



**CALFED
BAY-DELTA
PROGRAM**

1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155
Sacramento, California 95814

(916) 657-2666
FAX **(916) 654-9780**

July 13, 2000

Mr. Will Travis
Executive Director
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
50 California Street, Suite 2600
San Francisco, CA 94111

Dear Will:

Enclosed is the CALFED Bay-Delta Program's Final Programmatic Coastal Zone Management Act Consistency Determination. It reflects changes suggested by your staff on CALFED's Draft Programmatic Consistency Determination. We are seeking the Commission's concurrence, by August 25, 2000 with our consistency determination. Also included are a number of documents to assist your staff and the Commission in arriving at their decision.

Thank you for putting CALFED on the agenda for the August 17, 2000 Commission meeting. CALFED Program staff are available to help your staff better understand the CALFED Program as well as prepare information about the Program for the August 17, 2000 meeting. I have asked Ms. Cindy Darling to lead this effort. You may reach Ms. Darling at (916) 657-2666.

CALFED is currently at the culmination of a years-long planning process that began with the signing of the Bay-Delta Accord in 1996. Since that time, 18 state and federal agencies have worked together to devise a plan for restoring the ecosystem of the fragile Bay-Delta, while meeting the water reliability and water quality needs of millions of the state's citizens. During this process, there has been close and ongoing consultation with all the stakeholders involved with the ecosystem and water use. This process has been long and difficult, but has resulted in the current Preferred Alternative, which most involved stakeholders and political leaders agree will go the furthest toward meeting the many differing goals of CALFED.

As described in the EIS/EIR and Program Plans, CALFED will be of tremendous benefit to the Bay and its ecosystem. Under CALFED, tens of thousands of acres of land will be improved for habitat or restored to their natural marsh conditions. CALFED actions will be aimed at improving conditions for many Bay species, especially anadromous fish and

CALFED Agencies

<p>California</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Resources Agency Department of Fish and Game Department of Water Resources California Environmental Protection Agency State Water Resources Control Board Department of Food and Agriculture 	<p>Federal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Protection Agency Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service Bureau of Reclamation U.S. Geological Survey Bureau of Land Management U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service U.S. Forest Service Department of Commerce National Marine Fisheries Service Western Area Power Administration
--	--	--



Mr. Will Travis
July 13, 2000
Page Two

endangered species. High-quality fresh water will be available during times of the year when dealing with saltwater intrusion is most problematic. Overall flows to the Bay will be of better-quality water, with fewer pollutants and contaminants. If feasible, improved levees in the Suisun marsh will protect marsh habitats from the dangers of catastrophic levee failure, and resulting saltwater intrusion. Brackish marsh habitat will be protected and increased. By purchasing water for ecosystem needs, the Environmental Water Account will provide water for fish species when they need it most, without disrupting water needs of other users.

Against the many benefits to the Bay, the EIS/EIR acknowledges that there is a potential for adverse consequences. When outflows are at their highest, a small portion may be retained as storage. Currently, CALFED'S many experts and consultants are unable to document any adverse environmental impacts which would result from this detention, but part of the CALFED Program is to study the possible impacts of this action. Also, X2 may move a fraction of a kilometer to the east. Again, no adverse impact can be identified for this potential move, but CALFED has committed to study the issue. Before any individual projects are built, these questions would need to be answered, and impacts, if any, would need to be mitigated. Any project proposed within the jurisdiction of BCDC would need to return to the Commission for a consistency determination before that particular action or project could go forward.

CALFED's program's are interlinked, and each is necessary for the others to go forward. Viewed together, as CALFED must be, the many beneficial aspects of the Program to the Bay appear to outweigh the few potential negative aspects.

Enclosed Documents

CALFED's Final Programmatic Consistency Determination. We have incorporated your suggested changes into the final.

Response to Comments. A three volume set (one volume has two parts), responding to comments on the June 1999 Draft Programmatic EIS/EIR. There is an explanation of how to navigate around in these documents located at the beginning of each of the 3 volumes. However, to save you some time, the Commission's comment letter was assigned number 1238. It can be found in Volume III Part 1 beginning on page 496. Once you have located your letter, use the codes to the right of comments to locate responses in Volumes I and II. For example, the first response code to your comments is IA-5-2-19. The IA designation means this response is found in Volume I: Impact Analysis. Also found in Volume I are responses with a CR designation. Responses beginning with any other designation (IP, ERP, etc.) can be found in Volume II: Technical Appendices.

Phase II Report. If short of time, read this report. This report provides a general overview of all aspects of the Program. More importantly it describes how the Program may be implemented,

Mr. Will Travis
July 13, 2000
Page Three

governed and funded. Chapters 3 and 4 may prove to be most useful in helping understand the linkage between CALFED's programs and assurances.

Implementation Plan. This plan describes the proposed schedule and process for implementing near-term actions in the context of the overall implementation approach, including financial and assurance strategies. Chapters 1 and 4 may prove to be the most useful.

Impact Analysis Document. The Purpose and Need statement in Chapter 2 provides a clear sense of the interrelationship between all the programs and the need for all to go forward together if the overall program is to be a success. Chapter 2 also includes the description of alternatives. Potential flow changes are noted in chapter 5.1 and 5.2, water quality changes are presented in chapter 5.3 and potential effects on fish and wildlife resources are noted in chapter 6.1 and 6.2.

Framework for Action. This document released by Governor Davis and Secretary of the Interior Babbitt sets out actions anticipated to be included in the proposed preferred program alternative. You might want to review the following first: "Accountability and Program Linkages" beginning on page 2; "Science" beginning on page 36; "Governance" page 38; "Regional Approach to Ecosystem/Water Management" beginning on page 39.

If you have any questions, please call me at (916) 657-2666.

Sincerely,



Steven R. Ritchie
Acting Executive Director

Enclosures