

## DRAFT STAFF WORKING PAPER

Patrick:

### Presentation of USF&W Recommended Alternative to IDT:

15-20 minute presentation by USF&W staff, followed by Q&A, following which auxiliary Service staff would leave and IDT deliberations begin.

An "optimized alternative" will be one that, insofar as possible, meets CALFED objectives and Solution Principles, including reducing conflict in the system, improving water supply reliability, being equitable, implementable, and not causing significant redirected impacts. In addition from a practical standpoint, to be successful, the alternative chosen must provide sufficient benefits to the affected parties to constitute a desirable "deal". The Core Group has studied the USF&W proposal as it was originally presented to CALFED, and have identified questions that pertain to the sufficiency of the proposal with respect to some of the above characteristics. The following are some of the issues we anticipate will need to be discussed, and would appreciate Service staff being prepared to describe your recommended approach to optimizing the proposal in such a way as to eliminate significant problems:

1. How does the proposed 10,000 cfs capacity isolated facility, along a 3,000 cfs San Joaquin River diversion maintain adequate export capacity? In the absence of being able to at least maintain current levels of water supply, it is difficult to imagine how the expense of constructing such a facility would be seen as acceptable.

#### Considerations:

Evaluations presented to the IDT demonstrate the flow in the San Joaquin River is typically below 3,000 cfs in summer months and, once flow requirements are accounted for, it appears diversion capacity from the San Joaquin River would not often exceed about 1,000 cfs.

The demand of South Delta agriculture during peak irrigation periods may be on the order of 4,500 cfs which would be taken from the isolated facility. (We are attempting to firm up this estimate)

2. How can the Service proposal, which has the appearance of being functionally equivalent to a fully isolated facility, be seen as falling within the description of a dual facility which was adopted for environmental analysis and documentation?
3. The Service proposal appears to envision additional water being provided, presumably for ecosystem purposes. More specifically, how would such water be used? From what sources does the Service envision the water coming without depriving others of their water supplies?

Patrick, we are very interested in the Service proposal, and it is not our intent by posing potentially difficult questions to suggest that it is not viable, or that at least it has viable features. We think the same kind of test will have to be met by any proposal that has potential for being the Preferred Alternative.

On a slightly different topic, I was uncomfortable with the part of the last meeting of the IDT where there seemed to be a willingness of some IDT members to discard in-Delta or near-Delta storage on the basis of cost. I wasn't able to articulate my discomfort at the time, but have since clarified my thinking, and I want to try it out on you. My line of reasoning is that we are trying to optimize Alternative 1. We have concluded that addition of in-Delta or near-Delta storage would, in fact, be an optimizing feature, as it would permit cessation of South Delta exports for some period of time. But then, the suggestion is made that we should discard the storage because it costs a lot.

I believe we should not get into this kind of cost comparison at this stage of the selection process. Let us say, for example, there are two ways of optimizing Alternative 1 to avoid entrainment. One is to install in-Delta or near-Delta storage, and the other is XXXXXXXX (something or other). Then, if Option A is less expensive than Option B, fine we adopt Option A. However, as is the actual case, we don't know of another way of producing an optimizing feature for the alternative then if the feature is important, it stays, even if expensive.

Only when we begin comparing the three optimized alternatives in the attempt to find the Preferred Alternative are we able to judge whether the expense of storage in Alternative 1 is warranted with respect to its benefits, as compared to attaining equivalent or greater benefits another way.

I would appreciate your reaction to this thought, as it would be my plan to introduce it sometime during the next meeting.

1024IDT

9

C - 0 9 6 9 0 7

C-096907