about science in the Delta at the December meeting. These memos were discussed later in the meeting. The Board has not yet reviewed all of the scientific programs currently going on in the Delta.

Mount gave the Delta ISB's report to the Delta Science Council (DSC) last month (December 2011).

Recruitment of the new lead scientist is not settled yet, but is close. March 1 is still the planned start date. Negotiations with the University of Idaho have slowed down the process.

On March 2, Phil Isenberg will speak at the 15th Annual Travers Conference in Ethics and Accountability: Managing the Delta—The Governance Challenges of Adaptive Management.

3. Delta Stewardship Council Executive Officer Report – Joe Grindstaff

The public comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Delta Plan began November 4, 2011, and ends February 2, 2012. The next steps will be to consider the Draft EIR comments, the Delta Protection Commission's Economic Sustainability Plan, and comments on the fifth staff draft of the Delta Plan. The sixth staff draft of the Delta Plan should be finished by mid-March, followed by another comment period. The final staff draft will be adopted at the end of April, and then it will be sent to the Office of Administrative Law, which reviews regulations proposed by state agencies for legal and procedural compliance. Incorporating the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) will occur later. The effects analysis is the most important part of the BDCP, and the Delta Science Program (DSP) is organizing a second meeting of a scientific review panel to review it.

Comments on the Delta Plan vary depending on the stakeholder group. One large group wants minimal regulatory impact. Another is worried because it thinks the plan focuses too much on flow. A third is most concerned about levees—some recommend improving all levees to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Public Law (PL) 84-99 standard and even higher.

Delta Independent Science Board Meeting
January 12-13, 2012

The Delta Stewardship Council (DSC) budget will not increase for the next fiscal year. Money will come from the general fund and bond funds. No additional funding is available for new science grants.

4. Discuss Memo – Stable Funding for the Delta Science Program

The Board discussed whether or not this memo shows favorable bias towards the DSP, and decided that it does not because the DSP received favorable reviews at the October and December 2011 Board meetings. Then the Board discussed the memo itself—how to reorganize and strengthen it. Collier agreed to revise the memo and include a bulleted list of DSP accomplishments. They will discuss the memo again at the March meeting, so that the new lead scientist can participate.

The Board finished this item early, so started on Item 3 from Day 2.

5. Discuss Memo – An Initial Overview of Delta Science, the Delta Science Program, and the Roles of the Delta Independent Science Board

The Board discussed the organization and detail of the memo, who the audience is, and who to distribute the memo to, which will include the guests from the October and December meetings. The Board members will send their edits individually to Norgaard.

Public comment

Jim Verboon of Verboon Farms discussed two ways to move the existing water supply: take water from individuals to move it through the Delta or change the plumbing so it is more efficient. He suggested that the memos be sent to all agencies and to the Legislature. A group he works with suggests increasing existing channels between the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers around Twitchell Island.

Burt Wilson of Save the Delta discussed trihalomethanes, which are carcinogenic. He wants the water to be tested for those chemicals. The proposed 15,000 cubic feet per second flows into tunnels could affect salinity—it is the number one issue. Barrier gates would need to be put across Chipps Island to stop it.

6. Lead Scientist Report and Lunch Discussion – Cliff Dahm

Dr. Jane Lubchenco had originally intended to address the Board, but she was called back to Washington DC, so Will Stelle, Steve Lindley, and Maria Rea attended instead.

Stelle is Regional Administrator for the Northwest Region of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). He talked about science and the impact of lawsuits on science. Lawsuits are a disincentive to scientists to participate as scientific veracity may or may not be relevant with the situation becoming a "gottcha" game. This results in a strategic failure in process. Venues are needed where good science can be promoted and encouraged. The Board is a good example.

He then discussed the details of an agreement that had just been reached among Federal and state agencies, NGOs and the water contractors on water operations in the south Delta. He added that the participants have agreed to work together outside of the court room.

Stelle asked if there is any interest in participating in shared science as opposed to "combat" science. Shouldn't shared scientific principles result in shared scientific results? Would it be appropriate to tell the scientific community to stop the wars? There should be common ground that can be shared with decision-makers.

