

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
62	6	ch 10	10.1.1		Growth inducing affects in urban areas are identified as beneficial; ag is slated to grow as result of program - question validity of these statements in table		
63	7	ch 10	10.1-1		statements on table are not accurate regarding growth inducement; need to focus on whether or not growth is increased as result of program; maybe disclosure is the best solution - no clear determination		
64	8	ch 10	10-3		summarize resources that are being committed to other uses - include reference to other sections within doc where info is available		
58	193	10	10.1.1		Add supporting text for growth inducing		
60	194	10-1			substitute 'speculative' when discussing growth inducing impacts		
61	195	10-1			language is contradictory with regard to speculative nature of growth inducement in service areas. Check language with Interim South Delta Project to insert with addition of language provided by DFG, acknowledging contributions to growth inducement and suggesting possible mitigation strategies at local level (MANAGEMENT TEAM ISSUE)		
74	196	10-1		Steve Shaffer, CDFA	Ch 10 - Growth inducing impacts do recognize ag. impacts, but problems with Table 10.1-1.		
748	197	10-1	Entire chapter	WAPA	Cumulative impacts should include an analysis of changes in air quality and other effects resulting from substituting thermal power generation for hydropower generation, if hydropower generation is curtailed. As hydropower operations are affected, other generation facilities will change their operations to compensate. This potential impact should either be analyzed or an explanation should be provided as to why it is not significant.		
658	198	10-1	10.1.1	Rick B., CALFED	The 1st paragraph this section should be used to lead of the whole chapter. Move to just after 10.1 heading.		

H-000629

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
1255	199	10-1,2	growth-inducing impacts	FWS	<p>The first paragraph on page 10-1 is too mild in stating that "analysis of environmental effects include[s] a discussion of growth-inducing impacts." Section 15126(g) of the California Environmental Quality Act specifies that an EIR shall discuss "the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas)."</p> <p>On page 10-1, it is stated that the agricultural sector of the economy will be the most affected by CALFED. This is difficult to reconcile with DWR Bulletin 160-93, the California Water Plan Update, which predicts substantial decreases in agricultural water demand and substantial increases in urban water demand by the year 2020.</p> <p>Bulletin 160's summary states that South Coast Region population is expected to increase from 16 million to 25 million by 2020, but that "critical water supply difficulties" stand in the way of this expected growth. The bulletin indicates that one way to remove this obstacle to growth is to support "improved Delta transfer capabilities to improve reliability of ... SWP supplies." Thus it appears that CALFED's essential goal of improving Delta water transfer capabilities to meet 2020 water "demands" is by definition a significant growth-inducing impact. Why this fact is not recognized in the draft document, and why the impact is not disclosed as required by CEQA, is unclear.</p>		
1256	200	10-2	summary chart of growth-inducing impacts	FWS	The summary chart of growth-inducing impacts on page 10-2 finds a "potential beneficial impact on urban areas" that is not explained in the text. It should be noted that CEQA prohibits an assumption that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance.		
490	201	10-3	Section 10.1.2	Mike Cooney, DWR	The statement is made in the last paragraph of this section that potential growth-inducing impacts within the study area and potential mitigation strategies are still being identified by <u>ongoing</u> studies is incorrect, at least as far as the Department of Water Resources involvement. The DWR had been involved in ongoing studies of this nature, however, these studies have been put on hold indefinitely. I am unaware of other agencies attempts to address these issues.	T	

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
22	202	10-4	Section 10.2.1	Robin Reynolds, CDFA	Also reflected in Table 10.2.1.1. There would be no adverse long-term impacts to any resources..." is wrong. The program as proposed would have very adverse impacts on the rare and unique environmental resources related to agriculture. This must be amended to reflect the true nature of the program which CALFED is proposing.		
1257	203	10-4	Section 10.3, second paragraph	FWS	The paragraph states that the irreversible and irretrievable impacts for Alternative 1 are discussed in Section 10.3.4, a section which appears to be missing. Please include it.		
659	204	10-4	10.3	Rick B., CALFED	3rd paragraph add "and 3" after "...the Alternative 2". Delete 4th and 5th paragraphs.		
59	205	10-5			delete increased productivity with re to ag (long term gains)		
75	206	10-5		Steve Shaffer, CDFA	= Table 10.2.2-1 - There is a long term loss of ag. productivity.		
491	207	10-5	Table 10.2.1-1.	Steve Hayes, DWR	Add "Water Quality" and "Short-term adverse impacts during construction."	T	
57	208	10-5	table 10.2.1-1		no discussion of potential curtailment of hydropower generation and potential substitution of fossil fuel generation in its place, increasing rate of use of fossil fuel reserves		

H - 0 0 0 6 3 1