

From: Yale.Carolyn@epamail.epa.gov  
Date: Fri, 20 Feb 1998 17:39:58 -0800  
Subject: flags on the rest of fish/aquatic ch 7  
To: wendyh@water.ca.gov  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: EPA

Wendy-- a bit more, possibly late.

Chapter 7:

Pages 23ff on Delta Region: This is a bit of a mess.

\* There are no break points distinguishing discussions of alternatives 2 and 3. Distinguish between alternatives, and make clear what's common to all. (E.g., p. 24 middle col 1, refers to benefits of restoration actions which presumably also occur in Alternatives 1 and 3.)

\* Page 23 second col, second paragraph, first sentence refers to screens when the subject is barriers. Eliminate.

\* Last paragraph page 24: is this for Alternative 2? 3? Both?

\* First paragraph page 25: Was this meant to represent "worst case" conditions for a transfers discussion? Adds little. I would omit it, or rewrite, clearly relating the topic to transfers (possibly integrating with discussion page 7-28) and omitting sentence beginning "In addition..." (unless relaxed export:inflow criteria are part of the analysis).

Next paragraph page 25: potential confusion between an increased pattern and an increased flow (latter not necessarily the case, net). Rewrite, "Diversion in an isolated facility would improve the opportunity to establish natural flow patterns..."

\* Page 26, last paragraph first column and first full para second col: clarify which subalts of Alternative 3 this refers to; clarify especially operating conditions under which conclusions re net southerly flow occur.

\*\* Maybe I missed it, but I did not see in the text a discussion of the X2 adverse impact summarized in the introductory box.