

Com Number	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	DFG Comments
1	Through-out the AD		The word "Sacramento" should not be used when referring to "splittail".
2	xiv		Add: "ERPP Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan"
3	3	Line 6, Appendix 12	Modify to read: "The first of two ecosystem reports."
4	3	Last Sentence	<p>Modify last sentence to read: "Separate appendices for air quality, noise, public health and environmental hazards, transportation, and visual resources were not needed."</p> <p>Add sentence: "The information provided for the affected environment describes the environmental baseline or existing condition with which the No-Project and Program alternatives will be compared."</p>
5	1-1	Last Sentence	<p>Modify last sentence to read: "Separate appendices for air quality, noise, public health and environmental hazards, transportation, and visual resources were not needed."</p> <p>Add sentence: "The information provided for the affected environment describes the environmental baseline or existing condition with which the No-Project and Program alternatives will be compared."</p>
6	1-1	Paragraph 3; left column; line 2	Insert the word "some" before "fish".
7	1-1	Paragraph 3; left column; line 6	Modify line to read: "..Species Act (federal ESA) and State Endangered Species Act (CESA)." These acronyms should be used consistently throughout the report.

8	1-1	Left Column, Paragraph 3, Line 6; and Right Column, Paragraph 1, Line 1	Modify to read: "Water management changes implemented to protect these listed species reduced...."
9	1-5	Left Column, Last Paragraph, Lines 6 and 7	Delete word downstream since it is not in the Problem area. Modify sentence to read: "...from activities within and upstream of the Bay-Delta system".
10	1-6	Right Column; Paragraph 2; Lines 8, 9 and 10	Modify sentence to read: "...resulted in the need to continue to add more material to the levees increasing their height compared to the lands they protect. There is a growing concern that increasing levee heights relative to the land side, coupled with..."
11	1-9	Left Column, Paragraph 2, Sentence 1	Implementation will be by local agencies, non-profits such as The Nature Conservancy, and other agency and non-agency entities. The text should be modified here to explain the connection of the Programmatic EIS/EIR to them as well.
12	1-10	Right Column, Bullet 5	Add after word "environment" the following phrase: "also referred to as the environmental baseline or existing condition".
13	1-11	Right Column; Paragraph 2; Lines 4, 6, 7 and 8	Modify as follows, " ..under federal ESA Section 10 and CESA sections 2081 and 2090. Thus the Programmatic EIS/EIR will incorporate ESA issues." Delete the remainder to the sentence.

14	1-13	Right Column, Paragraph 1, Line 3	Add the following at the end of the second full sentence: "There is a linkage between the targets for tidal emergent wetland, tidal perennial wetland, seasonal wetland, and wildlife friendly agriculture, for State listed species such as Swainson's hawk and greater sandhill crane and wintering wildlife. Therefore, targets will not be changed in a manner that would result in adverse impacts to those wildlife species from the development of aquatic habitats."
15	1-15	Left Column, Paragraph 2, Line 6	After the words "section 7 process", add in parentheses "or 2081 and 2090 processes".
16	2-2	Right Column, Paragraph 1, Last Line	Add at end of sentence: "...because they help define the boundaries around the alternatives".
17	2-7		A separate table should be provided which displays the features of the assumed conditions for Existing Conditions.
18	2-7	Table 2.2.1-1	With regards to features 2 and 10, what is the significance of the recently proposed approach for B-2 water and the potential listing of the spring-run chinook salmon with regards to the assumptions under the No-Action Alternative? A sentence or two should be added to the text explaining the significance of these actions to this EIS/EIR.
19	2-13	Section 2.2.4	Consider including a map of each alternative, similar to those which can be found in the CALFED document <i>Phase II Alternative Descriptions</i>
20	2-14	Ecosystem Restoration Program, Left Column, Bullet 2	Modify to read: "Habitat restoration of tidal emergent wetland and tidal perennial wetland identified for the south Delta would ..."
21	2-16	Last paragraph of Section describing Alt. 2A	Delete 1B from the last line. Referencing 1C adequately describes the modification and improvements.

