

Conceptual Proposal Review Form (Related Programs Review) CBDA Environmental Water Program

Directions: Please use this form to record your evaluations. The review form contains a number of questions and asks you to provide an overall summary rating (Recommended for full proposal development, Not recommended for full proposal development) for the proposal. Please provide a narrative answer for each of the questions. Your entries should explain your evaluation, but do not need to be in complete, grammatically correct sentences. Please remember that these reviews will be available to the public on the EWP website. When your review is complete, please save it as a new Word file, using the following naming convention: first initial, last name, Clear Creek, the words "related programs review", and extension (i.e. wsears clear creek related programs review.doc). Completed review forms should be e-mailed to Stefanie Brearley (SBrearley@sanet.com, phone 916 737 3000). If you have further questions regarding the review or the document please contact Campbell Ingram (Campbell_Ingram@fws.gov, phone 916 414 6727) or Peter Downs (downs@stillwatersci.com, phone 510 848 8098 x138).

Proposal Title: Environmental Water Program Conceptual Proposal for Flow Acquisition on Lower Clear Creek

Reviewer:

Related Programs Review Questions

1. Does the sale of water have the potential to adversely affect the rights of others, including the SWP and the CVP?

The re-regulation of the flows would need to be coordinated with Keswick releases to avoid fluctuations in Sacramento River flows that could otherwise result in injury to the CVP (lost water supply). Re-regulation of Keswick in coordination with Clear Creek flows would need to retain fish protection in the Sacramento River above the Clear Creek confluence. Temperature standards would need to be met in the Sacramento River, and the effects of increased flows in Clear Creek vis-à-vis temperatures would influence flow management and re-regulation potential.

2. Are there opportunities for the acquired water to achieve multiple environmental benefits through partnerships with other acquisition programs?

EWA could use water released beginning in June and continuing until the Delta goes out of balance. EWA could participate in that part of the spring-summer strategy operations.

Miscellaneous comments:

Is the winter operations strategy allowable considering flood protection, spillway design, and permits for operating Whiskeytown Dam?

The last paragraph of Section 6.3 on Page 44 points up the need for exploration of the coordination of flows among the facilities (Whiskeytown, Keswick, Spring Creek tunnel) to maintain CVP supplies, water temperatures, and flows.

The methodology for addressing flow changes and temperature changes in the Sacramento River as a consequence of program operations should be addressed. What impact would increased Clear Creek flows have on main stem Sacramento temperatures? Could Keswick releases be reduced when Clear Creek flows are increased and still meet temperature and flow requirements on the Sacramento River?

The methodology for assessing water supply impacts to the CVP should be addressed.

The fluctuation of power generation inherent in the new operations will be a factor for USBR and WAPA to address.

The paper does not clearly discuss the acquisition of the water and the role of any willing seller. This reviewer assumes that the costs are entirely operational, monitoring, and power foregone, rather than the purchase of water. This point should be addressed clearly.

Would the use of the glory hole in summer present any recreational safety hazards in Whiskeytown Reservoir?

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating below.

Recommended for full proposal development

~~*Not recommended for full proposal development*~~

The project seems to have substantial merit and the potential to provide significant benefits at a modest cost.

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating:

The project seems to have substantial merit by re-regulating flows.

The flow coordination issues, Sacramento River impacts, and water supply issues described above should be explored further to assure practicality of the proposal and identify all costs and institutional issues. The science design seems quite detailed and adequate for the Clear Creek area. Discussion of potential monitoring for Sacramento River changes needs to be added, or coordination with other monitoring activities should be described. Once these operational issues are resolved, the re-regulation should proceed and the changes and benefits monitored as described.

