



Memorandum

Date: September 17, 1997
To: Steve Yaeger
From: Greg Zlotnick *Z*
Subject: Inventory of Proposed Alternative Modifications

At your request I have completed a review of all PCT, Agency and BDAC review of comments on the Phase II alternatives. The following is an inventory of the comments received through August 15th.

Proposed Changes to Described Alternatives:

Alt 1b

DFG: Desire one fish screen complex at head of CCF.

Alt 1c

DFG: Desire one fish screen complex at head of CCF.

Alt 2a

DFG: Increase intake at Hood to 15kcfs to allow for total closure of Cross Channel/Georgianna Slough. Install boat lock and fish passage at intake. Eliminate use of Snodgrass Slough as part of channel as seemingly in conflict with protecting wetlands. New fish screen at CCF.

Alt 2b

DFG: Increase intake at Hood to 15kcfs to allow for total closure of Cross Channel/Georgianna Slough. Install boat lock and fish passage at intake. Eliminate use of Snodgrass Slough as part of channel as seemingly in conflict with protecting wetlands. New fish screen at CCF.

CALFED Agencies

California
The Resources Agency
Department of Fish and Game
Department of Water Resources
California Environmental Protection Agency
State Water Resources Control Board

Federal
Environmental Protection Agency
Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Department of Commerce
National Marine Fisheries Service

Steve Yaeger
September 17, 1997
Page Two

Alt 3a

EPA: Need to explain more clearly the "spur conveyance links to the Bay Area and areas east of the Delta." Also, impacts and contribution to Program objectives.

Alts 3c, 3g, 3h

DFG: Increased screened diversion on Sacramento River.

Alt 3i

BDAC: Model diversions in stages and lower level of diversion (i.e. 5-10-15) at Hood. High diversion level discomforting.

DFG Alternative Proposal

- 10kcfs IF with screened intake at Hood, in 3 bay configuration.
- 2-3kcfs turnout into Mokelumne River near New Hope Tract.
- Screened intake to SWP pumps from Italian Slough when low export rates.
- Modify ISDP with Middle River Barrier and eliminating other ag barriers, eliminate dredging and intake relocation/enlargement provide overland supplies to other South Delta farmers from IF.
- North and South of Delta storage of 1-1.5MAF.
- 200KAF in-Delta storage in South Delta.
- Groundwater storage and upstream San Joaquin storage as in Alt. 3g.
- Discontinue use but retain current intake to CCF for contingency needs.
- Build intertie between SWP (CCF) and CVP (Old River).
- Upgrade CVP fish screens and salvage facility.
- Construct Head-of Old River operational radial gate barrier.
- Various specific and comprehensive operational criteria proposed by DFG.

Stein's In-Delta Storage IF Proposals

Alternative #1

- Connect Victoria, Woodward and Bacon Islands via 5kcfs siphons.
- At northeast tip of Bacon Island construct 4kcfs screened intake.
- On both Old and Middle Rivers, construct 5kcfs screened intakes to Victoria Island.
- Connect Victoria Island to CCF with 15kcfs siphon, with 15kcfs pumping facility.

Steve Yaeger
September 17, 1997
Page Three

Alternative #2

- Eliminate man-made waterways between Bacon, Woodward and Victoria Islands that would otherwise require siphons to make them single reservoir.
- At northeast tip of Bacon Island construct 5kcfs screened intake.
- At opposite ends of existing North Victoria Canal, which would be closed off with new levees, construct 5kcfs screened pumping facilities.
- Connect Victoria Island to CCF with 15kcfs siphon, with 15kcfs pumping facility.

Fish Screen Team General Recommendations

- Any alternative should be fully integrated hydrodynamically and operationally through rigorous modeling of all components together in the context on Delta hydrodynamic issues.
- Recommend North Delta isolated diversion of 15kcfs because it made little sense to screen at Hood and then expose concentrated fish left in the river to an unscreened diversion at the Delta Cross Channel (or other unscreened cross Delta flows).

BDAC Comments Pertaining to Narrowing Characteristics and Considerations

- Alex: IF needs to be responsive to possibly exacerbating flooding on southeast side of alignment if not going to siphon under current flow corridors.
- Alex: IF needs to be responsive to possibility of seepage problems.
- Tom Maddock: Ability to modify to reflect adaptive management needs should be considered.
- Alex: Suggest looking at storage components that could be used with any alternative as a common program.
- Tom Maddock: Water quality differences among alternative is key criterion.
- Alex: Need more analysis of potential to reduce bromine without IF, i.e. with through Delta only.
- Sunne: Implications for efficacy of common programs should be distinguishing criterion.

General Observations On Comments

EPA's comment on east side is going to be dealt with. Implications for contributing to Program objectives is legitimate issue that should also be addressed.

BDAC's comment on 3i needs to be addressed. Pretty straightforward.

Unless DFG's proposal is totally off-base, it should be brought forward if the environmental

Steve Yaeger
September 17, 1997
Page Four

community thinks it's worthwhile too. Not sure they do. Have some concern with in-Delta storage and loss of habitat and agricultural lands.

Stein's proposals are intriguing, but also suffer from loss of habitat and agricultural lands, as well as probable water quality skepticism. Should also get someone else to champion if gong to carry forward as added alternative, i.e. DWR rather than Stein. Then similar to DFG's proposal which isn't Terry's or Dick's baby.

As for the BDAC's general suggestions, they all need to be folded in to be responsive and they don't seem too outrageous.