22	2-17	Right Column, Paragraph 1, Line 2	Clarify that it is referring to alternative 1C. (This change is also relevant to other sections in this chapter e.g. page 2-20 and 2-21)
23	2-19	Right Column, Paragraph 2; Line 8	Clarify that it is referring to Alternative 1C
24	2-20	Left Column, Last Bullet	Delete language inside parentheses referring to mitigation.
25	2-21	Left Column, Paragraph 3	It isn't clear how the pumping capacity is increased by virtue of the new intake to Clifton Court or the head of Old River barrier since this alternative does not include Old River dredging.
26	2-25	Right Column, Last Paragraph, Last Sentence	Delete the phrase "or ecologically preferable". Clearly it is not ecologically preferable to only address one of the problem areas for salmon restoration.
27	2-27	Right Column, Last Paragraph, Last Sentence	Delete current first sentence and replace with, "As a follow-up to adopting the 1995 Water Quality Control Plan in 1995, the SWRCB is evaluating alternatives for implementing that Plan."
28	2-28	CVPIA Section	Consideration should be given to updating this section to reflect recent plan for B2 water (800,000 AF).
29	2-39	Section 2.6.5.2	We suggest that the acronym C-FOG not be used and that the term "Ops Group" be used.
30	Entire Table	Table 3.1-1	It is not clear if these are supposed to be generalized alternatives. Within alternatives some differences are so great that generalizations are questionable; examples are the fish entrainment impacts of Alt 2B and 2E.

31	Page 1	Table 3.1-1	Surface Water Resources: Add the following under the Alternative 3 Column, "Alternative 3 is expected to result in significant improvements in Bay-Delta Hydrodynamics compared to Existing Conditions and alternatives 1 and 2."
32	Page 1	Table 3.1-1	Surface Water Resources: This section ignores significant changes in hydraulics in the lower Sacramento River and Delta under both Alts 2 & 3. Additionally, improved water quality under Alt 2 is not dependent solely on storage facilities.
33	Page 3	Table 3.1-1	Modify the paragraph under Alternative 3 to read, "Alternative 3 is expected to have impacts slightly greater than Alternative 1 but less than Alternative 2."
34	Page 3	Table 3.1-1	Fisheries: Fish will probably be worst off with Alt 1, better off with 2 unless the upstream barrier problem proves very great, and best off with Alt 3. This table should be modified accordingly.
35	Page 3	Table 3.1-1	In the Alternative 1 Column add "greatest adverse impacts and the" before the word "least" and add the word "beneficial" after the word "least". In the Alternative 2 Column delete "greatest" and instead add "greater adverse impacts and moderate beneficial" before the word "impacts". In the Alternative 3 Column delete "greater" before the word impacts and insert the following, "the greatest beneficial impacts and least adverse" before the word "impacts".

36	3-1, Page 4	Table 3.1-1; Row 1	<p>In the Alternative 2 Column change wording to read, "Two variations of Alternative 2 are expected to have greater adverse impacts on vegetation and wildlife. Some of the impacted areas will provide additional aquatic habitat and benefit some species."</p> <p>In the Alternative 3 Column change wording to read, "One of the variations of Alternative 3 is expected to have the greatest adverse impacts on vegetation and wildlife. Some of the impacted areas will provide additional aquatic habitat and benefit some species. The other variations of Alternative 3 would have adverse impacts similar to the least damaging variations of Alternative 2".</p> <p>In the All Alternatives Column add, "Construction activities associated with the Levee System Integrity would cause significant adverse impacts on vegetation and wildlife."</p>
37	Page 9	Table 3.1-1	<p>Recreational Opportunities: Comparison among alternatives does not make sense. Intrinsic direct effects of alternatives are probably small except for potential of recreational facilities directly incorporated in an isolated facility. Overriding recreational effect would probably be proportional to improvements in fishery resources, as described above.</p>
38	3-1, Page 5	Table 3.1-1; Row 1	<p>Vegetation and Wildlife: In the All Alternatives Column add, "Construction activities associated with the Levee System Integrity would remove agricultural lands from production, while remaining lands would be afforded increased protection from flooding due to levee failure."</p>
39	3-1, Page 6	Table 3.1-1; Row 1	<p>In the Alternative 3 Column add the following wording, "Reduced salinity in exported water supplies will improve agricultural production and on-farm management."</p>
40	5-1	Right Column, Last Paragraph, Second Sentence	<p>Change the second sentence to read, "Land disturbed temporarily during construction would be restored through revegetation and would return to pre-construction conditions at different rates. These temporary losses are estimated at between 1,000 and 1,500 acres." (these are only estimates)</p>