Lindley is the Director of the NMFS Fisheries Ecology Division, Southwest Fisheries Science Center in Santa Cruz. The Center is responsible for commercial fish and salmon. Staff is

Delta Independent Science Board Meeting
January 12-13, 2012

working on dozens of projects, such as trying to develop lifecycle modeling tools and investigating population dynamics tied to water project operations. More broadly, the Center is moving towards using integrated ecosystem management (ecosystem and water operations) and is also trying to look at biological opinions more holistically so that tradeoffs can be considered.

Rea is Supervisor of the Sacramento Area Office, NMFS. The main issues are loss of riparian habitat, revegetation of levees, and restoring populations of fish above some rim dams. The office depends on the scientific community to provide information. The Board has a very important role regarding science in the Delta.

Discussion

The group discussed how to avoid combat science. Stelle suggested convening a group of scientists, posing specific questions about what is known, and finding out what the confidence level is. The idea would be to see if a broader, shared understanding can be developed. The complex web of variables requires a degree of adaptive management. Facilitated discussions are needed. A facilitator would need a deep familiarity with the scientific landscape, models, and statistics, and would need to have the stature to speak up when information is not credible.

7. Preparation for BDCP Draft EIR Review – Karla Nemeth

A working draft of the BDCP has been reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences. The goal now is to develop an outline of the main measures, facilities, and actions, and how they relate to ecosystem restoration. The draft is currently incomplete. It needs an expanded effects analysis, and it needs to address comments about flows, and biological goals and objectives. The effects analysis evaluates a 15,000 cubic feet per second facility with five intakes on the Sacramento River. If the project does not meet the standard of the Natural Community Conservation Planning Act (NCCPA) program, then a different project will be developed, and the effects analyzed again. This process will continue until a project is identified that meets the standards of the NCCPA. The other alternatives will not be analyzed as thoroughly.

The big moving pieces are the effects analysis, how to iterate on conservation measures, changes to facilities operations, and habitat restoration. A rollup chapter will synthesize all components for all species needs over their life stages.

For the NEPA/CEQA document, the five alternatives will include ranges in the amount of habitat restored, operations, and through Delta conveyance. The goal is to post the Draft EIS/EIR by late February and to post the effects analysis by April. Other chapters will flow from the effects analysis.

Big decisions that still need to be made concern water operations: the need to identify starting operations for a facility that will not be online for many years; the adaptive management program and the interplay among flows, restoration, etc.; and an effective structure for the BDCP. Other programs will need to fit in with BDCP. The BDCP is asking for help with monitoring from the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP), and the IEP is currently thinking about broadening its activities. A future BDCP science program could be part of IEP. To make it work, coordination would need to be improved and costs reduced.

IEP data come from the aquatic environment, but the BDCP includes restoration for marshes and other edge areas. To fill the gap, the BDCP will include experiments on topics such as promoting growth in fish, types of habitats, and types of rice thatch to use. Also, IEP coordinators are talking about expanding their monitoring beyond open water habitats anticipating that they might be asked to do it for BDCP.

Delta Independent Science Board Meeting
January 12-13, 2012

BDCP is a regulatory plan, and includes an adaptive management plan due to the requirements of the NCCPA. It will not be amended periodically. Annual monitoring and reporting will feed into the adaptive management.

The National Research Council (NRC) reviewed the November draft. BDCP is responding to recommendations. They do not have plans to ask NRC to review it again.

Earlier BDCP documents were criticized because the life of the plan is 50 years, but the plan did not look at climate change effects. The latest chapters that are posted online consider climate change. Other “changed circumstances” such as fire, flooding, and other reasonably foreseeable events will also be considered. Review comments are being incorporated. At the next meeting of the DSP-sponsored review panel for the BDCP Effects Analysis the panel will review how their comments were responded to as well as review new material.

The effects analysis considers between 55 and 61 species. Actions that are beneficial to one species might not be good for another. The effects analysis will evaluate this potential situation, and make recommendations on how the he Plan should accommodate it.