Conceptual Proposal Review Form (Related Programs Review) CBDA Environmental Water Program

Directions: Please use this form to record your evaluations. The review form contains a number of questions and asks you to provide an overall summary rating (Recommended for full proposal development, Not recommended for full proposal development) for the proposal. Please provide a narrative answer for each of the questions. Your entries should explain your evaluation, but do not need to be in complete, grammatically correct sentences. Please remember that these reviews will be available to the public on the EWP website. When your review is complete, please save it as a new Word file, using the following naming convention: first initial, last name, Clear Creek, the words "related programs review", and extension (i.e. wsears clear creek related programs review.doc). Completed review forms should be e-mailed to Stefanie Brearley (SBrearley@sanet.com, phone 916 737 3000). If you have further questions regarding the review or the document please contact Campbell Ingram (Campbell_Ingram@fws.gov, phone 916 414 6727) or Peter Downs (downs@stillwatersci.com, phone 510 848 8098 x138).

Proposal Title: Environmental Water Program Conceptual Proposal for Flow Acquisition on Lower Clear Creek

Reviewer:

Related Programs Review Questions

1. Does the sale of water have the potential to adversely affect the rights of others, including the SWP and the CVP?

It appears that no water would be purchased. Instead, the proposal is to conduct short-term, manipulation in the timing and routing of water into and out of Whiskeytown Reservoir. The main effect will be on hydropower operations, with compensation planned for foregone generation. Downstream from Clear Creek in the Sacramento River the change in magnitude and timing of flows will be relatively small. It does not appear that the rights of others, including the SWP and CVP would be adversely affected.

2. Are there opportunities for the acquired water to achieve multiple environmental benefits through partnerships with other acquisition programs?

Because the proposed project would be carried out through re-operation of water management facilities and apparently no water would be purchased, there does not seem to be any opportunity for a partnership with the Environmental Water Account.

Miscellaneous comments:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating below.

Recommended for full proposal development

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating:

The Concept Proposal addresses a legitimate habitat restoration element, acknowledges the scientific uncertainties and incorporates the adaptive management principles of stating hypotheses, conducting scientific evaluations, and incorporating feedback into future actions. System response will be numerous and confounding influences will be difficult to control. Nevertheless the approach seems to be well thought out and has a reasonable probability of success.

**Conceptual Proposal Review Form
(Related Programs Review)
CBDA Environmental Water Program**

Directions: Please use this form to record your evaluations. The review form contains a number of questions and asks you to provide an overall summary rating (Recommended for full proposal development, Not recommended for full proposal development) for the proposal. Please provide a narrative answer for each of the questions. Your entries should explain your evaluation, but do not need to be in complete, grammatically correct sentences. Please remember that these reviews will be available to the public on the EWP website. When your review is complete, please save it as a new Word file, using the following naming convention: first initial, last name, Clear Creek, the words "related programs review", and extension (i.e. wsears clear creek related programs review.doc). Completed review forms should be e-mailed to Stefanie Brearley (SBrearley@sanet.com, phone 916 737 3000). If you have further questions regarding the review or the document please contact Campbell Ingram (Campbell_Ingram@fws.gov, phone 916 414 6727) or Peter Downs (downs@stillwatersci.com, phone 510 848 8098 x138).

Proposal Title: Environmental Water Program Conceptual Proposal for Flow Acquisition on Lower Clear Creek

Reviewer:

Related Programs Review Questions

1. Does the sale of water have the potential to adversely affect the rights of others, including the SWP and the CVP? **Yes, possibly. But there is not likely to be any transferable water available for acquisition in Whiskeytown or on Clear Creek so this project would re-operation of Trinity – Whiskeytown – Keswick. That raises both power and water supply issues and would require close coordination with Central Valley Operations, to avoid water supply impacts to CVP contractors.**
2. Are there opportunities for the acquired water to achieve multiple environmental benefits through partnerships with other acquisition programs? **Yes, possibly but see note above. There may not be any water to acquire. The flows proposed might be achieved by re-operation with offsetting reductions from Shasta – Keswick but that would not make water available for other purposes. This proposal needs further discussion and will require close coordination with CVO.**

Miscellaneous comments:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating below.

Recommended for full proposal development **Yes, but with close coordination with CVO.**

Not recommended for full proposal development

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating:

Given lack of transferable water on Clear Creek this project will require re-operation and close coordination with CVO.