41	5-4	5.2.3 Conveyance	The East Delta Habitat component which is associated with alternatives 2D, 2E, and 3H should be described and an estimate of acreage shown.
42	5-6	Table 5.2-2	Delta islands should be changed to "Delta channel islands". Fresh emergent wetlands should be displayed so that the tidal and non-tidal components are shown separately. The word "tidal" should be added to the habitat type "saline emergent wetland".
43	6-1	Left Column, Paragraph 1	Add the following sentence to the end of the paragraph, "The information in this summary displays impacts relative to the No-Action Alternative but does not indicate the relative magnitude of beneficial or negative impacts needed to compare among the different with-project alternatives".
44	6-1	Left Column, Last Paragraph	<p>Modify third to last sentence to read: "For the Bay-Delta region specifically, changes in flow conditions are also considered adverse and significant from the perspective of water supply and water quality if they have the potential of increasing reverse flows in the western Delta."</p> <p>Modify the second to the last sentence to read: "It is recognized that different significance thresholds and different measurements of changes in flows and changes in Bay-Delta hydraulic conditions may apply to other resources. Significant, adverse impacts may occur to those resources even when those impacts were not considered significant for surface water resources."</p>
45	6-2	Table 6.1-1	<p>Delta-Salinity/Bromide: The program has concluded that differences in bromide concentrations is one of the biggest differences among alternatives. Major changes are needed in the Delta and Service area sections in this table to reflect that.</p> <p>It isn't clear why Alternative 3A indicates that it has the potential for a greater adverse effect on water supply than Alternative 1A. This should be explained.</p>

46	6-3	Table 6.1-1	An explanation of how the symbols in the legend are used is in order. For instance, the meaning of having a rating of 0/+ should be explained. Also, it should be made clear that the open circle, dark half circle and dark full circle are adverse impacts. The word "adverse" should, therefore, be added to the definition. These changes should be made for the other chapters and tables as well.
47	6-4	Left Column, Paragraph 2	The text states that the No-Action Alternative result in changes that are less-than-significant. This conflicts with information shown in Table 6.1-1. That information indicates a significant but mitigable adverse impact. Furthermore, given that the adverse impact is significant with respect to Existing Conditions, adverse impacts of the alternatives that go beyond the No-Action Alternative are also, by definition, significant. A thorough review and editing of the text, table, and applicable model runs appears to be in order.
48	6-4	Left Column, Paragraph 4	It isn't clear why no change in Delta inflow would imply that future demand for Delta exports would not be met. This should be clarified.
49	6-5	Right Column, Paragraph 1	This paragraph contains two apparently misleading statements. It states that Alt 3 has the highest potential to reduce Delta outflow. The operations studies done to date project the same increase in exports with each of the three alternatives in combination with storage; furthermore, Alt 2 and Alt 3 have the same potential to divert water from the Sacramento River. Considering both of these facts why is the statement in the draft correct?  Secondly, the next to last sentence states that flows in the Sacramento River would increase. At least below Hood; flows decrease significantly and this point needs to be discussed.
50	6-27	Right Column, Paragraph 3	The "significance criteria" described here of 5 to 15 percent are not relevant to evaluating effects on aquatic resources. The text should be clear that these criteria apply to surface water resources for the purpose of water supply and water quality.
51	6-28	Section Paragraph 1	Insert the following words after the word "hydraulics" in the second line: "... from the perspective of water supply and water quality...".

52	6-31	Right Column, Paragraph 1	Do the operations studies support the conclusion about the unique reduction in spring outflow? If so why? Since the operations studies project the same increase in exports for all three alternatives, why would this statement be true, or an intrinsic effect as implied?
53	6-31	Left Column, Paragraph 3	The discussion of increased salinities seems out of place and perhaps should be moved to the chapter on water quality.
54	6-33	Left Column, Paragraph 3	Make it clear that these conclusions about the Bay Region and changes in X2 apply only to surface water resources and effects on water supply and water quality. The "small" changes noted are not likely to be considered insignificant from an aquatic resources perspective.
55	6-39	Left Column, Paragraph 3	The brief comparison between the program elements and Existing Conditions is misleading in our opinion. With increased exports of 700,000 to 1,200,000 acre-feet from current conditions to conditions under the No-Action Alternative (page 6-40) it is inconceivable to us that increased exports from the Delta beyond that level for alternatives 1 and 2 would not result in significant adverse impacts on Delta hydrodynamics.
56	6-39	Left Column, Paragraph 3	There is no evidence that salts will tend to build up in the south Delta with Alternative 3. Modify the second sentence to read: "Reduced cross-Delta flows will result in a reduction in the volume of lower salinity Sacramento River entering the south Delta. This will result in generally higher channel water salinities in the south Delta."
57	6-40	Left Column, Paragraph 3	In the second sentence a definition for "moderate" should be provided.
58	6-41	Right Column, Paragraph 1	The text is misleading since Alternative 1 in some configurations does not result in beneficial impacts. A careful editing of this entire impact assessment is in order since in its current state it will be of limited value during the public review of this document and be of little use to decision makers attempting to document selection of a preferred alternative.

