

Comment Number	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	
1	Main Doc 5-7	5.2.1 ¶1	Kent Nelson	Text says Table 5-3 "provides a menu of the actions that are currently contemplated...". Table 5-3 contains no "actions".	ok
2	Main Doc 7.1-10	Table 7.1-2		I question whether the fishery impacts resulting from the "Construction and operation of new reservoirs" can be mitigated. It is the existing reservoir system that has left anadromous fish with little spawning and rearing habitat to begin with. Squeezing the remaining breeding populations into smaller areas due to more reservoir construction continues the downhill slide. When spawning habitat is inundated, it is virtually gone forever.	NO
3	Main Doc 7.1-21	7.1.2.1 ¶3		If more natural flow and salinity variability is to be introduced back into the Delta, freshwater quality standards will have to be relaxed in the west Delta, and the Contra Costa Canal intake at Rock Slough will have to be relocated. Can you explore this a little more?	Ok we just's relocate no more
4	Main Doc 7.1-23	¶2&3		¶2 states that sediment movement (and associated turbidity) is good for the river and Delta system. However, ¶2 implies that sediment contribution into the system needs to be controlled with Best Management Practices. Isn't this a contradiction? Which is it...is there too much or not enough sediment in the system?	NO
5	Main Doc 7.1-26	1 st column, bullet 4 vs. 2 nd column, bullet 6		These objectives pull in opposite directions. The document is full of examples like this. At what point will priorities begin to sort out these conflicts?	NO
6	Main Doc 7.2-24	Last ¶		McCormack Williamson Tract is one of the Delta's hotspots for elderberries and the obligate elderberry longhorn beetle. This extra benefit should be mentioned when discussing setback levees on this Tract.	NO

H-000862

7	Tech Report Affected Environ. Veg and Wildlife 5	Table 1		Where in this table does levee-associated riparian habitat appear for the Delta?	
8	TRAE Veg/Wild 21	1 st ¶ bullets		Need to include two more important bullets: 1) Levee failure/island flooding, and 2) Impaired natural processes (i.e. fluvial process)	
9	Tech Report Environ. Conseq. Veg/Wild 3	Significance Criteria		How about qualitative factors mentioned on Page 1, Assessment Methods, ¶3 of this technical report?	
10	TREC Veg/Wild 5	Table 1		Many of the same "Impact" evaluation criteria get "PS's" AND "B's" for each alternative. How is the reader supposed to weigh the ratings when a single action has both positive and negative effects? I.e. for Habitat Area, Alternatives 1,2&3: "Loss or degradation of wetland and riparian communities" (PS ratings); "Increase or improvement of wetland and riparian communities" (B ratings).	
11	TREC Veg/Wild 8	Table 2		There are many different symbols used in CALFED EIR/EIS tables which mean the same thing or similar (i.e. "Beneficial" is represented in various tables by "+", "B" "full moon" and "half moon"). It would be helpful to adopt a standardized set of rating symbols for all tables.	
12	TREC Veg/Wild 15	Ecosystem Restoration Program ¶1		If this concept is not in the Main Document, it should be. It is important in understanding the interrelationship between the ERP and the impacts of other program actions. I was unclear on this concept until this point in my review.	

