Technical Issues with Finding

Inaccurate assessment of temperature impacts

Table 8-5 should indicate that temperature increases can impact drinking water treatment, including increased source water pathogen and algal concentrations, treatability and chemical rates of reaction, and treated water quality (page 8-28).

Insufficient assessment of temperature changes on drinking water treatment

The analysis focuses on effects to aquatic life and does not include temperature as part of the water quality impact assessment for other beneficial uses, such as MUN (page 8-129, lines 17-20).

The DEIR/EIS must address the insufficient assessment of temperature effects on MUN beneficial uses. More specific comments are presented in Attachment 1.

Metals (WQ-27 and WQ-28)

Assessment Type	CEQA Assessment Finding for Alternative 4	
Qualitative	CM1	Less than significant
	CM2-CM22	Less than significant

Technical Issues with Finding

Insufficient assessment of total metals impact on drinking water intakes

Drinking water standards for metals constituents are based on the total fraction, including both dissolved and particulate metals. It is inappropriate to apply the standard to only a portion of the total regulated constituent; therefore, the standard is not accurately applied to a dissolved fraction. The metals analysis needs to be revised to look at impacts to total metals levels because all amounts of metals will be treated; increased metals levels in source water may result in additional treatment requirements and increased treatment and residual management costs to municipal water suppliers.

Insufficient assessment of the effect of reservoir level on metals concentrations

Page 8-219, lines 34-42, state that there were no strong correlations of dissolved metals concentrations and river flow; however, an equally or more relevant relationship is between the reservoir stage and dissolved metals. This was not adequately evaluated.

Metals water quality impacts must be reevaluated to consider total metals relative to impacts on the MUN beneficial use. The DEIR/EIS must evaluate metals concentrations and correlations with other operational parameters, such as reservoir stage, to fully evaluate impacts. More specific comments are presented in Attachment 1.

Aluminum

Assessment Type	CEQA Assessment Finding for Alternative 4
None	Not evaluated

Technical Issues with Finding

Insufficient assessment of aluminum impacts to beneficial uses

Aluminum was not included in the analysis and can sometimes exceed relevant aquatic life and drinking water objectives. This constituent is especially important to drinking water treatment since it is a primary coagulant used to remove solids and changes in source water concentrations can impact treatability. Any projects disturbing soil, increasing turbidity, or using coagulants have the potential to increase aluminum concentrations and potentially impact beneficial uses.

Aluminum must be evaluated for impacts through available modeling of the BDCP and alternatives. More specific comments are presented in Attachment 1.

Selenium (WQ-25 and WQ-26)

Assessment Type	CEQA Assessment Finding for Alternative 4	
Quantitative (limited to the Delta)	CM1	Less than significant
	CM2-CM22	Less than significant

Technical Issues with Finding

Insufficient analysis of unknowns and potential increases in selenium

The CM2 through CM22 analysis concludes that selenium biotic uptake may be increased by the increased residence time in the restoration areas (8-286 lines 1-3) and then suggests that the restoration areas should be designed and operated as flow-through to minimize impacts. However, such operation may be inconsistent with the wetlands needs and in some cases could result in the increased discharge of methylmercury and organic carbon while minimizing the habitat benefits of the restoration areas.

The analyses of CM2 through CM22 in the DEIR/EIS must consider the cumulative impacts on affected constituents and constraints for restoration area operation. More specific comments are presented in Attachment 1.

COMMENT 5 – INSUFFICIENT MITIGATION OF ADVERSE AND SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

There are a number of water quality constituents for which significant adverse impacts were determined. There are several additional constituents, as described above, where the lack of certainty or lack of assimilative capacity should require meaningful mitigation measures. When impacts are significant or cannot be reliably quantified, the mitigation measures should provide meaningful and legally assured actions or programs that will ensure that impacts will not occur, or otherwise the impact should be found unavoidable. There are a number of instances in the DEIR/EIS where impacts are identified but deferred to future evaluation or uncertain mitigation efforts. Moreover, impacts in the key areas near to and upstream of the proposed intakes are not adequately evaluated or mitigated.

An EIR must describe feasible mitigation measures that can minimize each significant environmental effect of a project. [14] As noted above, these mitigation measures must be enforceable and legally binding, so there is adequate assurance that the measures actually will be implemented. Many of the mitigation measure proposed in the DEIR/EIS do not meet this test.

