

(K)

Ballouy

Vol 1

Vision Statement Comments - Sacto-San Joaquin Delta Eco. Zone

Sacto-San Joaquin Delta Ecological Zone

p 1, col 2, bul 1 : Listing winter run as threatened considered okay?

p 2, col 1, bul 2: Restore steelhead upstream of dams (former range)?

p 2, col 2, bul 1,2: What is "former abundance"?

p 2, col 2, bul 2: Too general even for this list.

p 2, col 2, bul 6: This level can be reached by reducing overall population levels available to be entrained. State percentage of population entrained?

p 3, col 1, para 2: Natural hydraulics were not in place in the mid 1960s.

p 3, col 1, para 3: Reducing "ag waste runoff" in the Delta is difficult where there is a high ground water table.

p3, col 1, para 3: "Reducing loss of freshwater inflow...to diversions" implies no reduction to exports from the Delta?

p3, col 1, para 4, sent 2: Did the Delta ever have a high level of primary productivity?

p3, col 1, para 4, sent 3: " Estuary productivity will be improved by restoring tidal action to wetlands" Suisun Marsh duck club owners will not be happy with this statement.

p3 col 1, para 4, sent 4: Not much is known about "nutrients and foodweb organisms in the shallower areas of the Delta." We never knew what level they were in the first place, so "high levels" are unknown.

p 3, col 2, para 1: How will species introduced since the 1960s affect this vision?

p3, col 2, para 2: Delta Protection Commission will not like the potential of restoring ag land to tidal tule marshes.

p 4, col 1, para 3: Add "reduction of introduction opportunities for new species"

p 5, col 1, para 3 sent 3: Shoal areas are subject to both deposition and erosion.

p 5 col 2, para 1: Is the ecological health reduced or changed?

p 5, col 2: What is the table showing "Unit Health of the Delta Ecological Zone" signify?

p 5, col 2: Second table (?) match the title of the table terminology match the terminology in the text.

p 5, col 2: General observation: In the vision statements, we are pursuing 1960s and 1970s level for fisheries population. This text implies an earlier time period goal for wetlands habitat...such as the early 1900s?

p 6, col 1, para 2: This is also an area of significant impact by introduced species.

p 6, col 2, para 1: Significant amounts of tidal marshes still exists in Suisun Marsh.

p6, col 2, para 2, sent 2: Vineyards have limited waterfowl and wildlife habitat value.

p7, col 2, para 3: We have not found any red-legged frog in the Delta.

p8, col 2, tables: Define "Historic Monthly Average Flow" and "Unimpaired Monthly Average Flow"

p10, col 1, para 3: Add salt loading from ag drains?

p10, col 2, para 2: Does "restored hydraulic conditions" by definition improves survival or that we know what the restored hydraulic conditions are and they will consequently improve survival?

p 11, col 2 : Add fish passage problems at Georgiana Slough?

p11, col 2: What are the fish passage problems at Snodgrass Slough?

p12, col 2, para 1: Add "channel alterations such as the Delta Cross Channel" to things which influence the hydraulic processes in the North Delta.

p 14, col 1, para 2: How important is it to control hyacinth throughout the complex?

p 14, col 1, para 3: It may not be beneficial to screen every agricultural diversion.

p 14, col 1: Add the preservation of shoal development at the confluence of the Sacto River and Steamboat Slough.

p 14, col 1, para 4: Does this paragraph belong here?

p 15, col 2, para 1: The Delta Cross Channel should be added to the list of things that affect the hydraulics in this area. It should be distinguished from channel diversions which imply things such as ag diversions.

p 16, col 1, para 2: Any diversion mechanism for keeping salmon out of Georgiana Slough?

p 16, col 2, para 1: Tidal headlands of sloughs would improve habitat for predatory species. Reconcile that habitat with migration routes of salmon.

p 17, col 2, para 1: Add “ man-made barriers” to influences on hydraulic processes.

p 17, col 2, para 1, sent 6: “began to significantly alter hydraulic patterns, particularly during water years” Water year type is left out of the sentence?

p 18, col 1, para 1: Recent modified hydraulic processes (increased flows since the operation of New Melons) have probably increased dissolved oxygen levels, lowered water temperature levels, diluted salt loadings and increased water circulation.

p 18, col 2, para 2: Is there any interest in screening Bantam-Carbon intake?

p 18, col 2, para 3: Barrier at the head of Old River should prevent fish from moving into the southern Delta.

p 18, col 2, para 3: Shouldn't need to screen the barrier.

p 21, col 1, para 2: Mention predation problem in Clifton Court Forebay.

p21, col 2 para 1, sent 1: The islands in Middle River has the only resident Black Rail population in the Delta. If habitat restoration/expansion is not planned, at least provide existing habitat protection.

