

- 1 • Borrow sites: Borrow areas and areas identified for the storage and/or disposal of
2 spoil, RTM, and dredged material. (see SWRCB-3, RDEIR/EIS Mapbook Figure 3-
3 4.)
- 4 • Footprint mitigation: As described in the draft Biological Assessment and discussed
5 in the testimony of Ms. Pierre, the project includes a suite of Environmental
6 Commitments primarily in the form of habitat restoration, protection, enhancement,
7 and management activities necessary to offset the footprint and operational impacts
8 from construction of the intake facilities. Of relevance to this testimony, is the up to
9 4 linear miles of channel margin enhancement to offset the impacts from the intake
10 facilities.

11 The CWF alignment and facility locations are shown in Exhibit DWR-213, Location of
12 Facilities. (Exhibit DWR-212, Section ES.1.)

13 The major engineering design criteria reflecting management decisions and that guided
14 the conceptual design for the CWF includes the ability to:

- 15 • Deliver up to 9,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) (maximum capacity) to the North
16 Clifton Court Forebay through three 3,000 cfs on-bank river intakes.
- 17 • Protect fish with state of art screened intakes (on the Sacramento River and with the
18 installation of the HORG), the basis of which will be discussed in Part 2 of the
19 hearing.
- 20 • Provide for operational reliability and flexibility through the use of two parallel 40-foot
21 diameter main tunnels and a 9,000 cfs pumping plant.
- 22 • Isolate water supply from existing rivers and sloughs.
- 23 • Deliver water to the SWP/Central Valley Project (CVP) export pumping plant
24 approach canals downstream of their respective fish collection facilities.
- 25 • Withstand a 200-year flood event with the sea level rise predicted from climate
26 change. (Exhibit DWR-212, Section 3.5.)
- 27 • All facilities designed and constructed to withstand maximum considered earthquake
28 loads for the region.