

(Filename: SRT21011.wpd)

SPECIFIC COMMENTS
FROM AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES
DURING 2/10/98 AND 2/11/98 MEETING

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
24	1						
32	2						
22	3				ag impacts need to be looked at with cumulative perspective		
29	4				determine where commercial fisheries should be discussed - sidebar, separate section, within an existing section		
4	5		5.3	EPA	Need to add systemwide context (discussed by region but identify systemwide context)		
74	6		7.1-2		footnote missing in title for proposed or listed species		
22	7	all			check mitigation nomenclature regarding unmitigable/unavoidable, etc. throughout the document and potential impact to phase 3. Have we enveloped all impacts?		
21	8	guide			include discussion about the state of the process presented by this document - the doc is in progress and subject to revision, additions and changes as we move from draft to final - identify what is not included here.		
2	9	5		DFG	rename chapter, by adding "Land Requirement Assumptions"; move section 5.2 to end of chapter and expand with Rick's text. Add text boxes to chapters 6,7,8 referring reader back to the assumptions in chapter 5.		
19	10	5			maps are good - further discussions are needed to evaluate how maps may be developed down the line		
3	11	5	5.2	CDFA	reorder discussion to follow same order as in chapter 1 (ERP, etc)		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
29	12	6			review conclusions regarding significance of delta outflow, particularly no action		
37	13	6			review use of percentages, particularly those over 100%		
39	14	6		BOR	add balanced discussion on use of X2 as indicator and what parameters		
48	15	6			separate out summaries for each portion of surface water section		
20	16	8.2		USGS	subsidence is not addressed as an ag issue; should also be addressed in no action - lands taken out of production due to subsidence by 2020 (check); cross reference to ag as impact		
26	17	8.3			disclose assumptions that went into analysis - pathway to conclusions (text from Hill); replace tables with those provided		
47	18	12			add discussion of future public involvement		
1	19	5-1	right col, bottom para	DFG	is it possible to identify temporary disturbances? Add estimation - perhaps additional 10%.		
6	20	5-1	5.1	EPA	Add sentence that directs reader to where they can find water assumptions		
7	21	5-2	last para		delete last paragraph and first para on 5-4 (geomorphic criteria)		
8	22	5-2	last bullet		add Woodward and Bacon Islands after Victoria Island Recheck acreage values on table (Sergio will check)		