59	6-44	Right Column, Paragraph 1	The mitigation measures proposed are not realistic because the placement of habitat will be driven by factors unrelated to the risk of increases in DOC. The "treatment" of peat soils referred to here is vague and benefits unsubstantiated. The document should propose mitigation measures that are likely to be implemented and will not result in further adverse impacts on fish and wildlife that would require mitigation.
60	6-46	Paragraph 2	The discussion under All Alternatives states that ERP actions have the potential to cause adverse impacts to water quality yet the remainder of the text discusses that restoration will take place on lands currently managed for agricultural use. The text should explain how development of wetlands (presumably with no use of herbicides and pesticides on lands which formerly had used these chemicals) will decrease water quality.
61	6-56	Right Column, Paragraph 4	Reference is made to a Table 6.1.4 illustrating water supply changes in the Delta for all programmatic alternatives. Unfortunately the table on page 5-57 doesn't provide that data. A revised table should be provided or the text modified.
62	6-58	Left Column, Paragraph 3	The last two sentences make very little sense to us and should be deleted.
63	6-61	Right Column, Paragraph 4	Comments made on page 6-39 also apply here.
64	6-80	Delta Region Section	There is little evidence that subsidence in the Delta is linked to "ground water pumping" in the context ground water is used in this section. Delete the second and third sentences and delete the word "other" in the last sentence.
65	6-91	Right Column, Last Paragraph	Delete this paragraph (continues on to next page).
66	6-93	Left Column, Paragraph 1	Modify this paragraph to delete references to intensification of high selenium levels. We are not aware of any data which suggest that selenium is a concern any where in the legally defined Delta.

67	6-93	inset	Some different approach for presenting this summary of impacts needs to be explored. The main problem is that some variations of alternatives 1, 2, and 3 do result in the impacts described, however, others do not. This should be clarified.
68	6-94	Table 6.3-1	We are unable to find a rationale for a no-effect designation for conversion of agricultural soils for the No-Action and 1A alternatives. If none can be found the ratings should be changed.
69	7-1	Left Column, Paragraph 3, Sentence 2	The word "may" should be replaced with a more active term such as "will" or "will not". If the modeled output does not predict additional flows then say so.
70	7-2	Table 7.1-1	Additional south Delta exports; first row: Alts 3A-3H should be + rather than none significant adverse impact.
71	7-2	Table 7.1-1	Through Delta; third row: The No-Action and Alt 1 should be rated as darkened half circles; Alt 2 should be o except for 2E which remains as shown; and Alternative 3 should be + since screens at Hood will reduce diversion of fish into central Delta.
72	7-2	Table 7.1-1	Through Delta; fourth row: The No-Action and Alt 1 should be rated as darkened half circles; Alt 2 should remain as shown; and Alternative 3 should be +.
73	7-3	Table 7.1-1	Is the underlying hypothesis concerning the differential impacts of the CVP/SWP intertie valid?
74	7-4	Table 7.1-1	South Delta Barriers; fourth row: The No-Action and Alt 1 should be rated as darkened half circles since the temporary barriers will remain or permanent barriers installed; Alt 2 and 3 A and B should remain as shown; and Alt 3E, H and I should show no change.
75	7-4	Table 7.1-1	Head of Old River Barriers; fifth row: Alt 3 I should show no change.
76	7-11	Table 7.1-1	Aquatic productivity; third row: The No-Action and Alt 1 and 2 should be rated as darkened half circles for all five species listed; Alt 3A through H should remain as shown; and Alt 3I should show no change.

