

**CALFED**

**TECHNICAL REPORT  
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

**SUPPLEMENT TO FLOOD CONTROL**

**DRAFT**

**March 1998**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Table S-1. Summary of Flood Control Environmental Consequences .....	S-2
Table S-2. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Resource Elements and Impacts of Actions on Flood Management in the Delta Region .....	S-8
Table S-3. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Resource Elements That Could Affect Flood Management in the Sacramento River Region .....	S-9
Table S-4. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Resource Elements That Could Affect Flood Management in the San Joaquin River Region .....	S-10

## SUPPLEMENT TO FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM

Table S-1 compares key parameters of flood control for existing conditions, the No Action Alternative, and CALFED configurations.

Table S-2 was used to screen resource elements of the Ecosystem Restoration Program and determine which elements would affect the flood control system. Table S-3 summarizes the actions in the Ecosystem Restoration Program that could affect the flood control system in the Sacramento River Region. Table S-4 summarizes actions in the Ecosystem Restoration Program that could affect the flood control system in the San Joaquin River Region. These tables were based on Appendix A of the Phase II Alternatives Descriptions Report (CALFED 1997). For more specific information regarding the actions, refer to the report.













Resource Element	Flood-Related Actions	Potentially Significant Impact on Flood Management
Stream flows	Provide pulse flows	No
Delta channel hydraulics	Reduce flows in selected channels	Yes
	Construct network of channels and reduce constrictions in the Yolo Bypass	No
Water temperature	None	No
Floodplain inundation and sediment retention	Convert selected leveed lands to tidal marsh/slough complexes, construct setback levees, connect dead end sloughs, construct overflow basins	Yes
Food web	None	No
Levees and bank protection	Modify levee and berm vegetation management practices on water side of levee	Yes
Dredging	None	No
Exotic species	None	No
Predators	None	No
Unscreened and poorly screened diversions	None	No
Contaminants	None	No
Boat wake erosion	Reduce boat traffic in selected channels	No
Illegal and legal harvest of fish and wildlife	None	No
Shallow water habitat	Flood selected islands, primarily with land elevations between 5 and 9 feet below sea level	Maybe; volume provided by additional storage too small (for example, 10 to 70 TAF) relative to size of Delta (for example, over 700,000 acres) and duration of flood events (several days). However, could provide localized flood control benefits
Non-tidal perennial aquatic habitat	Acquire and develop deeper open-water areas in restored saline emergent wetland habitats	No; too small an area
Tidal slough habitat	Restore tidal slough habitat	No; it was assumed that new sloughs would not contribute significantly to conveyance in Delta
Seasonal wetland habitat	Restore and manage additional acreage	No; largest restoration would be in designated floodplain expansion areas
Riparian scrub habitat	Obtain conservation easements or purchase land needed to restore riparian habitat from willing sellers	Yes
Riparian woodlands	Purchase riparian woodland property or easements	No
Tidal emergent wetland habitat	Develop tidal wetlands	Yes
Non-tidal emergent wetland habitat	Restore non-tidal emergent wetland habitat	No; however, could result in local flood control benefits
Mid-channel islands	Protect and improve existing channels in the Delta	No

Table S-2. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Resource Elements and Impacts of Actions on Flood Management in the Delta Region

Resource Element	Flood-Related Actions
Shaded riverine aquatic habitat (SR)	Vegetate barren riprapped banks and construct setback levees to provide wider floodplains.
Diversion dams-fish passage and predators (SR)	Make physical changes to structures in the Sacramento River, such as bridge abutments, diversion dams, and water intakes.
Stream meander belts (NSV)	Restore the 50- to 100-year floodplain of Cedar Creek.
Dams, reservoirs, and other human-made structures (NSV)	Remove diversions from South Cow, Old Cow, North Cow, and Clover creeks that are barriers to migrating salmon.
Stream meander belts (CC)	Preserve or restore the 50- to 100-year floodplain. Evaluate the construction of setback levees to allow channel meander in areas presently confined by levees.
Dams, reservoirs, and other human-made structures	Reconstruct facilities and structures that impair fish passage.
Floodwater and sediment detention and retention (CB)	Improve the sediment deposition capacity of the Colusa Basin.
Dams, reservoirs, and other human-made structures (CB)	Reduce hindrances to fish passage and reduce the use of seasonal barriers.
Stream meander belts (BB)	Preserve or restore the 50- to 100-year floodplains along the lower reaches of stream; evaluate the construction of setback levees to allow channel meander in areas presently confined by levees.
Dams, reservoirs, and other human-made structures (BB)	Evaluate the feasibility of removing diversion dams on Butte Creek.
Dams, reservoirs, and other human-made structures (FRS)	Remove dams on Yuba River; remove or modify culvert crossings on Bear River.
Natural stream channel process (ARB)	Maintain floodplain along the lower American River. Develop a floodplain management program.
Stream channel configuration (YB)	Evaluate the feasibility of modifying cross-sections and channel configurations in Cache and Putah creeks; reconfigure the Yolo Bypass to restore its natural configuration with slough connections to Cache and Putah creeks.
Floodwater and sediment detention and retention (YB)	Evaluate the feasibility of reoperating and modifying the Yolo Basin to increase its capacity for floodwater detention and sediment retention.
NOTES:	
SR = Sacramento River Ecological Zone.	
NSV = North Sacramento Valley Ecological Zone.	
CC = Cottonwood Creek Ecological Zone.	
CB = Colusa Basin Ecological Zone.	
BB = Butte Basin.	
FRS = Feather River/Sutter Basin Ecological Zone.	
ARB = American River Basin Ecological Zone.	
YB = Yolo Basin.	