[14] State CEQA Guidelines § 15121(a), 15126.4(a). *See Environmental Council of Sacramento v. City of Sacramento* (2006) 142 Cal.App.4th 1018, 1039 ("A gloomy forecast of environmental degradation is of little or no value without pragmatic, concrete means to minimize the impacts ....")

For example, for Alternative Number 4, the DEIR/EIS (page 8-447, line 17-22) determined that: "Although the BDCP will implement CM12 with the goal to reduce this potential effect, the uncertainties related to site specific restoration conditions and the potential for increases in methylmercury concentrations in the Delta result in this potential impact being considered significant. No mitigation measures would be available until specific restoration actions are proposed. Therefore, this programmatic impact is considered significant and unavoidable." In this way, the DEIR/EIS acknowledges significant impacts and the availability of mitigation measures, but fails to provide specifics on the mitigation measures and the potential water quality outcomes. Lack of site-specific information is not sufficient reason for deferring the evaluation of mitigation measures. The DEIR/EIS does not identify or commit to follow-up actions in cases where mitigation measures are not effective or water quality conditions degrade further and cause impacts to beneficial uses.

The DEIR/EIS must evaluate a broader range of available mitigation measures and reasonably quantify their performance and ability to prevent methylmercury and other constituents with findings of significant impacts from entering the Delta. The DEIR/EIS should provide follow-up actions if mitigation measures are not effective or water quality conditions degrade further and impact beneficial uses.

Attachment 1 provides additional comments related to the sufficiency of mitigation.

COMMENT 6 –INSUFFICIENT EVALUATION OF FISCAL BURDEN ON LOCAL AGENCIES

Implementation of the conservation measures to meet the Plan's goals will undoubtedly result in increased costs to local agencies to monitor and assess the effectiveness of the water quality improvement related activities. Local agencies' ability to generate funding to conduct these additional activities is subject to potentially significant limitations, including Proposition 218 and Proposition 26. For example, the operation, maintenance, and improvement of MS4s typically is funded by storm drainage rates, and under Proposition 218, a local agency can only increase storm drainage rates after (1) conducting a notice and protest process with a protest rate below 50%, and (2) obtaining voter approval for the increase from a majority of the ratepayers subject to the rate or from two-thirds of the electorate.

Additional costs imposed on local agencies by CM19 may have potentially significant impacts that should be evaluated as part of the DEIR/EIS water quality assessment (Chapter 8). For example, to the extent that the proposed CM19 places a significant fiscal burden on local agencies, those agencies may be forced to defer or forego other improvements or programs designed to improve water quality or protect the environment.

The DEIR/EIS must include evaluation of the potential significant fiscal limitations and burdens that may be imposed on local agencies.

COMMENT 7 – INCONSISTENT AND INADEQUATE DEFINITION OF THE AREAS OF ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS IN PLAN AREA

The DEIR/EIS states that the Plan Area includes the statutory Delta as well as Areas of Additional Analysis, where CMs1 -22 would be implemented outside the statutory Delta. The Areas of Additional Analysis specifically include the Yolo Bypass and Suisun Marsh. However, two of the conservation measures (CM2 – Yolo Bypass Fisheries Enhancement and CM19 – Urban Stormwater Treatment) are apparently located outside of the statutory Delta yet were not included in the Areas of Additional

Analysis. The DEIR/EIS analysis is incomplete by omitting an evaluation of the impacts to this additional area.

The analysis must clearly define the physical area for the Plan Area and the Study Area and perform the assessment on these defined areas. Attachment 1 provides specific comments related to the definition of the areas of additional analysis.

COMMENT 8 – TECHNICAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS IN EVALUATION OF IMPACTS

The DEIR/EIS has numerous technical errors and omissions in its evaluation of the impacts of the BDCP related to water quality. These errors and omissions are related to the following general topics, with specific comments and references provided in Attachment 1.

Incorrect summarization of the drinking water regulatory requirements in California

- Incorrect drinking water standards,
- Incorrect application of metals drinking water standards to only the dissolved fraction,
- Incorrect determination of compliance with drinking water standards, and
- Incorrect information and discussion of the regulatory requirements and enforceability of secondary drinking water standards for drinking water agencies.

Incorrect technical assumptions on the treatability of various water sources by conventional filtration

- Incorrect assumption that temperature is not significant to drinking water treatment,
- Incorrect assumption that conventional filtration is not impacted by increased loads of constituents, and
- Incorrect use of long-term averages for determination of significance of impact.

