

Author: ERIC LEUZE at RMI\_MAIL

Date: 8/12/97 8:27 AM

Priority: Normal

TO: KREG MCCOLLUM at BE\_OREM

Subject: Re: Affected Environment Requirements

Kreg: I will check into sources for the info you requested in support of affected environment. Please take a close look at the following, and let me know if you have any questions.

Please consider what the top priority data gaps and issues are for the impact analysis. Significance criteria is one good example. In that regard, since we are not presenting results for the SWP and CVP individually, I do not believe we can present impacts on the Restoration Fund. In any event, we need to refocus and consider what impacts might reasonably be estimated given the changed approach. This will have implications for what we include on the Resotration fund in the Affected Environment as well, obviously.

I suggest we use the Sites/Colusa reservoir in the north, and the Los Banos Grandes reservoir in the south for the "representative" storage projects, since these are the projects assumed for the DWRSIM analysis. You should have the pre-feasibility report on Sites/Colusa. Let me know ASAP if you don't. I will investigate the availability of data regarding Los Banos Grandes.

*Don't have  
am not familiar with*

I assume we will want to include construction use during construction estimates for the representative projects, but I am open to argument. However, I am not clear on what distinction we can reasonably draw between the scope of what we present for "representative" projects, and what scope of review would be conducted in a project level environmental review. Mark may have some input.

I suggest that you formulate strategic and broad planning questions on which Mark might be able to assist, and lets pose those questions ASAP.

On the quantitative analysis side, we should have the results for the existing conditions and the other six cases which have been developed to characterize the 17 configurations soon. I suggest that you look soon at how we will deal with the fact that several configurations, (including some that are for different alternatives!) use the same DWRSIM case. As a result, there will be no distinction in estimated pumping and generation impacts. You can draw the correlation between DWRSIM cases and configurations based on the spreadsheet I gave Duncan, which I thought I gave you already but am attaching just in case.

*→ If there is no  
difference between  
then there is none.  
We should probably  
present a full  
@ least between  
alternatives.*

I do not believe we will be able to include any quantitative analysis on groundwater pumping in this report, but I will confirm ASAP.

One substantive comment I received is that water use efficiency program may well result in increased on-farm power use, as energy is substituted for water by, for example, pumping for sprinkler irrigation replacing flood irrigation. We need to address this. Check with Stuart Robertson at B-E for suggestions.

I have received no other comments of substance, but will keep you posted. As you might have guessed, my schedule is going to be very tight after tomorrow, Wednesday. I will be in the office all day today, and Wednesday a.m.

Reply Separator

Subject: Affected Environment Requirements

Author: KREG MCCOLLUM at BE\_OREM

Date: 8/11/97 4:46 PM

In looking at the data that you sent me, I think we still need a couple of items (primarily from the SWP).

I do not see any historical data (1960 and later) for the SWP. We

need the following SWP historical data:

1. Project Energy Use
2. Generation
3. Power/Energy Sales
4. Rates

The same information is also lacking for a current assessment (1995 level of development). We do have it for 1993 (based on the December 1995 Management of the State Water Project). Let me know if there is nothing more current and I'll use 1993 for our current year.

The only CVP info that I think is lacking is historical data on Restoration Fund Revenues. We have a current estimate, but no historical data.

Thanks.

KMc