

**OFFICE MEMO**

<b>TO:</b> Steve Yaeger Calfed Bay Delta Program	<b>DATE:</b> January 31, 1996
<b>FROM:</b> Stein Buer <i>SM RS</i>	<b>SUBJECT:</b>  Comments - Draft Alternative Report

The following summarizes comments prepared by the Long-Term Planning and North Delta Management Section on the Calfed Bay Delta Program Draft Alternatives Report. Priyanka Arora, Shahram Ahi, and I reviewed the report, and our main points are summarized here. Their detailed comments will also be provided separately for your consideration.

1. The conceptual range of the alternatives is sufficiently broad to set the stage for the environmental documentation process. While various interests may wish to suggest new alternatives or variants of those already included, it is unnecessary for Calfed to include more alternatives at this stage.
2. The alternatives appear to be reasonably balanced, in that habitat restoration, control of various sources of watershed and aquatic habitat degradation are included with all the alternatives.
3. It is imperative that cost considerations be brought to the table as quickly as possible, even if they are very rough (say round to the nearest \$500 million). At this point the alternatives are all loaded with a host of measures which I think all can agree to in concept (is anyone opposed to a clean, productive ecosystem?) but the hard choices are in the dollars and the allocation of water.
4. This follows directly from (3): The water supply implications of the alternatives need to be explored. We cannot really further narrow this group of alternatives without some understanding of the water supply redistribution which would likely occur with implementation of the alternatives. We are working with your staff and the Modeling Support Branch staff to initiate such modeling. The key issues will be assumptions about what Delta protective standards to associate with each alternative.
5. We understand that you are trying to keep the alternative descriptions fairly general at this time, and that has been effective in establishing the conceptual range under consideration. However, the generality leaves a lot of questions unanswered (see Ms. Arora's comments), and makes it difficult indeed to evaluate costs, benefits and impacts. One possible approach would be to build a specific sub-alternative within each of the classes of alternatives represented by the 20 now in the binder. These sub-alternatives would have facilities, acreages, and operating criteria spelled out, allowing for modeling of water supply and hydrodynamic effects, acreage calculations, and cost estimates.

Attachments