77	7-12	Table 7.1-2	Entrainment losses; fourth row: Alt 3 should be rated as o for all three salmonid species listed.
78	7-13	Table 7.1-2	Through Delta and isolated; first row: The No-Action, Alt 1, and Alt 2 should be rated as darkened half circles for all five species; Alt 3 should be rated as a +.
79	7-12 and 7-14	Table 7.1-2	X2 shift depends on change in Delta outflow which is not necessarily proportional to Rio Vista flows and in this case probably isn't since Alternatives 2 and 3 redistribute flow between Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers.
80	7-21	Right Column, Paragraph 3	This section contains a vague description of flow benefits. Modeling information should demonstrate if reoperation of a reservoir and diversion facilities will produce additional short term flows.
81	7-22	Right Column, Paragraph 2	Pacific herring spawn in San Francisco Bay. This section should be revised to reflect that information.
82	7-35	Left Column, Paragraph 5	The text should make clear that the threshold for adverse impacts on listed species is normally a lower threshold.
83	7-38	Left Column, Line 3	The idea that increased exports may be either adverse or beneficial is incorrect. Any increase in exports will result in adverse hydraulic conditions in the south and central Delta. This will result in both resident and anadromous fish species moving into the south Delta.
84	7-39	Left Column, Paragraph 5	Is the statement about minimal changes in outflow justified given that operations studies indicate a 9% increase in exports?
85	7-48		This section generally exaggerates impacts of operational alternatives on the Bay. Introductory paragraph on previous page says about all that needs to be said. Also third full paragraph in left column and second full paragraph in right column say much the same thing.
86	7-50	Right Column, Paragraph 2	It is an exaggeration to say that "flows that approximate natural patterns may be restored under Configuration 1C". The last sentence on the page comes closer to the truth but even that is probably questionable as we suspect changes will be small in relation to existing conditions.

87	7-54	Left Column, Paragraph 2	Specify which "electronic databases" were used to identify the species and habitat which could potentially fall within project footprints.
88	7-54	Box	The "No Action" alternative states that conditions are forecasted to be similar to existing conditions. This statement is in conflict with the definition of "no action" found on page 2-6 which defines the "no action" condition as an approximation of the physical, operational, and regulatory features which are anticipated to be in place in the year 2020. "No Action" and "Existing Conditions" are two very different conditions and should not be used interchangeably since it is unlikely that conditions won't be significantly worse under the No-Action Alternative with increased demand.
89	7-54		<p>The discussion and the table lack perspective as to the relative consequences of the ERPP versus the conveyance alternatives regarding vegetation and wildlife. ERPP will be the dominant consideration, except possibly for storage facilities which seems to be ignored entirely in the table. The box inset in the text is not accurate since some of the Alt 2 configurations that include East Delta and Tyler Island habitat result in the greatest impact on vegetation and wildlife.</p> <p>The second paragraph should be modified to explain that impacts will also be considered significant adverse impacts if substantial reductions in waterfowl and shorebird habitats occur.</p>
90	7-56	Table 7.2-1	SWP and CVP Service Area: The listing of adverse impacts should be focused on special status species and their habitats. All alternatives should be rated with a darkened half circle.
91	7-59	Waterfowl and Shorebirds	The discussion should be clarified to include migratory and resident waterfowl and shorebirds. Much of the habitat conversion resulted in the loss or reduction of resident breeding waterfowl as well as reduction of suitable habitat for migratory birds. The last sentence of the first paragraph of this section should be modified by deleting "...but were not hunted."