P 22, col 1: Is CALFED going to address net cross Delta flow impacts on fisheries in the central Delta?

p 23, col 1, para 3: Reconcile the term “manage” with “protect”. Add hydraulic (flows, velocity) protections in shallow areas. Sedimentation, erosion... Changes in vegetative cover? Temperature, food source,

Organizationally, you are losing me here. Things are appearing to become redundant.

p 23 DELTA ECOLOGICAL ZONE RESTORATION PLAN: having trouble understanding the purpose of this section in terms of what information is included under main element heading. Seems like it should include:

1. short definition of the element
2. which aspects of that element is being selected for protection
3. a short list of potential actions to protect those aspects.
4. possibly a list of aspects of that element that can't be addressed by the ERPP and why

p 25, col 2, para 2: How do these “elements” relate to the seven “elements” listed in the Delta Ecological Zone Restoration Plan? These will be confused with the Table 2 ecosystem “elements.”

p 25, col 2: The format layout confuses the reader as to what element 1 is. It appears to be agricultural lands but I think it is actually strategies to incorporate fish and wildlife habitat protection with current land uses.

p 25, col 2, para 3: What do the levels signify?

p 25, col 2, : Add crop shift to irrigation season which would have reduced impact on fish diversions?

p 26, col 1, para 2: Do we need predator control measures here?

p 26, col 2: What is the position of ERPP on aquatic mammals such as beaver, muskrats, etc? Add a section on preserving shore line habitat for turtle basking, shore birds roosting etc?

p 27, col 1: Add examine natural erosion and deposition processes in the Delta and design projects to incorporate these processes to minimize dredging and dredge disposal impacts and maximize secession habitat development from this process.

p 27, col 2: Potential additional bullet: Where practical within the broad floodplain, do not close levee breaks to allow the development of a natural meander belt.

p 28, col 1: Potential additional bullet: Determine areas of natural deposition and encourage successional habitat development.

p 29, col 1: Element 4 is a list of actions that could take place in the other elements?

p 30, col 1, para 1: Is this politically correct to mention? If it is, should Delta lands and north of the Delta retirement programs be proposed?

p 30, col 1, para 2: We will never "avoid" exports during the February through July period.

p 30, col 1, para 3: We need some assurance that the calculation of X2 actually reflects hydraulic and biological situation desired. As the measurement of X2 is refined, the actual amount of reservoir releases may change consequently affecting upstream benefits associated with X2.

p 30, col 1, para 4 : check on real time monitoring

p 30, col 2, para 2: This clashes with the ISDP and will force the redefinition of the ISDP purposes in addressing water levels in the south delta for their EIR. Habitats have developed in many of the "barriered" dead end sloughs such as Trapper Slough. This concept needs to be examined more closely before calling for their elimination. How does the concept of weirs fit here? Paradise Cut, for example.

p 30, col 2, para 3: Screened diversions in the south delta don't have the same fisheries benefits as the north delta. They may not be economically beneficial to the fisheries resources.

p 30, col 2: There are no predation loss actions listed.

p 31, col 1, para 2: Seems like perforated flat plate screens would have debris problems. Just state that the screens need to be replaced?

p 31, col 1:

1. Need to say anything about the Clifton Court Predation situation?
2. How do we reconcile Delta wide habitat improvement activities with increased predation losses associated with improved predator species habitat?
3. Is it worthwhile to consider moving the CVP intake to Clifton Court Forebay?
4. Is it worthwhile to consider moving a consolidated water supply intake for south delta to Clifton Court Forebay?
5. Is it worthwhile to consider an overland facility to move water from New Melons to the CVP/SWP facility?

p 31: Somewhere we should mention something about the protection of the delta from significant salinity intrusion and its effect on habitat should a Delta levee break and draw Bay water into the Delta.