Inadequate representation of ambient water quality

- Insufficient process for selection of pesticides of interest,
- Incorrect information and discussion of summarized information on pathogens from outside sources,
- Insufficient data query for constituents of interest outside of the Delta, and
- Insufficient number of data points to make determination of significance.

These errors and omissions, as well as all those presented in Attachment 1 must be corrected.

COMMENTS ON BDCP

The City and the Delta would be profoundly affected by the BDCP. The high quality of the American and Sacramento Rivers are the primary reason why the proposed BDCP intakes are located in the Sacramento River downstream from and adjacent to the City. Protection of these water resources is a local and statewide responsibility.

While we recognize that a project of this size is complex and resource intensive, we have identified a variety of presumptions, assertions, and conclusions within the BDCP document that are inaccurate or insufficiently supported. These issues will have significant effects on the City and our water quality management programs. The following key comment topics are discussed in this letter and are supported and expanded upon in Attachment 3, which is included and incorporated in our comments:

1. Insufficient Evaluation of Take Alternatives
2. Lack of Meaningful Role for Local Agencies in BDCP Governance
3. Insufficient Commitments for Adaptive Management and Monitoring Programs to Protect Upstream and Delta Water Quality
4. Insufficient Justification for Conservation Measure 19
5. Insufficient Evaluation of Water Quality Impacts
6. Inadequate Flow Evaluation in the Sacramento River for Conservation Measures 1 and 2
7. Insufficient Incorporation of Climate Change Effects
8. Technical Errors and Omissions

COMMENT 1 - INSUFFICIENT EVALUATION OF TAKE ALTERNATIVES

The BDCP includes a Proposed Action as well as "take" alternatives A through I. However, these alternatives are only variations of the Proposed Action, rather than being true alternatives "to reduce or avoid the take of the covered species."[15] The BDCP has not provided sufficient alternatives and evaluation to reduce or avoid take of the covered species.

The BDCP states that temperature impacts on covered fish species will be significant in the future and that climate change impacts will enhance that impact.[16] The lack of an alternative that includes seasonally limited export flows to allow increased upstream reservoir storage or Delta outflow is inherently flawed given the purpose of alternatives. One potential way to reduce or mitigate the temperature impacts is to change the operational parameters for upstream reservoirs to allow increased carryover storage. By allowing increased carryover storage, the cold water pool storage will increase, which could lessen projected temperature impacts during the fall period.[17] One way that the carryover storage can be increased is to seasonally optimize the export flows. This action should be evaluated to reduce or avoid the take of covered species.

Also, in order to maximize water supply availability for all demands, consideration should have been made for balancing water storage throughout the State, including contemplation of existing volumes of surface water storage in Southern California prior to determining the volume of Delta export. Once water is exported from the Delta, there is a reduced ability to meet local water demands in Northern

[15] BDCP, Highlights, page 98, sidebar 1

[16] BDCP Chapter 2, 2.3.2.1.5, page 2-18, lines 18-26 and 2.3.3.2, page 2-24, lines 36-43 and page 2-25, lines 1-31

[17] BDCP, Appendix 5A, 5.A.2.5.4, page 5A.2-72, lines 30-375

California or Delta outflow requirements. In addition to demonstrating the deficiency of the alternatives, these impacts require identification and evaluation in the BDCP documents.

The scope of take alternatives must be expanded to consider additional actions to address temperature and water supply availability impacts.

COMMENT 2 - LACK OF MEANINGFUL ROLE FOR LOCAL AGENCIES IN BDCP GOVERNANCE

The City recognizes and supports the proposal to include a Stakeholder Council for municipal agencies, non-governmental organizations, and the general public (page 7-1, lines 37-39), as this provides outreach and opportunities to respond to decisions by the Program Manager, Adaptive Management Team, and Permit Oversight Group. The City and the rate payers it represents, as well as other north-of-Delta agencies, have a significant financial and natural resource stake in the outcomes of the BDCP. Therefore, local Northern California agencies need to be afforded a more significant role in BDCP implementation and assessments. As noted in the BDCP (page 7-26, lines 5-9), the California Natural Resources Agency is working with counties to develop a program with more significant county involvement in BDCP implementation. The local municipalities have a similar stake as counties in water supply, land use, NPDES regulation, and water quality issues and should be included in discussions regarding this implementation role.