Public comments

Tina Cannon Leahy of the California Assembly Committee on Water, Parks and Wildlife asked if restoring habitat will allow for increased reliability of the water supply or if population improvements will be required before allowing increases to pumping. The BDCP will include operational criteria. An adaptive range of operations would trigger movement of water.

Tom Zuckerman of the Central Delta Water Agency recommended reducing reliance on the Delta and investigating how existing facilities could be augmented before building an isolated conveyance.

Lowell Jarvis of the Mountain Counties Water Resources Association is concerned about the 50-year period associated with the BDCP. He wants an index for water quality in the Delta. He recommends using the Delphi technique and using empirical data rather than models when making decisions.

Statutory requirements for BDCP Draft EIR review – Joe Grindstaff

Both the DSC and the Board need to review the BDCP Draft EIR, but the focus for each will be different. DSC will incorporate the report that the Board writes into their letter of comment. The consulting firm, ARCADIS, will help the DSC with their review. The company will advise the DSC on whether or not the BDCP EIR meets statutory requirements. The EIR could be 10,000 pages long. Questions that need to be considered while reviewing are: does it help to achieve the coequal goals? Does it achieve the coequal goals in a way that respects Delta as a place? How does it fit with specific elements of the law? Does the Draft EIR comply with CEQA?

For its review, the Delta ISB will use reports from the DSP-sponsored independent review of the BDCP effects analysis. Due to the length and scope of the BDCP Draft EIR, the Delta ISB might need additional expert assistance. It is considering the use of staff from ARCADIS, technical experts, and expert panels. The DSP will prepare a straw proposal that includes a list of possible experts, a list of what the Delta ISB might focus on, recommendations of topics that the Delta ISB can review themselves, and a budget. The Board will discuss the proposal at the March meeting. Norgaard also agreed to send a memo to Jerry Meral, Assistant Secretary, Natural Resources Agency, asking for sufficient time for public review so that an adequate evaluation can be done.

Public comment

Tina Cannon Leahy wonders why agency comments on the BDCP will be collated by DWR. She would like to see the individual comments from agencies, not a collation, specifically those prepared by the Department of Fish and Game. Seeing all comments would help the BDCP look more transparent. The reviewing agencies suggested collating their comments.

8. Public Comment (For matters that were not on the agenda, but within subject matter jurisdiction of the Delta ISB.)

None

4:09 p.m. – Adjourn

Day 2: January 13, 2012

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m., January 13, 2012, by the Chair of the Delta Independent Science Board (ISB or the Board), Dr. Richard Norgaard. Five members of the Board were present for the meeting: Brian Atwater, Tracy Collier, Edward Houde, Jeffrey Mount, and Richard Norgaard. Five members attended by phone: Elizabeth Canuel, Michael Healey, Judy Meyer, Vince Resh, and John Wiens. No members were absent.

Delta Science Program Staff in attendance: Cliff Dahm, Lauren Hastings, Sam Harader, Joanne Vinton

2. Presentation and Discussion – Historical and Current Efforts to Establish Flow Objectives with a focus on the San Joaquin River Flow Objectives and South Delta Salinity Objectives – Les Grober, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)

Les Grober discussed the history of the SWRCB's Bay-Delta plans and decisions. He illustrated his discussion with graphs showing average monthly San Joaquin River flows, a typical hydrograph for the Stanislaus River, monthly flows at Vernalis, daily flows for the Tuolumne River, and comparisons of unimpaired and observed flow at Vernalis. To view the handouts and graphs, [click here](#).

Currently, SWRCB is developing flow criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta ecosystem using a synthesis of scientific reports, computer models, and scientific peer review. The peer reviewers were John A. Dracup, Ph.D., P.E., Mark E. Grismer, Ph.D., P.E., Henriette (Yetta) Jager, Ph.D., Julian D. Olden, Ph.D., and Thomas P. Quinn, Ph.D.