**Table S-3. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Resource Elements That Could Affect Flood Management in the Sacramento River Region**

<b>Resource Element</b>	<b>Flood-Related Actions</b>
Shaded riverine aquatic habitat (EDT)	Restore 15 stream miles of self-sustaining diverse riparian community along the Mokelumne River
Stream meander migration (SJR)	Restore the defined floodplain; reestablish stream meander zone on the San Joaquin River between Vernalis and the mouth of the Merced River
Levees, bridges, and bank protection (SJR)	Set back 10 miles of levees along the San Joaquin River between the Merced River and Vernalis
Shaded riverine aquatic habitat (SJR)	Restore 50 stream miles of self-sustaining diverse riparian community
Shaded riverine aquatic and riparian habitat (ESJB)	Restore 15 stream miles of self-sustaining diverse riparian community along each river
NOTES:	
EDT = Eastside Delta Tributaries Ecological Zone.	
SJR = San Joaquin River Ecological Zone.	
ESJB = East San Joaquin Basin Ecological Zone.	

**Table S-4. Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan Resource Elements That Could Affect Flood Management in the San Joaquin River Region**

## FLOOD CONTROL

### LIST OF PREPARERS

Mark W. Cowin

B.S., Civil Engineering, Stanford University

Years of Experience: 18

Planning Chief of Storage Facilities Unit, CALFED Bay-Delta Program

Preparation of system operations studies to support evaluation of Program Alternatives.

Gerald L. Horner

Ph.D., Resource Economics, Washington State University

Years of experience: 27

Preparation of Economics of Flood Control Technical Appendices

Peter M. Standish-Lee

M.S., Water Resources, California State University, Sacramento

B.S., Oceanography, California State University, Humboldt

A.B., Zoology, University of California, Berkeley

Years of experience: 27

Alternatives Planning

Lead Consultant for Flood Management technical report

Michelle G. Lynch

M.S., Civil Engineering, University of California, Davis

Years of experience: 2

Preparation of Flood Control Technical Appendix

Lynn Moquette O'Leary

M.S., Civil Engineering, University of California, Davis

B.S., Civil Engineering University of California, Davis

Years of Experience: 13

Leader, Flood Control Impact Team

Loren Bottorff

M.S., Civil Engineering in Water Resources, University of Nevada, Reno

Years of Experience: 24

Development of Alternatives

Rick Breitenbach

M.S., Biological Conservation, California State University, Sacramento

Years of Experience: 25

Environmental Documentation Program Manager

Elizabeth Dyer

M.S., Earth Science, Northern Arizona University

B.A., History, University of California, Berkeley

Years of Experience: 3

Report preparation and coordination

Trina D. Farris

Years of Experience: 25

Text edits and preparation of figures and tables

Ted M. Frink

B.S., Fisheries Ecology, California State University Humboldt

Years of Experience: 15

Report preparation and technical review

Wendy S. Halverson Martin

B.S., Environmental Studies, California State University, Sacramento

Years of Experience: 17

Project Manager. Technical and Editorial preparation and review

Mark McCourt

B.A., Gonzaga University

Years of Experience: 16 months

Graphics

Ray McDowell

B.A., Geography, California State University, Sacramento

Years of Experience: 10

Environmental Specialist-Coordination of NEPA/CEQA documentation

Frank Piccola

M.A., Government Administration, Rider University

B.S., Environmental Science, Rutgers University

AASc. Laboratory Technology, Middlesex County College

Years of Experience: 25

Environmental Manager-Coordination of NEPA/CEQA documentation