

Alternative 1

Advantage

1. Maintains contact of urban water users and Delta.
2. Environmental community's "Soft Path."
3. Water quality advantage in Delta.
4. South Delta access to water.
5. Maintains maximum flows in Sacramento river.

Disadvantage

1. Reverse flows continue to exist.
2. Requires storage to meet solution objectives if Delta water quality standards change.
3. Least flexible to system outages or changes.
4. Continued impacts to outmigrating salmonids particularly from SJ and resident Delta fish.
5. Export water quality is minimally improved.

Alternative 2

Advantage

1. Maintains contact of urban water users and Delta.
2. Improves mid-Delta export water quality.
3. South Delta access to water.
4. Water quality advantage in Delta.
5. Increases habitat in mid-Delta.

Disadvantage

1. Reverse flows continue to exist.
2. Not flexible to system outages or changes.
3. Increases risk to upstream migrants and continued impacts to outmigrating salmonids particularly from SJ and resident Delta fish..
4. Requires storage to meet solution objectives if Delta water quality standards change.
5. Reduces Sacramento River flows.

Alternative 3

Advantage

1. Requires least amount of storage to meet solution objectives if Delta water quality standards change.
2. Maximizes system flexibility and reliability.
3. Maximizes fishery risk reduction.
4. Improves Delta circulation (Q West).
5. Improves export water quality.

Disadvantage

1. Disconnects urban water users from Delta.
2. Viewed as a "Hard Fix.:"
3. Reduces Sacramento River flows.
4. Impacts in Delta water quality for users.
5. Initially more expensive without storage.

One analysis I would like to see is how much storage is required to meet the 2020 demand for all three alternatives given more stringent Delta standards. I do not think it is realistic to predict a relaxation of Delta standards in order to meet export demands. It seems that the reduced storage for Alternative 3 would offset the increased capital cost associated with the conveyance system.

In regards to the assurances question: There are technical, legal, and political assurances. The present condition assurances system is viewed as "ideal" for some reason. I see no changes in the legal assurances arena, our system of laws will continue to exist. Alternatives 1 and 2 are the weakest from a technical stand point. Alternative 3 is best from a technical assurances stand point. Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 all have their own political land mines associated with them. I prefer to support a decision on technical and legal grounds in a public forum.

If you have any questions before Friday, December 12, 1997 please use my VoiceCom # 1-800-384-8732 *757-8282 and leave a message.

Mark A. Cocke