Board members had several questions and comments:

- What happens after the peer review? Reviewers will not be contacted again, even if comments are not incorporated. A revised version of the flow objectives will be completed at the end of January, along with an additional report—a draft of the economic analysis.
- Reviewer comments on the report were good. Some conclusions drawn from the report are: flow and physical habitat are not interchangeable; current flows are not sufficient to protect public resources; specific prescriptions for flows have not worked; the timing of flows from tributaries perhaps should coincide; and, to be successful, a science program is needed.
- What is the difference between flow criteria and objectives? Criteria have no regulatory authority whereas objectives do. To develop objectives, a balance is needed between the criteria and other demands for water.

Delta Independent Science Board Meeting
January 12-13, 2012

- Is the report the final document? No, the water quality control plan will be the regulatory document. Some determinations are very broad. Information that is technical or scientific in the report matters, but flow is the master variable. It helps with everything including fisheries and predation.
- More flow is better, but how much more and when? The SWRCB is using unimpaired flows to try to figure it out. The recommendation will be to use some percent of unimpaired flows. Unimpaired flow is a calculated number and does not include consumptive use or other uses. Using a percent of unimpaired flows responds to some of the timing issues.
- Regarding Vernalis, where does the longer view come into play, looking back and forward into the 2100s? It will depend on precipitation patterns and how they change. The question could be answered through adaptive management. The report shows only what is needed now.
- The San Joaquin River flow has a monthly time step. A shorter time step could be important in California because of the way rain falls here. For the idea to succeed, a coordinated operations group is needed with a plan for each year.
- Regarding more variable flow regimes, are they planned for spring? Yes. But exact operations might not be possible. They will need to be determined based on channels and what they can handle. If flow is increased too quickly, the effects can be bad. For example, stream flow is increased for boating, and it has negative ecological effects. The details will have to be worked out depending on operational and environmental needs.
- What about implementation? A percent of unimpaired flow will be used along with how it needs to be lagged. Implementation will be left to fisheries experts who would submit plans. This is the adaptive management component.
- What ability does SWRCB have to influence the operations? Water rights proceedings will be followed by a new water quality certification. SWRCB could discuss who is responsible.
- Once flow objectives are established, will there be further negotiation with stakeholders? When SWRCB makes a determination, it always looks for cooperative agreements. It wants to allow for flexibility and wants to strike a balance. SWRCB thinks that it can bracket the effects by looking at a range of percentages of unimpaired flow. Using a whole range would allow for agreements. The draft language might use a range plus or minus 10 percent, for example—an adaptive range. It will be sufficiently prescriptive, but not locked in. Flexibility is needed for water short years with a limited water supply and for when increased flows are released.
- Using arithmetic medians was more informative than arithmetic means for work in Florida. Is mean or median flow used? Neither. Flow is tied to real-time inflows into major rim dams and measured using gauges.
- Regarding geomorphic thresholds—what happens when they are not crossed? Sometimes San Joaquin flows are big during the winter, so setting objectives for spring season only misses other processes during other seasons. Yes, but regulations will consider spring only because that is when the problems occur. It is a question of storing water in dams to use the water as it always has been used.
- The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is currently ignoring climate change in its relicensing work. How does SWRCB deal with FERC's desire for long-term certainty for licenses? That has not been decided. Adaptive management needs to be incorporated somehow.

Delta Independent Science Board Meeting
January 12-13, 2012

- How do wet and dry years play out? The regulations will not use those classifications. They will use a percent of unimpaired flow and will not have to make up for a previous dry year.
- What will happen 50 years down the road? That is an important and difficult policy decision. The facilities are not designed for changed conditions. What helps fisheries today might not help in the future. It is an important consideration but ahead of what SWRCB is trying to do now. In the future, an update would be needed. The update will need to consider effects on water supply.
- The report on the salt tolerance of crops in the south Delta by Glenn Hoffman has one summary determination—salinity appears suitable for all crops. The report was only about agricultural use of water (and did not include municipal use) because the most sensitive use is agriculture in the southern Delta.

Salty water is being sent to the San Joaquin Valley—what about the long-term effect? That issue will be taken up later. It is recognized as a big problem. How does the salinity relate to achieving TMDLs? Salinity will be revisited when TMDLs are reviewed.

