

97-A60



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, SACRAMENTO  
CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
1325 J STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814-2922

October 17, 1997

Regulatory Branch (199600168)

Craig Stevens  
Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.  
2600 V Street, Suite 100  
Sacramento, California 95818-1914

Dear Mr. Stevens:

I am writing in response to the draft outline for the §404(b)(1) alternatives analysis for Phase II of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, our identification number 199600168. Your effort was substantially complete in scope. However, we have reorganized some items, and have expanded the detail associated with the line identifying the Guidelines. A copy of the reworked outline is enclosed.

If you have any questions, please write to my attention, Room 1480 at the letterhead address, or telephone (916) 557-5266.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jim Monroe".

Jim Monroe, P.E., Esq.  
Chief, Delta Office

Enclosure

Copies furnished w/ enclosure:

- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Attn: WTR-3 (Carolyn Yale), 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105-3901
- > CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Attn: Frank Piccola, 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155, Sacramento, California 95814

G - 0 0 6 0 9 4

G-006094

## Outline of 404 Process Documentation for CALFED

### I. Introduction

- A. Program Introduction
- B. Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines
  1. No other practicable alternative that would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem, that does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences.
  2. If preferred alternative involves discharge into special aquatic site, rebutted presumption that less damaging alternatives that do not impact special aquatic sites are available.
  3. Consistent with the CZMA
  4. Does not violate state water quality standards
  5. Does not violate toxic effluent standards or prohibitions under §309 of the CWA
  6. Does not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed threatened or endangered species or adversely modifies designated critical habitat
  7. Conforms to Title III of Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972
  8. Discharge will not result in substantial degradation of waters of the United States, taking into account significant adverse effects resulting from the discharge upon:
    - a. human health and welfare, e.g. effects on municipal water supplies, fish, shellfish, wildlife, and special aquatic sites;
    - b. life stages of aquatic life and other wildlife dependent on the aquatic ecosystem
    - c. aquatic ecosystem diversity, productivity, or stability; and
    - d. recreational, aesthetic, and economic values of the aquatic ecosystem.
  9. All appropriate and practicable steps have been taken to minimize potential adverse impacts on the aquatic ecosystem.
- C. Purpose of the Analysis
- D. Need for 404(b)(1) Documentation (CALFED actions that could affect wetlands and other waters of the U.S.)

### II. Background on CALFED Process

- A. History of Water Development and Conflict in the Bay-Delta
- B. History of the CALFED Process
- C. Critical Nature of Solution Principles and Interrelatedness of Four CALFED Objectives
- D. Public Agency and Public Involvement (including state and federal resource agencies)

III. CALFED Program Purpose

IV. Documentation of Alternative Development Process (Phase I)

- A. Alternatives To Resolve Bay-Delta Problems
- B. Alternative Identification
- C. Alternative Refinement
- D. Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration and Why

V. Documentation of Programmatic Impact Analysis and Alternative Screening (Phase II)

- A. Criteria used to screen alternatives (distinguishing characteristics and how they relate to practicability; as constrained by cost, logistics, and technology) [Note: more detailed description of distinguishing characteristics to come from Frank by 10/7?8).?]
- B. Alternatives eliminated from further consideration and why
- C. Selection of Preferred Alternative [to come later?]

VI. Demonstrate Compliance by the Preferred Alternative with Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines [This section should show explicitly how each of the items outlines in Section I(B) are complied with.]

VII. Next Steps: CALFED Phase III: Project Implementation

- A. Project Specific Environmental Documentation
- B. Programmatic, Regional, and Individual Permits

VIII. Citations

Attachments

- 1. CALFED Purpose and Need Statement, memo from Lester Snow, March 25, 1997
- 2. List of Actions Considered
- 3. List of Actions Rejected and Why
- 4. Phase I Final Documentation Report, September 1996