Conceptual Proposal Review Form (Related Programs Review) CBDA Environmental Water Program

Directions: Please use this form to record your evaluations. The review form contains a number of questions and asks you to provide an overall summary rating (Recommended for full proposal development, Not recommended for full proposal development) for the proposal. Please provide a narrative answer for each of the questions. Your entries should explain your evaluation, but do not need to be in complete, grammatically correct sentences. Please remember that these reviews will be available to the public on the EWP website. When your review is complete, please save it as a new Word file, using the following naming convention: first initial, last name, Clear Creek, the words "related programs review", and extension (i.e. wsears clear creek related programs review.doc). Completed review forms should be e-mailed to Stefanie Brearley (SBrearley@sanet.com, phone 916 737 3000). If you have further questions regarding the review or the document please contact Campbell Ingram (Campbell_Ingram@fws.gov, phone 916 414 6727) or Peter Downs (downs@stillwatersci.com, phone 510 848 8098 x138).

Proposal Title: Environmental Water Program Conceptual Proposal for Flow Acquisition on Lower Clear Creek

Reviewer: Paul Fujitani

Related Programs Review Questions

1. Does the sale of water have the potential to adversely affect the rights of others, including the SWP and the CVP? Depending upon the structure of the final program and its relationship to CVPIA 3406(b)(2) and other CVP project operations there is the potential for the program to impact water supply and project power. There are also outstanding questions regarding the technical viability of the project in regards to the safety of Whiskeytown Dam. Reclamation is currently evaluating the capability of utilizing the spillway for the release of the proposed flows.

2. Are there opportunities for the acquired water to achieve multiple environmental benefits through partnerships with other acquisition programs?

Miscellaneous comments:

Water and power costs for the project may be understated. It may not be possible to achieve the operational targets in a single trial in a given year based on forecasted precipitation and inflow. Flood control operations and releases are difficult to predict and are almost guaranteed to be different than anticipated.

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating below.

Recommended for full proposal development

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating:

I do have some concerns regarding the technical feasibility and potential costs, but these could drop out and it is still worth investigating

**Conceptual Proposal Review Form
(Related Programs Review)
CBDA Environmental Water Program**

Directions: Please use this form to record your evaluations. The review form contains a number of questions and asks you to provide an overall summary rating (Recommended for full proposal development, Not recommended for full proposal development) for the proposal. Please provide a narrative answer for each of the questions. Your entries should explain your evaluation, but do not need to be in complete, grammatically correct sentences. Please remember that these reviews will be available to the public on the EWP website. When your review is complete, please save it as a new Word file, using the following naming convention: first initial, last name, Clear Creek, the words "related programs review", and extension (i.e. wsears clear creek related programs review.doc). Completed review forms should be e-mailed to Stefanie Brearley (SBrearley@sanet.com, phone 916 737 3000). If you have further questions regarding the review or the document please contact Campbell Ingram (Campbell_Ingram@fws.gov, phone 916 414 6727) or Peter Downs (downs@stillwatersci.com, phone 510 848 8098 x138).

Proposal Title: Environmental Water Program Conceptual Proposal for Flow Acquisition on Lower Clear Creek

Reviewer: Roger Guinee, Water Operations Division Chief, Sacramento FWO, USFWS

Related Programs Review Questions

1. Does the sale of water have the potential to adversely affect the rights of others, including the SWP and the CVP? **My understanding is this proposal is not a sale of water, but a reoperation of Whiskeytown Reservoir releases to provide the experimental flow releases to Clear Creek between 4,000 – 6,000 cfs. In my view, it's not likely to adversely affect the water rights of others on Clear Creek, however there may be potential CVP water supply or power generation impacts. It will be necessary to coordinate with USBR's Central Valley Operations (CVO).**

2. Are there opportunities for the acquired water to achieve multiple environmental benefits through partnerships with other acquisition programs? **There may be opportunities to coordinate the experimental reoperated flow releases with Interior's (USBR, FWS) releases of (b)(2) water that occur each year in Clear Creek. This coordination should occur with Interior and the B2 Interagency Team (B2IT).**

Miscellaneous comments:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating below.