- The flow report does not say much about habitat or concentration of pesticides—what do you get with different percents of flow? Generally, we get more beneficial effects with more flow, but we do not want to use flow as a control program for pesticides.
- Is there an increase in habitat with different flows? Increased flows increase wetted habitat, which is good. Flow is the master variable.
- Regarding water quality—what are the major attributes? There is a long list for certifications, but for flow criteria, they are not considered.
- What methodologies are being used for flow criteria? SWRCB is using a hybrid of methods.
- Who is working on this project? Excellent staff with assistance from experts at state and federal fisheries agencies, Cliff Dahm, and others at UC Davis. But it is a struggle to recruit and retain qualified staff.
- Flow and habitat are not interchangeable, but are they linked somehow? The best habitat is not successful without water to support it.

Depth and velocity are linked to flow. It is a direct relationship. Flow = habitat = more of a particular species. Rethinking of the Delta has been based on aquatic species, but we have to look at all species including those living on the margins. The flow report is great, but it looks only at salmon, and does not consider habitat at all. The idea is that you cannot just increase habitat without flow. Not just the quantity and quality of water is important, but also the configuration of the stream. Putting that step in the report makes the argument more sophisticated.

There is good, fundamental science about the natural flow regime paradigm dating from 1997. Restoring part of the natural hydrograph will be beneficial for fish. But habitat matters, too, for example, improving rearing habitat is also important for fish species. The BDCP focuses only on habitat. The flow report talks about flow only. Rote adherence to natural flow will not always provide additional benefit. The report needs to discuss how different tributaries contribute different benefits to the system.

We have to rely on the implementation of adaptive management and the FERC relicensing process. The flow report does not discuss specifics but only general principles. The adaptive management program will be more important than the flow criteria. Adaptive management will allow for fine tuning, but it puts the burden on those managing the resource.

Delta Independent Science Board Meeting
January 12-13, 2012

The decision is to use proportional percents for the three main tributaries. But for the Stanislaus, for example, the floodplain is not in as good shape as the others, so maybe proportional percents are not good enough. Maybe the Merced and the Tuolumne need to contribute more flow.

Flow and habitat are not interchangeable, and there are aspects of flow that are important but do not relate to habitat such as providing cues for fish migration. Therefore timing of flows is important. Flow also provides cues to predators, to eat migrating fish.

Scientists in Europe are trying to improve biodiversity. An indicative metric they use is the degree of channelization. They look at the length of the channel and the amount of edge habitat. For a highly braided river, the ratio of length to edge habitat is high, which in turn is linked to higher biodiversity—increases in birds and other species. How will SWRCB bring in other land management practices? By giving recommendations to other agencies.

There are some spatial aspects to this that need to be part of the planning.

- How will adaptive management actually work? The next step is implementation, then ideally a group will form to coordinate operations. The group would be responsible for operations, both daily and long term. Much more needs to be done. The idea is to suggest but not be prescriptive.
- Would a group of experts be formed to determine the percent of unimpaired flow? Agencies that have knowledge of fisheries would decide. The percent would be a daily decision. Across the board, all programs would need monitoring and would need to look forward and back.
- Metrics and monitoring are needed to do adaptive management. Are permit holders required to do the monitoring? If additional monitoring is needed, yes. Monitoring needs to be unbiased and involve multiple agencies.
- How exactly do you calculate unimpaired flows for tributaries? The operations group would need to decide. The basis for the decision would include watching how fish are doing and the size of returns.
- How does SWRCB work with BDCP? Do they work closely to meet their objectives? Both have been in discussion with DSC on the Delta Plan. SWRCB is also working with BDCP to provide useful information. The problem is that the processes are happening at the same time.

Is it a formal arrangement? Yes.

- How does science keep its integrity and voice in the process? The legislature is relying more and more on science. How do you see it? Has it changed? Are there difficulties with the adaptive management approach? Are the risks associated with adaptive management being traded off? With a range of percentages, the flow could be set at the low end. It is going to be hard to come up with just one number. It is more important to identify a range of water operations within which decisions can be made.
- How do you estimate costs? We look for inflection points. There appears to be some threshold flows. A range is good for balancing, but we do not want science to be hijacked by balancing. It appears that more flow is better, so we could make specific flow prescriptions. SWRCB will have a difficult decision to make. The coordinated operations group will require concurrence.

