

X-Sender: rickb@goldeneye
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.3 (16)
Date: Sun, 18 Jan 1998 15:52:14 -0500
To: chadwick@s3.sonnet.com, rfo@calweb.com, engelbri@wapa.gov,
wendyh@water.ca.gov, Ehoward@ibr2mp700.mp.usbr.gov,
phoward@ibr2inet.mp.usbr.gov, jerryj@wrfs2.swrcb.ca.gov,
kkelly@water.ca.gov, louis.gail@epamail.epa.gov,
moem@hvcdojnet.state.ca.us, jmonroe@usace.mil,
enelson@wapa.gov,
loleary@water.ca.gov, mscoonov@counsel.com,
sdshaffer@ucdavis.edu,
lhsmith@usgs.gov, gary.stern@noaa.gov,
chuckv@water.ca.gov,
fwernett@delta.dfg.ca.gov, yale.carolyn@epamail.epa.gov,
mcocke@ca.nrcs.usda.gov, marc@resources.ca.gov,
patrick_leonard@fws.gov
From: Rick Breitenbach <rickb@water.ca.gov>
Subject: administrative draft
Cc: lorenb@water.ca.gov, sbuer@water.ca.gov, kimc@water.ca.gov,
cooke@water.ca.gov, mcowin@water.ca.gov,
ddaniel@water.ca.gov,
bfong@water.ca.gov, sgross@water.ca.gov,
jordancj@worldnet.att.net,
sguillen@water.ca.gov, jheath@water.ca.gov,
jkelly@water.ca.gov,
bmarshak@aol.com, dmc@water.ca.gov, raymac@water.ca.gov,
zachm@water.ca.gov, zamiv@pacbell.net,
ronott@water.ca.gov,
fpiccola@water.ca.gov, selkirk@water.ca.gov,
mselkirk@igc.apc.org,
shanks@water.ca.gov, lsnow@water.ca.gov,
rwoodard@water.ca.gov,
syaeger@water.ca.gov

1/18/98

DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/
DRAFT/DRAFT

To : Administrative Draft EIS/EIR Reviewers

From: Rick Breitenbach

Subject: Purpose and Programmatic Nature of CALFED Bay-Delta
Program

Administrative Draft Programmatic EIS/EIR

Just a follow up to the discussions we had on Friday about the
purpose and

programmatic nature of the Administrative draft Programmatic EIS/EIR (Admin draft).

The Programmatic EIS/EIR consists of a main document and assorted technical appendices. The main document consists of the standard environmental document information, i.e., Purpose and Need statement, description of alternatives, discussion of consequences and so forth. The technical appendices generally expand on the information in the main document. One technical appendix that has received a bit of attention is the Phase II Report. This report will lay out all the efforts completed in Phase II including the Program's work which has lead (starting with the original 12) to an alternative, that appears, at this time, to have technical resource management advantages (TRMA). A summary of this effort will be included in the main document before it is released to the public. The Phase II report will also discuss issues/strategies/policies that have guided development of the Program.

The Admin draft consists of the main document absent a discussion of the Phase II Report information. The Admin draft, as will the public draft, provides information to decision makers and the public on the range of possible consequences associated with each of 12 alternatives. The 12 alternatives evaluated present a wide and reasonable range of options to meet the Program's objectives. The Admin draft is not meant to revisit the rationale behind the makeup of the alternatives, that is, why do some alternatives have surface storage facilities or Delta conveyance facilities or an ecosystem restoration component. However, the information that comes

from the evaluations of the 12 alternatives will be useful in deciding which features should be in the preferred alternative. Further, the information on the consequences of the 12 alternatives in concert with the analyses/efforts to identify the TRMA will prove useful in selecting the preferred programmatic alternative.

The descriptions of the consequences of the 12 alternatives are not specific. That is because we do not what will be specifically built, where it will be built or when it will be built. We know that all the alternatives include water quality actions, water use efficiency actions, ecosystem restoration actions, levee system integrity actions and watershed management actions and we generally know what types of actions they will be and in some cases we can estimate the potential area that might be impacted by some of the actions. We also know that some alternatives include water storage (surface and groundwater) and Delta conveyance facilities. What we do not know are the specific size, location and operation regimes of these storage and conveyance facilities. A general or programmatic evaluation of the 12 alternatives was completed because of the lack of site/project specific information, the limited amount of time to conduct the evaluations and in some cases the preliminary nature of the assessment information that was available for use. Oftentimes evaluations are qualitative in nature giving the reader a sense of direction of consequences, in others a range of potential consequences are displayed and in others the maximum consequences anticipated are displayed. Prior to implementation of any action, site specific environmental documentation will be prepared.

DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/DRAFT/

DRAFT/DRAF
T/DRAFT/