For example, the BDCP describes the implementation of CM19 for urban runoff treatment through NPDES permits (page 3.4-327, lines 17-24), which include comprehensive stormwater management and pollutant reduction programs. However, the BDCP does not provide technical development of a baseline for urban runoff effects on the covered species or a description of how future assessments of effectiveness would be made by the Adaptive Management Team (e.g., quantitative benchmarks, modeling tools, etc.). The far-reaching assertion of "implementation of CM19 through the NPDES permits" suggests an active role in permitting by the Implementation Office and direct tie-ins between the BDCP and MS4 permits. In this scenario, local agencies input of their scientific assessments is limited to their respective NPDES permit renewals, which is potentially well after the Adaptive Management Team has published its effectiveness assessments.

Local government must be given a more significant role in management of the BDCP to the extent that the BDCP will impact local water supply, water quality, and land use planning. The role should allow local agencies representation on the adaptive management issues that impact them.

COMMENT 3 - INSUFFICIENT COMMITMENTS FOR ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING PROGRAMS TO PROTECT UPSTREAM AND DELTA WATER QUALITY

The BDCP will be one of the most divisive and resource intensive public policy and infrastructure projects in recent California history. Already, hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on planning, engineering, and technical assessments. However, the City believes that the BDCP and BDCP DEIR/EIS do not adequately commit, in level of detail or resources, to an ongoing assessment program that will provide quantitative assessments of effectiveness and evaluate the identified uncertainties of the BDCP. The Effects Analysis conducted as part of the BDCP does not compute the baseline effect of the pollutant stressors on covered species that the conservation measures are based on; therefore, how will the Adaptive Management Team evaluate future effects and effectiveness of the conservation measures, especially CM19?

The BDCP admits that the Plan and its conservation measures (CMs) have considerable uncertainty with regard to ecosystem benefits and likely outcomes.[18] Adaptive management is implemented to allow CM flexibility, and the focus is defined as assessing achievement in meeting the biological goals and objectives. There will be opportunity for revising CMs and biological objectives.[19] This places a critical and powerful need for adequate monitoring and assessment of the system. Much of the monitoring and modeling in the BDCP, however, is relegated to a research action; these critical components of adaptive management should instead be discussed explicitly within the Effects Analysis with a mandated schedule. The adaptive management approach should have a transparent and comprehensive monitoring, modeling, and assessment program that can adequately quantify biological and water quality changes due to changes in flows, climate change, contaminant sources, physical changes, and reasonably anticipated beneficial use impacts. This should include verification of the effects analysis and an evaluation of the identified uncertainties. This assessment framework is not provided, even for the evaluation of current conditions, and there is no monetary commitment to provide such tools, data, and resources for the Stakeholder Council. The Science Program should allow bottom-up participation from local agencies; this is important so that joint solutions can be evaluated and implemented, as well as to avoid "serial engineering" by which one 'solution' causes another ecological or public policy problem. Local agencies should have a clear and significant role in BDCP decisions if modifications are considered to the CMs that will impact local agencies.

The BDCP must include a clear, expanded description of the Adaptive Management program framework and the monitoring components and tools that will be used to make assessments, address uncertainties, identify unintended consequences of the BDCP, and propose changes to system operations. For example, a decision tree should be developed for interpreting scientific information relative to the management action and evaluating the certainty of the relationships, the benefit to covered species, and information needs and priorities. Within this decision tree, local agencies should have the ability to provide input and make management decisions when the outcomes affect them.

There has not been a clear prioritization of management actions (conservation measures) to optimize available resources and mitigate effects to the covered species or other aquatic life impairments. It also is not clear from the BDCP whether CM1 can proceed with or without the other conservation measures, if they are not completed or fully funded.

Additional information must be provided regarding the minimum number of conservation measures that are required to be implemented in order for CM1 to be operated, the course of action if funding is not secured for all the conservation measures, and whether CM1 exports can or will be restricted if other conservation measures are not successfully implemented.

The existing Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) structure is not thoroughly justified in the BDCP. Other BDCP cited documents[20] have suggested formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that includes local agencies to develop the appropriate Delta science and assessments. For example, page 3.4-329, line 13 states that "The Adaptive Management Team will use results of effectiveness monitoring to determine if reducing stormwater pollution loads results in measurable benefits to covered fish species or their habitat and to identify adjustments to funding levels, control methods, or other related aspects of the program that will improve the biological effectiveness of the program." The form

[18] BDCP, Chapter 3, 3.4.23, page 3.4-354, lines 8-12

[19] BDCP, Chapter 3, 3.4.23, page 3.4-354, lines 21-27

[20] Public Policy Institute of California. *Stress Relief. Prescriptions for a Healthier Delta Ecosystem.* April 2013

and technical basis for the assessment is not provided, and the means of establishing relationships between contaminant reductions and covered species is not identified.