92	7-59	Existing Conditions	The last sentence discusses the changes that have occurred within the Delta and the survival of species in spite of these changes. This is somewhat misleading because many species have been significantly impacted from the changes. The current ranges of numerous plant species are limited to small patches on channel islands. Breeding waterfowl populations have been significantly reduced due to the loss of nesting habitat as well. While many species have adapted to agriculture uses, there are many that have not. The agriculture lands do not supply all of the life cycle requirements for many species.
93	7-61 through 7-63	Waterfowl and Shorebirds discussion under Delta, Bay, Sacramento River, and San Joaquin River Regions	The Delta section on page 7-61 states that 10% of wintering waterfowl inhabit the region; the Bay section on page 7-63 states that 70% of wintering waterfowl inhabit that region; the Sacramento River section states that 60% of wintering waterfowl inhabit that region; and, the San Joaquin River section states that 25% of the wintering waterfowl inhabit that region. These statements need to be clarified so that readers have a clear understanding that migratory waterfowl move through all of the regions and do not stay in one region for the entire winter. For clarity we recommend that you delete the 70 % reference for the Bay region since for the area discussed in the AD this figure is inflated for ducks and geese but in line with estimates of shorebirds.
94	7-62	Special Status Species	The first paragraph discusses known occurrences of plants while the second paragraph opens with potentially occurring wildlife species. The discussion then states known occurrences of various wildlife species. The first sentence should be changed to avoid confusion to the reader.
95	7-66	Section 7 Sentence 3	Isn't it true that the San Joaquin River Region is larger in size than the Sacramento River Region? In place of saying, "... San Joaquin River Region has more land devoted to agriculture" it would be of value to the reader to have this presented as a comparison of percentages.
96	7-68	Column 2, Paragraph 2	The first paragraph discusses known occurrences of plants while the second paragraph opens with potentially occurring wildlife species. The discussion then states known occurrences of various wildlife species. The first sentence should be changed (delete the word could) to avoid confusion to the reader.

97	7-77	Column 2, Paragraph 3	It is stated that configuration 1C storage facilities could affect up to 16,000 acres. A more accurate statement is that these facilities could inundate up to 16,000 acres; affected acreage is going to depend upon location of the storage facility and could run much greater than the inundation acreage.
98	7-79	7.2.2.5, Bullet 3	Implementation of the ERP is listed as a mitigation measure for loss or disturbance of wetland and riparian communities. The ERP was not designed to serve as mitigation. We recommend that reference to this as a mitigation measure should be deleted.
99	7-79	Left Column, Last Paragraph	Implementation of the ERP is listed as a mitigation measure for loss or disturbance of wintering waterfowl habitat. The ERP was not designed to serve as mitigation. We recommend that reference to this as a mitigation measure should be deleted.
100	7-80	Left Column, Bullet 6	Implementation of the ERP is listed as a mitigation measure for the fragmentation of riparian habitat. The ERP was not designed to serve as mitigation. We recommend that reference to this as a mitigation measure should be deleted.
101	8-18	Table 8.2-1	Conversion or loss of agricultural land in the Bay Region is rated a significant and not mitigable. This conflicts with the text on page 8-23, last paragraph in the left column which states that it won't. This discrepancy should be corrected.
102	8-15	8.1.2.6, Bullet 2	Clarify what was meant by, "... shifting agriculture to new areas." One concern is which habitat type will be converted to agriculture. High value habitat for wildlife could be adversely impacted and would require additional mitigation.
103	8-38	Right Column, Last Paragraph	This paragraph should be restructured so it discloses the fact that significant unavoidable impacts will occur with implementation of any of the CALFED alternatives.
104	8-52	Column 2, Paragraph 2, Sentence 2	Since this is an impact to agriculture it can be assumed that the shift will not occur to land already in agriculture, therefore, it needs to be stated on what type of land this will occur. This shift could require mitigation if it involves natural lands.

105	8-63	8.3.1.1, Paragraph 4, Sentence 1	Correct "... Brentwood and Oakley areas ...".
106	8-76	8.3.1.2, Sentence 1	Define "rural".
107	8-83	8.3.1.3, Sentence 1	Is open space meant as it is defined on page 8-88, section 8.3.1.4: national forest and park lands, state parks and recreational area, and BLM and military properties. Include a definition here as well as page 8-88.
108	8-89	Existing Conditions, Sentence 1	Isn't a majority of this land used as grazing in which case it would be categorized with agriculture.
109	8-96	Land Use, Last Paragraph	It is not clear if the figure 12,630,000 acres mean for the entire CVP and SWP Service Areas outside the Central Valley. It would be of benefit to the reader to have the information for the different portions of this greater area presented in a table showing acres and land use for each.
110	8-106	Lines 1-4	Clarify what will be generating the cost savings and who will get those savings.
111	8-145		The discussion in general and particularly the paragraph split between this page and page 8-151 focuses on recreation related to land use changes. The split paragraph focuses on impacts, but recreational use related to the described actions is likely to be greater than for the existing "open space". More importantly, the recreational impacts of the alternatives will more likely be determined by their potential for recovering fish species than by the direct land use changes.
112	8-147		The Delta section of this table needs a row for "Recovery of Fish Populations" analogous to the rows with that title under Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers.