

C

TO: Dick Daniel  
FROM: Rick B  
SUBJECT: Comments on ERPP  
CC: Steve/Lester/Loren

I think you and the folks that worked for you should be commended. You have assimilated a good deal of information into the reports. I can only see the Program and the resources improving because of all of your efforts.

Most of my format suggestions assume Joe Public will be reviewing and trying to understand these documents. If that is wrong, then we may be able to get away with less. My sense is that most controversy stems from misunderstanding. If we can make these documents as easy to understand as possible, it will go a long way to minimizing misunderstanding/controversy. As you will see, most of my comments relate to the format. I'll continue to read for more technical issues.

If you use me as an example of a reader who has some familiarity and compare my effort with someone with no familiarity you may get a sense of the magnitude of the format issue or maybe just my ignorance. It took me 3-4 hours to figure out (I think) how all of this comes together and 3-4 more to get through 4-5 topics. I believe this could have taken much less time if there was an overall pix of the package an overall pix of the respective sections and an explanation of the relationships between the topics.

1. Add an Introduction to both reports to provide the reader a generic sense of what is contained within both documents. Perhaps, the introduction uses the headings found in each volume and works the reader through a generic example including definition and relationships. Seems like the following are the general headings. They may be organized slightly different than the current texts.

Volume 1- Vision, Background, Objectives, EcoFunction, Status, Health Card, Opportunities, Linkages

Volume 2 - General Vision, Specific visions, Background, Status, Health Card, Pathway, Restoration Plan, RP Components, Linkages, Related Benefits, Targets/Actions.

2. The headings and associated information should be presented consistently throughout each document.

3. The introduction should help the reader understand we are preparing a programmatic EIR/S and what that means with respect to detail and why we have offered more detail here.

4. The introduction should help the reader understand that the ERPP is one part of the alternatives. That all pieces must go forward simultaneously.

5. The introduction needs to explain the grading system. We should be able to offer our opinion as to why we gave the grades we did.

6. A clear tie between resource visions and their short-term and long-term targets and the various eco zone vision technical appendices would be real helpful. There is a sizable amount of overlap and it is confusing.

Volume 1

## Format

1. Provide a specific document overview. What the reader can specifically expect in this report. A suggested outline of topics follows, additions are underlined, some topics are organized slightly differently.

Vision - general in bullet form; visions- specific to unit in bullet form; elaborate on general vision(s); general health card (pre and if we are going to use them, suggest a post program health card as well); Background; elaborate on specific visions; specific unit health cards; restoration plan; rp components; linkages; benefits; and summary table of specific targets and objectives; specific targets and objectives.

## Specific

1. Need to adjust statement on Page I. I believe Scoping identified a need to include ecosystem restoration in the overall program not a specific ERPP. Always need to keep the whole Program in the forefront.

2. There doesn't seem to be a water quality vision for the Delta p.1-4.

3. Grading needs to be explained and documented. Shouldn't items graded be consistent across units? How about a similar table showing what our actions will do? P. 10 and all others.

4. Process/Status p. 10, indicates improvements expected for aquatic system not so for terrestrial system.

5. The name of the Technical Appendix beginning on p.35 should be titled as such on p.22 rather than referring to an attached appendix.

6. Restoration plan numbers should correspond to component elements; Table 1 should correspond to plan/component elements; how does Table 1 correspond to Specific Targets and Objectives? Units for most numbers on Table 1 are missing.

7. Is Appendix 14 identified on page 31 tech app identified on page 22?

8. Each Technical Appendix (Targets and Objectives) needs an introduction helping the reader understand what is coming and a summary table.

## Volume 2

### Format

1. Provide a specific document overview. What the reader can specifically expect in this report. A suggested outline of topics follows, additions are underlined, some topics are organized slightly differently.

Vision- bullet form; general objectives - bullet form; elaborate on vision/objectives; Background; Ecofunction description for all; Status, Health Card (pre and post), Opportunities, Linkages.

2. Formats for what seem to be good examples of "physical processes/needs/etc" and "status" sections are on pages 39 and 45 respectively.

3. There needs to be a tie between resource visions and eco zone vision technical appendices.

5. Short-term and long-term targets need to be a part of all resource visions.

### Specifics

C1 1. Page VI add "implementation" to title. Limitations of Preliminary "Implementation" Objectives... Without, reader may confuse with table 1 objectives.

C2 2. Page 1. Need to tie flows to flow dependent functions otherwise seen as being the standard cure all for all ills.

- C3 3. Water rights should be carefully reviewed by the lawyers.
- C4 4. P.6. "time-value of water" noted with no explanation.
- C5 5. P 17. Opening statement indicates vision is related to other visions but does not offer vision.
- C6 6. P 26. Reference to water/storage alternative needs to be changed to w/s component.

Delta Sloughs

- 1. Need to check consistency with Delta Eco Zone. DEZ restoration plan mentions sloughs but they are not in its plan components and unsure if they are in its technical appendix.