H - 0 0 0 6 4 2

H-000642

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
10	23	5-2	third bullet		add Los Vaqueros and Los Banos Reservoir names? (Policy Group input necessary?)		
9	24	5-2	5.2.2		Add qualifier statement identifying why the example reservoir sites were used. Add brief discussion of surface storage screening process ongoing (Sergio)		
11	25	5-2	5.2.2		Include discussion that identifies that acreage numbers do not include mitigation acres		
14	26	5-4			check if east delta habitat component is included - adjust if necessary		
18	27	5-4	bullets	CDFA	confirm that information in ag land use packet policy group is included in ch 5		
17	28	5-4	bullets		check on in-delta and north habitat improvements (should be added?) Check table for consistency with changes		
15	29	5-4	last 2 bullets		delete western isolated facility bullet		
5	30	5-5		CDFA	add sentence clarifying that willing sellers/buyers has not influenced impact analysis (see Rick's text). Intent to strive to accomplish all land needs using willing seller willing buyer. If land needs aren't met through that option, other options will be considered.		
12	31	5-5	top of left col		delete "low intensity" from first sentence		
16	32	5-6	5.2-2	CDFA	make sure numbers are rounded off		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
20	33	5-6	5.2-2		clarify text to ensure that it explains these are max values and refer reader to ERP appendix		
23	34	5-6	5.2-2		clarify use of riparian; add forest sra; add text to table header 'and habitat types that would be created or enhanced' - consider splitting out habitat created vs impacted		
13	35	5-9	second col, first par		strike "top level"		
25	36	5-9	2 nd column	BOR	indicate on list where upper watersheds are discussed		
28	37	6-1			add reference in 6 directing reader to resource chapters for discussion on water use in urban, rec, fisheries, wildlife, ag (add discussions in those sections)		
27	38	6-1	2 nd para, 2 nd sent.	BOR	Add discussion re: development, limitations of models, assumptions and plan for further work (including validation) between draft and final doc. (Consider adding to Chapter 5 also/instead of here) (Liz)		
40	39	6-2			conjunctive use issue and relationship to subsidence - review what is included; add discussion of monitoring, (also should be discussed from adaptive management perspective)		
26	40	6-2	6.1-1		decide if the tables stay or not - is there a better way to display summary information; ck the lack of unknowns in both the text and table. If tables stay, review for consistency with text; check water supply info; separate salinity and bromide; add text to explain legend		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
33	41	6-4	no action		present modeling results and assumptions instead of speculative language included in the last paragraph of section. Include definition of hydrology. Incorporate edited model tables from tech report (inflow, outflow and exports for Sac and San Joaquin).		
31	42	6-5		DFG	clarify what we know vs what we don't know regarding what alts do to river flows (see specific comments from DFG)		
30	43	6-5	top right column		alt 3 impacts could be unknown due to redirected flow of Sacramento River - maybe identify that these are results of models (add qualifiers to identify unknowns)		
34	44	6-5	3 rd para right column	EPA	expand text to support first sentence; reflect in tables; include comparison to both no action and existing conditions, particularly drinking water quality at north delta intakes		
42	45	6-7	bottom left	DFG	delete 'and transfers' from first sentence.		
38	46	6-8	second column		regarding X2 - see language from EPA		
35	47	6-8	top of right col	DFG	tone of statement regarding delta outflow - don't use delta surplus wording		
40	48	6-8	2 nd para right col		clarify if discussing carriage water		
36	49	6-8	4 th para	EPA	para break after second sentence		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
43	50	6-9	1 st colume third para, 6 line		delete strictly		
41	51	6-9	2 nd column 2 nd para		provide simplified language such as in this para for all alts (ave delta inflow and exports)		
56	52	7-1			last sentence under Delta, change would to could; recognize here and elsewhere that potential significant adverse impacts from warming of delta waters and improved predator habitat and impacts to native species (address this impact through monitoring, adaptive management process) retrofit the main discussion on Delta impacts and include summary here. Identify that this is controversial and there is disagreement among experts		
54	53	7-1	bottom left col		move 'may' to in front of 'protect'		
52	54	7-1	box	EPA	revise text for the box, as per Warren, Susan, Bellory instruction		
53	55	7-1	delta region		clarify what is meant by dredging guidelines (and other items from ERP)		
1	56	7-2		CDFA	cropping patterns should be discussed in this chapter - make linkage between importance to wildlife. Synergistic relationship btwn the two.		
2	57	7-2			beneficial impacts of ERP are not given enough treatment		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
3	58	7-2		USFWS	insufficient information regarding impacts from storage and conveyance (i.e., Los Banos) and not reflected in table.		
4	59	7-2		EPA	could discussion be included here or in ch 5 about issues/resources triggering 404 and process involved?		
6	60	7-2			need table of special status species in veg similar to one in fisheries		
72	61	7-2	table		consider developing an 'all regions' column; improve differentiation among beneficial (double ++) combine Sac and SJ; add a caveat that explains you can't add pluses or compare relative importance down the columns.		
55	62	7-2	table		review table for consistency; tie to text somehow; review for significance or qualify with necessary mitigation.		
71	63	7-3	4 th line		construction of intertie needs to be clarified with regard to adverse or beneficial (text needs to follow table)		
9	64	8-1		CDFA	new title to better describe ag resources :Land Use, Social and Economic; additional information needed in ag section to better describe physical environment perspective, tone down economic analysis		
12	65	8-1		BOR	conflicts between conclusions discussed under alts and common programs need to be addressed		
44	66	11-1		CDFA	Include state regs; ag protection regs in particular		
46	67	11-8		EPA	add Clean Air Act conformity - EPA to provide paragraph		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
45	68	11-8	sect 11.7	CDFA	more discussion of methods to offset conversion of prime farmland – cross reference to where this issue is discussed – assure compliance with Farmland Protection Act		
34	69	6-10		USGS	numbers on figures don't add up - need to define why (should have mass balance); check justification for use of all numbers on both figures and tables(see comments provided)		
32	70	6-11			numbers of sign figures are not justified - misleading (add qualifier explaining use of or specify number that makes sense)		
44	71	6-15	1 st para		add after uncertain "is a subject of disagreement among experts" and end paragraph at recreational uses (delete Populations of striped bass.....)		
46	72	6-15	2 nd col, fourth par		replace 'beneficial uses' with a list of uses		
45	73	6-15	2 nd col, third para		rewrite para		
49	74	6-27			explain assessment methods for common programs and rationale behind that assessment method		
47	75	6-27	6.1.2.2	EPA	develop sign criteria that relate more accurately to impact issues identified on summary table or drop in this section and explain where they are picked up in other sections -		
50	76	6-27	6.1.2.3		First paragraph, fix wording!		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
51	77	6-39	6.1.2.6;6.1.2.7		explain that this is not a section for which we developed mitigation or identify significant unavoidable impacts		
36	78	6-44	2 nd para, right col		first statement makes no sense - ck entire paragraph and adjust		
35	79	6-48	7 th para		check second statement re crops grown after land drained		
39	80	6-52	table		check source for data (date of analysis)		
42	81	6-55			water use and management section needs substantial rewrite - if not possible, then need to flag issue for reader discussing additional info/work that will be completed		
37	82	6-58	3 rd para		rewrite - see comments from Frank		
41	83	6-94	table		remove row regarding reservoir induced seismicity under San Joaquin Region		
79	84	7-10	table		add impacts to striped bass recreational fisheries in reservoirs		
75	85	7-11	first box		change spawning and rearing to spawning and/or rearing		
73	86	7-11	table		add scores for no action column		
77	87	7-20	last paragraphs in both col		seems to be inconsistency - beneficial and adverse - reword to clarify		
78	88	7-23	table		modify caption to match what is included in table; address SWP/CVP service area on table some way (perhaps with footnote after striped bass)		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
57	89	7-28			need clarification of assessment methods to explain how indicators describe adverse and beneficial impacts (see specific examples in comments)		
58	90	7-28	bottom first para under 7.1.2.1		Add 'unknown' to beneficial or adverse impacts in second to last sentence		
59	91	7-31		EPA	clarify use of term 'productivity' - cite info that supports determinations; define distinction between primary productivity and biomass losses		
60	92	7-34	1 st col		4 th bullet seems out of character with others; delete bullet		
66	93	7-37	3 rd para	BOR	expand what is meant by restored condition		
63	94	7-38	third sentence		expand info and lay in operation data (Bellory/Warren)		
62	95	7-38	top, 2 nd col	EPA	flow effects need to be more explicit and use the operation data available (check entire section)		
64	96	7-39	bottom first col		can statement of 'minimal to ecosystem level impacts' be supported?		
67	97	7-50	sac river	BOR	explain lack of modeling for temperature in Sac river and how results may change		
69	98	7-51	last para, 2 nd column		expand on harvest related actions - explain where it came from (ERP)		