The BDCP must include development of this science JPA to support adaptive management. The BDCP must be updated to include development of the baseline for assessments prior to implementation of all conservation measures.

COMMENT 4 - INSUFFICIENT JUSTIFICATION FOR CONSERVATION MEASURE 19

CM19 is described in seven pages of the BDCP with little detail, numerous inaccuracies on urban runoff contaminants and water quality regulations, and without any evidence that CM19 control measures could provide any measurable benefits to the covered species. Conservation Measure 19 (CM19, BDCP Section 3.4.19) intends to decrease urban runoff contaminant discharge to support Objective L2.4 to provide water quality to "help restore native fish habitat". However, there is no technical analysis demonstrating the potential benefits of CM19 aside from incomplete descriptions of pyrethroid research in upstream urban tributaries; this research has *not* demonstrated relevance to impacts on covered species in the Delta. No technical justification is provided for the primary inclusion of urban runoff sources as a Conservation Measure over all other contaminant stressor sources that are described throughout the BDCP and BDCP DEIR/EIS but are absent as Conservation Measures. As proposed, CM19 provides no new benefits to downstream covered species. Furthermore, CM19 proposes measures that are already generally implemented by stormwater management programs and local planning departments with new development requirements.

Conservation Measure CM19 must be removed because it is not justified as an action that would reasonably improve the covered species populations in the Delta. The proposed conservation measure fails to meet a reasonable expectation of beneficial impacts for the following reasons:

- The BDCP and BDCP DEIR/EIS do not provide sufficient detail to reasonably conclude that the CM19 suggested best management practices (BMPs) would have any adverse or beneficial impact on water quality in the Delta.[21] Pesticides are identified as the primary "concern for fish" (BDCP page 3.4-327, lines 9-10) and as the basis for the need for CM19. The studies cited in the BDCP (Weston et al. 2005, Teh et al. 2005) do not show linkages between urban runoff and effects on covered species and therefore should not be used as justification for CM19.
- Most urban runoff from the Sacramento region and areas upstream of this region does not directly enter the Delta. As such, the conclusion that actions to reduce the amount of pollution in stormwater runoff entering Delta waterways will be of high benefit to Delta smelt, white sturgeon, steelhead, and Chinook salmon (Essex Partnership, 2009) does not consider the fate and transport to points where impacts to covered species are of concern (BDCP page 3.4-332). Even if contaminant load sources are reduced, it is not established that there would be a downstream Delta benefit since contaminant degradation, dilution, adsorption to particulates, and other fate and transport processes would reduce any aquatic life effects (Werner, et al. 2008, page 32), which is consistent with pyrethroid experimental studies downstream. Urban runoff dilutes some pollutants and is only an intermittent exposure during the higher flow wet season.

[21] Delta Stewardship Council. *Final Delta Plan. Page 230 recommendations* "WQ R2. Identify Covered Action Impacts. *Covered actions should identify any significant impacts to water quality."*

- CM19 does not consider pesticide and other contaminant source control by the entities that manufacture, regulate, and control their use in urban and non-urban areas. The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) gives the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) authority to determine which pesticides can be used in the United States and how they can be used. The application and approval of pesticides are regulated by both the EPA and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR). Local agencies do not have the authority to limit the use of pesticides when applied according to these rules. If retained, CM19 should propose actions to better regulate and approve pesticide formulations and applications so that they will not have effects on covered species when used legally. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Board recently adopted Basin Plan amendments that better acknowledge state and federal government responsibility.

  References to pesticide source control should acknowledge that municipalities are statutorily prohibited from regulating the use of pesticides, and that existing state and federal statutory authority for regulation of pesticides is sufficient only when it is properly exercised to prevent water quality impacts.

- The BDCP does not acknowledge that the most effective "source control" approach to control many contaminants in urban runoff is product control by manufacturers and regulators. In particular, lead and pesticides have been controlled through product reformulation or discontinuation. Recent legislation (SB346) will phase out copper in brake pads, a significant contributor to urban runoff loads.

