

OFFICE MEMO

TO: Mark Meeks	DATE: January 30, 1996
FROM: Priyanka Arora <i>Priyanka</i>	SUBJECT: Review of Draft Alternatives 1-10 Developed by the CALFED Bay Delta Program

Per your request to review the alternatives as written by the CALFED Bay Delta Program, the following are some comments that I had as I read the write-up. These comments are thoughts that came to mind and are only meant to bring about more discussion of the issues.

As many of the components are applied in different combinations to make up the alternatives, the comments are presented by component and issue and not by specific alternatives. (Though a couple of notes on alternatives 8 and 9 are made near the end).

Physical and Structural Features

Flow Barriers: Where would they be installed? Would this be done in collaboration with the ISDP's installation of barriers?

Delta Levee Habitat Restoration: One of the actions included are setback levees. Where would the material come from? Cost needs to be considered. Studies done by the INDP in evaluating this component could be looked at.

It lists some good candidate areas but these are good areas for what? For berms, setback levees, SRAH,....?

Bay Habitat Restoration: It says use of dredge spoils to create wetland areas, but where would these spoils come from? Note that extensive testing would have to be done to determine whether the spoils contain any toxic contaminants.

Install Bypass at Mouth of Old River: Is ISDP putting a barrier here?

Flood Protection Level: The latter part of this section mentions islands that would have work done upon their levees so as to protect "important regional infrastructure". What is the criteria for determining what constitutes valuable habitat and/or infrastructure? Is it monetary value or number of sensitive species? Or would the criteria be more judgmental?

Migration Barriers: "Work to improve the effectiveness of behavioral barriers." How are they planning to do this? Do more studies, experiments? Would these studies be done before implementation of barriers or while barriers are in place and being used?

Channel Islands: Can look at Staten Island Project - in analyzing this component. How will the zones be established, upon what basis and who will regulate those areas?

Operational and Management Features

Real Time Monitoring: What does this mean? Does this mean to follow species around and if they get too close to the construction area, then to alter project operations. If so, how would the project be altered?

Modify Clifton Court Operation: How is this affected by the construction of a new intake by ISDP?

Institutional and Policy Features

Operational Factor: How easy is it to change set environmental standards? Wouldn't a lot of supporting data have to be gathered and analyzed and extensive involvement by other agencies and the public have to be done.

CALFED Regulatory Team: Development of a way to facilitate getting permits might become a long and arduous process. An example, look at the Regional Board's attempt to develop a General Order Permit.

Dredge Materials: "Clean" dredge material means that it meets water quality objectives. How will it be determined who gets the material and how much? Would it be through a bidding process, first-come first-serve, or a ranking system of some sort of the projects that require the material.

Preliminary Assessment

Benefits: For water supply, it seems circular. "Improving export water supply reliability by reducing reliance on the Delta as a source of water supply and this is done by improving the reliability of export supplies."

For water quality, it is improved depending upon where and when the barriers are in place.

For system reliability, what are "island failures"?

Constraints and Concerns: For levee stability reliability and export supplies, how are these different from baseline conditions? Does this alternative increase the risk or the vulnerability of these concerns?

Mark Meeks
January 30, 1996
Page Three

For Alternative 8, wouldn't this option be expensive and met with lots of opposition from the reclamation districts. This would result in a loss of agricultural and wildlife/plant habitat. Seems to have major concerns associated with this alternative.

For Alternative 9, seems to conflict with what was said by CALFED before. They wanted a list of options that would increase water supply. They had said not to worry about the south of Delta storage as the contractors would take care of that. Was that then and this is now?

cc: Stein Buer

B - 0 0 5 0 2 6

B-005026