Recommended for full proposal development **Yes, it will be important to coordinate closely with Interior and B2IT.**

Not recommended for full proposal development

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating:

TITLE: Environmental Water Program Conceptual Proposal for Flow Acquisition on Lower Clear Creek

REVIEWER: Dick Jewell
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Water Acquisition Program

DATE: 9-9-04

PROGRAM REVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. Does the sale of water have the potential to adversely affect the rights of others, including the SWP and the CVP?

Anytime water is taken from one use and placed to another someone is affected somewhere in the system. The extent of the affect is dependent on where and when the water is taken, if storage is affected, and what amount of return water flows will be impacted.

Regarding the idea of purchasing water for increasing Clear Creek flows, the locations in the CVP and SWP that might be adversely affected range from Clear Creek and the Trinity River through the Sacramento River to the delta and beyond the delta south. Generally speaking any change in water use could affect as far south as Westlands Water District.

One needs more specific information in order to accurately determine potential affects. Generally speaking, given this proposal, you should expect to have to address adverse impacts upon other water users throughout the systems.

2. Are there opportunities for the acquired water to achieve multiple environmental benefits through partnerships with other acquisition programs.

There can be opportunities for multiple environmental benefits from this water. These would be limited to the transferability of the water used. Would this water be able to be placed into storage after it achieved its intended use, could it be moved at some future date for other fish flow benefits or for movement to a refuge, or temperature control, or contribute to delta outflow? Or is the water limited to use only on Clear Creek? These are a few of the questions that would need to be answered before one could determine if the Clear Creek water could achieve more then one environmental benefit.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS:

The concept proposal does not address some very basic questions. Is there water available for purchase, how much, from where, and when?

Short of re-operating Whiskeytown and Trinity Reservoirs the opportunity for acquiring water is extremely limited. The only water that might be available would be the 6,000 acre feet that is still owned by the McConnell Foundation. Beyond that I am not aware of any amounts of water that would be large enough to be able to facilitate the kind of flows that the proposal has outlined. As for obtaining water from CVP for this purpose, be aware that the CVP has not been able to deliver full entitlements of water throughout their system for many years and the possibility of their giving up any water is remote.

To better be able to focus on water needs for this proposal it would be helpful to outline how you plan to achieve the flows that are needed by showing the combinations of quantities and timing needed.

As an example:

When Igo flows are at 2,000 cfs then the CC project will release 1,200 cfs of purchases water from Whiskeytown to effect a 3,200 cfs flow for as long as possible up to 2 days duration. With this scenario one needs to acquire approximately 5,000 acre feet of water release from Whiskeytown..

It should also be shown how this can be achieved with the purchase of (how much?) spot market water, long term water, permanent water, option water, power forgone, or any combination of these water acquisition alternatives.

This would also help refine the comparative costs for combinations of water purchases.

OVERALL EVALUATION SUMMARY RATING:

From a water availability prospective, the next phase of the programs implementation should not only address what is ultimately desired from a biological prospective but should also include a design for what can be achieved with water currently available.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF SUMMARY RATING:

The opportunity for acquiring water on Clear Creek ranges from extremely limited to non-existent. All but some small quantities of water are owned by Reclamation and the Reclamation water has already been allocated.

The Service has tried throughout the past to obtain additional water for Clear Creek flows. We have had some success in increasing flows and in doing so have determined that there is not any additional water obtainable at this time.

The possibility of Reclamation changing operations to accommodate this proposal is also extremely limited. This is because of the other obligations Reclamation must meet in order to operate and that they appear to have over allocated the water available in the system.

Also, the possibility of reconfiguring Whiskeytown to hold more water to be used for environmental releases, I am told, is nothing Reclamation is considering at this time.