- The BDCP and BDCP DEIR/EIS do not comprehensively evaluate all sources of contaminants and therefore cannot adequately evaluate how to control contaminants through CM19. The BDCP does not present an analysis that evaluates the downstream covered species benefit of any contaminant source controls. As discussed in the DEIR/EIS (Table 5.D.2-1 "Land Use and Typically Associated Containment Issues" (DEIR/EIS page 5.D-2, Line 27), urban runoff is only one source of contaminants in the Delta and is an insignificant source for most of the identified contaminants of concern. However, other sources identified as significant have not been specifically included in the conservation measures. The reference documents refer to a number of other pollutants that are attributed to other sources and for which urban runoff is not known to be significant contributor. For example, BDCP Table 3.4.19-2 references dissolved oxygen depression as a water quality impact; however, urban runoff likely does not contribute significantly to the downstream oxygen impairments. Another example is that CM19 is the only conservation measure identified with the Conservation Hatcheries Facilities covered activity for facilities construction (BDCP page 5.2-14); the role that urban stormwater (MS4) programs that are part of CM19 would have in mitigating construction of these facilities is not clear in the Effects Analysis and the referenced Appendix (5H). Only considering one of many sources without making direct connections between activities and outcomes is an imbalanced and flawed approach, especially when the relative impact of the selected source is not known or may be insignificant when compared to others. A computational model assessment of the benefits of all source control measures for all sources should be performed to examine the effect of sources on the downstream covered species. This evaluation should be conducted before determining the scope of a conservation measure on contaminant reduction.

- Contaminant sources, as a whole, and the entities that regulate and control their use and discharge, should be considered so that the most significant and cost-effective removal strategies are prioritized and addressed first. While we agree that continued reductions of discharged urban runoff contaminants is an important environmental effort (which is already underway), it is unrealistic to

assume that reductions of one intermittent source would cost-effectively result in significant or even measurable downstream changes. For example, the Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Workgroup evaluated urban and non-urban source control for multiple drinking water constituents of concern. The drinking water constituents of concern were then quantitatively modeled in hypothetical future conditions to evaluate the potential impact on the municipal water supply beneficial use. Hypothetical urbanization of the Central Valley did not cause significant changes to downstream water quality.[22]

- The effectiveness of urban runoff BMPs in terms of specific urban runoff quality changes and Delta impacts was not evaluated. For example, typical structural control benefits vary between contaminants, and while a particular BMP may decrease urban runoff loading for one contaminant, it may increase the urban runoff loading for another contaminant. In the case of pesticides, a BMP designed to remove sediment bound pesticides might be completely ineffective for removing pesticides that remain in the dissolved phase. The BDCP should evaluate urban runoff BMPs for potential benefits to downstream Delta water quality. Without a sufficient understanding of the downstream benefits, widespread implementation of additional BMPs is not justified.
- The BDCP does not adequately define the physical area of the expected urban land use changes and the spatial extent of CM19 control strategy implementation. The BDCP refers only to restoration areas outside of the statutory Delta as included in the Plan Area and makes no references to the urban areas in the periphery outside of the statutory Delta. The control strategies listed in CM19 are generally the type of best management practices already included in new urban development, but the conservation measure does not acknowledge the legal and logistical challenges of large scale changes to already developed urban areas. The great preponderance of MS4 drainage property is not municipally owned, and it is unclear how CM19 intends to implement private land use changes.
- There is no justification provided for the cost estimate for CM19 implementation, maintenance, or monitoring. The BDCP estimates approximately $50 million in CM19 stormwater treatment for all MS4 programs over the 50 year plan. This level of funding significantly underestimates the scope of urban stormwater treatment that would be necessary to provide detectible downstream benefits. The two rounds of Proposition 84 funding totaled approximately $86 million in stormwater projects covering a much smaller area than the urban areas inside and upstream of the Delta. For a rough comparison, this funding covered several hundred acres of "stormwater treatment", and the urban area in the Delta and tributary watersheds are hundreds of thousands of acres. Moreover, no funding is proposed for the BDCP-required effectiveness monitoring, which also is costly. The BDCP states that CM19 funding would come from existing Proposition 84 or 1E bonds and future water bonds. Because CM19 is inadequately described, it is not possible to accurately evaluate the potential financial liability to local stormwater management agencies.
- Because the area of CM19 implementation is unclear, it is not possible to accurately estimate its cost. Based on the results of previous Proposition 84 low impact development (LID) project funding and known costs of retrofit of existing development, $50 million would only fund improvements for a small fraction of the total urban or municipal area. The Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Workgroup estimated that best management practices (BMP) "treatment" for the entire urban area

[22] Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Workgroup Synthesis Report. February 2012.

within the Central Valley would cost $14.9 billion by 2030.[23] The extreme discrepancy in cost and scope is significant and suggests that the proposed CM19 would be insufficient in scope and resources to demonstrate benefits to covered species. This large discrepancy in the uncertainty of benefits and cost to local agencies is indicative of the inadequate evaluation and insufficient justification for CM19.