H - 0 0 0 6 5 0

H-000650

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
76	99	7-53			types of upstream trib activities such as removal of gravel ponds and subsequent removal of bass habitat (ERP) should be added; address water level fluctuations in south of delta reservoirs		
68	100	7-53	mit	EPA	try to rewrite to mimic the way handled in terrestrial (Bellory/Warren)		
70	101	7-53	7.1.2.8		Clarify content of section		
8	102	7-55			add common programs to tables		
7	103	7-56		DFG	unknowns need to be dealt with - disk from Frank		
5	104	7-73	bottom right col	CDFA	lands coming from ag are not identified; end of chapter, not identified as sign impact. Cross reference to ag resources - resource impact. Crops should be dealt with as vegetation		
21	105	7-79			copy first para under mitigation strategies into each section of doc		
13	106	8-15		BOR	delete 2 nd bullet in right column		
10	107	8-16		CDFA	develop maps for three main regions for ag land use; cropping patterns, prime farmland resources		
14	108	8-25			focus should be acreage numbers rather than number of farms; move land use section from 8-26 to 8-25 after existing conditions heading		
15	109	8-28	table		fix so it reflects ag numbers		
16	110	8-29			social well being section doesn't relate well to ag		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
17	111	8-33			add water related issues to sign criteria; clarify sign criteria to be more specific		
11	112	8-33; 8-39		CDFA	clearly state how these sign criteria will be used for second tier documents; incorporate tables with range of impacts (some direction provided from Steve)		
18	113	8-38			on insert: 3 rd from last bullet needs to be clarified - potential controversy		
19	114	8-38		DFG	on insert; replace intro sentence on bottom block with "mitigation strategies for unavoidable..."; first bullet under last section - remove " and affordable"		
23	115	8-38			language for mitigation strategy: "The CALFED benefits of water supply and reliability should be provided to agricultural water users on an equitable basis considering the nature and extent of impacts to ag resources, including land and water."		
25	116	8-40; 8-42			question whether these tables should be removed given treatment of land use in section		
24	117	8-43			shorten para top right column to better reflect relative importance of water transfers		
38	118	8-48	insert		delete 5 th bullet from bottom or reword by ending sentence at 'problem', deleting the rest		
28	119	8-56	tables		revisit, revise and add beneficial impacts to all tables		

A #	C #	Page No	Para/ Line	Agency	Comment	T	P
27	120	8-60	2 nd col, center para	WAPA	inconsistent with info contained in summary box; need to state qualitative nature of available information and how this impacts the analysis - identify the unknowns as well		
43	121	6-117	6.3.2.6	CDFR	add actions under ERP and land retirement that fall under sign unavoidable impact section		
30	122	8-148			check text and table for reservoir recreation; combine tables and add benefits		
33	123	8-187			adjust first sentence under reservoir section to characterize flood control as incidental to function(don't infer that it is primary function)		
31	124	8-205	4 th para	USFWS	balance the treatment of some benefits of levee veg, etc.; cross reference to veg section		
61	125	7-29;7-30			clarify water temperature between Delta and riverine; describe controls over delta temps (shallow water, ambient effects, etc.)		
65	126	7-42;7-53	last para, column 1; sign pot un		check apparent conflict of statements re significant impacts and further elaborate to clarify		