Delta Independent Science Board Meeting
January 12-13, 2012

- Increased variability of flows will put more pressure on levees and pumps, which needs to be phased in . Does this affect the use of science? Even scientific assessments will change over time.
- The cost of putting science into effect depends on the ease of implementation.
- Technology and values change over time, even outside of adaptive management. The flow report will be reviewed periodically.
- Regarding the Delta ISB's role: It is always helpful to get some determination from experts on whether or not SWRCB documents are based on sound science. Most important are future issues—how can an adaptive management program be formed that is sufficiently rooted in science? Should the SWRCB work with ISB? How much is ISB willing to do in reviewing products? SWRCB is very interested in using the best available science. How much is ISB willing to do?

The Board is in an experimental stage in finding out what its role is. It could oversee objectives, but in what way? Also, the relationship to SWRCB still needs to be worked out. Where can ISB add best value? In general, it is an oversight board.

There is a tendency when making very hard decisions to think more information is needed. It is helpful to hear when an action is good based on the available information.

Public comment

Val Connor of the State and Federal Contractors Water Agency asked if the Board will evaluate the best available science used to write the substitute environmental document. She also asked about increasing flows in the fall—how will unimpaired flows be managed in the fall and will ISB be involved?

Greg Zlotnick of the State and Federal Contractors Water Agency commented on Les Grober's handouts. It is important to understand that SWRCB's duty is to protect the public trust. As this process moves forward, the coequal goals need to be considered. Water supply reliability includes economics. Water quality is important. Dilution is a waste of water to solve water quality problems. Regarding the role of the Delta ISB in deciding what is the best available science—what is best now might not be the best in the future. Deadlines are pushing decisions. New science that is being done now needs to be considered.

Mark Rentz of the Association of California Water Agencies talked about the role of the Delta ISB. An integrated, comprehensive approach to issues is needed. What ISB can do to help all other agencies is to constantly ask how to look at an issue systematically. Managers need to understand relationships so that they can make the right decisions. They need to ask the right questions and use the best available science.

Jim Verboon of Verboon Farms is concerned about San Joaquin River flows. The flows move with tides, so they are stagnant, and the Sacramento River overwhelms the San Joaquin flows. He would like the Board to consider those issues.

John Shelton of the California Department of Fish and Game made some points about high flows and geomorphic processes. Flood control releases are constrained by downstream capacity. Even 30-40 percent of unimpaired flows could be too much. Regarding climate change, it is a huge unknown issue on the San Joaquin River. The Board needs to discuss how to get better science and find more scientists to work on the issue.

Delta Independent Science Board Meeting
January 12-13, 2012

Amy Richey of Mosaic Associates asked if there will be a sensitive analysis. She suggested that the Board look at experimental designs.

3. Continue Discussion of Memos

The decision was made to wait until March to finish the memos, so that the new lead scientist can be involved.

4. Preparation for Next Delta ISB Meeting

A suggestion was made to read all BDCP documents, and then write a short memo that lists issues that need some attention. The Board has the expertise to do it. What is the Board's role? Les Grober and others should think about it. Possibly Les Grober should be invited to the March meeting.

Peter Goodwin has expertise in modeling the interaction between habitat and flows. Others who know about modeling could also be invited.

A suggestion was made to invite the preparer of the BDCP adaptive management chapter to the next meeting.

Integration of science is needed at the water operations management level. To what extent are land use, habitat, pollution, and other issues integrated so that the science can be used by managers? If the Delta ISB does not do this, then what is ISB's purpose?

We could recommend to the Council that the Delta ISB should focus on big science issues.

Les Grober mentioned a water operations group. Would it be informative to hear about how water operations are handled now? Yes.

Dick will work with Lauren and staff to see if all of this can be accommodated at the March meeting.

5. Public Comment (For matters that were not on the agenda, but within subject matter jurisdiction of the Delta ISB.)

None

12:21 p.m. – Adjourn