- Additional costs imposed on local agencies by CM19 may have potentially significant impacts that should be evaluated as part of the BDCP effects analysis. For example, to the extent that the proposed CM19 places a significant fiscal burden on local agencies, those agencies may be forced to defer or forego other improvements or programs designed to improve water quality or protect the environment.

Comprehensive Evaluation of Contaminant Sources and Prioritization of Contaminant Based Conservation (Control) Measures

CM19's focus on urban runoff is not justified. CM19 does not sufficiently address SMART, "specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound," biological objectives as stated (BDCP page 3.3-3, lines 3-8). The BDCP provides no means to assess the effectiveness of meeting the goals for CM19. Impacts to covered species from contaminant sources should be sufficiently understood to result in cost effective benefits before implementing control measures. The evaluation of contaminant-based control measures in the BDCP and BDCP DEIR/EIS should include a robust evaluation through a stakeholder process with consideration to the following components:

- Technical evaluations of all reasonable contaminant control measures for all source categories, implementation methods, and their resulting water quality performance should be performed to characterize benefits and costs.
- A computational fate and transport model that incorporates the technical source evaluations should be performed to examine the effect of sources and source control on downstream water quality. The evaluation should consider downstream Delta locations of interest to the covered species and the potential water quality impacts of the examined control measures.
- An appropriate characterization of the impacts and uncertainty of impacts of all contaminant sources on the covered species should be performed. The BDCP chapter identifies pesticides as the contaminant of particular concern (page 3.4-.27, line 11) and bases its general characterization of urban runoff quality and pesticide impacts on pyrethroid pesticide research. The cited Weston research does not demonstrate that upstream urban runoff sources cause Delta covered species toxicity miles downstream from stormwater outfalls, but this research instead shows a decreasing toxicity signal from upstream sources.[24] Once the existing and potential water quality conditions are known at the downstream Delta locations of interest, an evaluation of the specific benefits to the covered species should be performed.
- Following the complete evaluation of contaminant sources and control effects on the covered species, the control measures should be prioritized based on the known benefits and costs of the control

[23] Geosyntec. *Urban Runoff Source Control Evaluation for Central Valley Drinking Water Policy*. Prepared for California Urban Water Agencies. March 2011.
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb5/water_issues/drinking_water_policy/dwp_urban_sources_study.pdf

[24] Weston DP1, Lydy MJ. *Urban and agricultural sources of pyrethroid insecticides to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta of California*. Environ Sci Technol. 2010 Mar 1;44(5):1833-40. doi: 10.1021/es9035573..

measures.

This approach would also generate alternative contaminant control measures that could be used to better perform specific evaluations in the BDCP DEIR/EIS.

An evaluation of source controls and downstream benefits must be performed prior to including CM19 within the BDCP. The BDCP should designate funding to support stakeholder research, evaluations, and modeling so that any identified contaminant conservation measures can be appropriately evaluated.

Monitoring and Assessment Cost to Local MS4 Agencies

Local agency participation in planning conservation measures and other activities is vital to successful collaboration to restore and maintain the ecological health of the Delta. Further, implementation of the conservation measures to meet the Plan's goals will undoubtedly result in increased costs to local agencies to monitor and assess the effectiveness of the water quality improvement related activities. Local agencies' ability to generate funding to conduct these additional activities is subject to potentially significant limitations, including Proposition 218 and Proposition 26. For example, the operation, maintenance, and improvement of MS4s typically is funded by storm drainage rates, and under Proposition 218, a local agency can only increase storm drainage rates after (1) conducting a notice and protest process with a protest rate below 50%, and (2) obtaining voter approval for the increase from a majority of the ratepayers subject to the rate or from two-thirds of the electorate. Thus, the BDCP should include developing relationships among agencies, mobilizing the flow of technical information, and providing sufficient funding and resources to support water quality outcomes.

