

From: Pete/Lydia Chadwick <chadwick@sonnet.com>
To: DFG_HQ.HQ1 (RBRODDRI)
Date: 7/15/98 5:10pm
Subject: CALFED Preferred Alternatives

Ryan,

The following is some amplification of the 4 most significant points I transmitted the other day and some less significant comments:

- (4) 1. Conveyance, p. 6 first condition- I do not understand the narrowing of water quality considerations to include only bromide issues. The urban water agencies and to a lesser extent San Joaquin Valley farmers have always considered the lower salinity of Sacramento River water to be a big benefit of an isolated facility. Have they abandoned that position or has CALFED misread the issue? It is of concern environmentally because the lower the salinity of a water supply the more potential wastewater reclamation has. i. e. the lower the salinity the more times you can recycle it before it becomes too saline for further use. I believe this potential applies primarily to urban water supplies. More recycling could translate to less demand on diversions from the Delta and less environmental impacts. The validity of abandoning this consideration needs to be questioned.
- (6) 2. Conveyance p. 6 condition h- I do not understand the rationale for tying an isolated facility to "progress towards regional surface storage". It seems to tie two benefits to water users together. Many people believe that there are no financially feasible surface storage projects. If that is true, legitimate needs for isolated conveyance could be frustrated for inappropriate reasons. We should seek deletion of this provision.
- (14) 3. Appendix B-2 Monitoring etc. item 2- The major work on defining what adaptive management really means is delayed until stage 1 rather than being dealt with in the ROD. Many of us see it as a key assurances issue. Should it be included in the list of assurances to be included in the ROD on page A-2?
- (22) 4. South Delta Improvements p. B-11 items 5, 6, and 7. Based on IDT recommendations, the draft Phase II report recommends a single new CVP/SWP fish screen at the intake to Clifton Court. The combined effect of items 5, 6, and 7 is to abandon that and adopt permanent separate CVP and SWP screens. I believe the primary driving force is the desire of fish facility research folks in the Bureau to proceed with their plans for fish facility research at Tracy. Most comments by members of the Fish Facility Technical Team on the minutes of their recent meeting indicate that the primary view of the Committee favors a consolidated diversion at the intake to Clifton Court as the IDT recommended. Besides the optimization of fish screen operations, questions about linkage of the CVP and SWP systems may not have been thought out adequately. This should be questioned and probably referred to the Management Team for more thorough review.
- (23) 5. p. 4 para 2, 3d from last line: "CALFED may not be able to rule out" should be "CALFED can not rule out".
- (24) 6. p. 7 Surface storage a, Should be divided into two separate conditions,

OK
ADP
7/17/98

OK
ADP
7/17/98

OK
ADP
7/17/98
STRAUBLY ACSES