The BDCP must commit to participation with, and funding for, the Delta Plan, Delta Science Plan, and the Delta Regional Monitoring Program (RMP) and provision of additional resources (e.g., funding, monitoring, modeling, technical evaluation tools, etc. for local agencies) as a required action (i.e., not an additional action) with a known schedule. Source evaluation and effectiveness monitoring requirements should also be specifically funded by the BDCP, because the assessments are specific to covered species benefits.

COMMENT 5 - INSUFFICIENT EVALUATION OF WATER QUALITY IMPACTS

The BDCP evaluation of water quality impacts is insufficient and lacks clear methods and summaries of effects. In particular, there are significant insufficiencies for CM19 as described above; however, the evaluation of impacts for other conservation measures and the project as a whole are also insufficient. Several of the key inadequacies in the water quality assessment are described below and in the detailed comments provided in Attachment 3. The inadequacies include failure to consider detailed quantitative impacts for all constituents of concern, failure to consider impacts at locations on the Sacramento River near to and upstream of the proposed CM1 North Delta intakes, and failure to sufficiently evaluate temperature effects on the municipal drinking water (MUN) supply beneficial use. In general, the presentation of the Chapter 5 effects is highly fragmented and is based on cross-references to appendices. This inefficient organization makes it difficult to interpret results.

The BDCP is not consistent with recommendation WQ R2 of the Delta Plan: covered actions should identify any specific impacts to water quality. Insufficient evaluations are provided in the BDCP and the BDCP DEIR/EIS on the potential significant impacts to water quality from the BDCP, especially impacts that may impact MUN beneficial use upstream of the proposed new intakes.

The BDCP fails to assess water quality impacts on other beneficial uses (e.g., domestic and municipal drinking water) at areas just outside the Plan Area that will be impacted by CM1, CM2, and the related

operational modifications to upstream reservoirs. In addition, the BDCP also fails to assess the impacts of operational modifications to upstream reservoirs, including water storage and release patterns. Water storage and release patterns have a great impact on the river hydrology and Delta outflow[25]. Furthermore, they can have a significant effect on the quality of the water discharged to the downstream rivers (such as the Lower American River and Lower Sacramento River), as has been identified by the BDCP[26] and by Watershed Sanitary Surveys for those water bodies. Impacts to these downstream rivers are evident in the BDCP temperature model runs of the project and alternatives, and they are projected to be even more significant in the future due to climate change impacts. The BDCP alternatives could also affect clarity (turbidity), organic carbon, metals, nutrients, pathogens, and fate and transport impacts on other organics like pesticides[27]. The BDCP did not conduct an assessment of contaminant sources to prioritize where conservation measures would be best implemented. Finally, there was no apparent evaluation of cumulative impacts and synergistic effects of water quality constituents acting simultaneously.

These inadequacies must be addressed before implementation of the BDCP. The BDCP water quality evaluation must be expanded to include areas outside of the Plan Area that will be impacted by CM1 and CM2, a broader scope of water quality constituents of interest, an assessment of all non-negligible sources of contamination, and an evaluation of cumulative and synergistic effects on water quality.

Lack of Quantitative Water Quality Assessments

There was a very limited water quality evaluation conducted as part of the BDCP. Temperature evaluations focused on species survival with no consideration of other beneficial uses, such as drinking water [disinfection by-product (DBP) formation in treated water][28]. Salinity, dissolved oxygen, and turbidity[29] were evaluated as well as other constituents related to survival of the impacted species, including mercury, selenium, ammonia; however these constituents were only evaluated in the Delta[30]. The BDCP does not adequately evaluate the water quality impacts of the BDCP in the action area[31], especially in the reach of the Sacramento River from Emmaton to Veterans Bridge. Computational watershed and surface water quality modeling for all constituents of concern should be performed to quantify potential changes. The modeling would also provide vital information to assist in establishing a monitoring program that can detect changes below impact or effect levels. An understanding of diversions, exports, and upstream sources and their relative contribution to downstream ecological issues is lacking. Modeling of sources and system dynamics, as was done in the Central Valley Drinking Water Policy, should be supported and further developed; this is essential information for planning any activities and evaluating impacts and controls of stressors.

The BDCP must use more robust and widely accepted assessment tools to assess the potential impacts and evaluate performance of conservation measures through the permit term. These tools should be made available for use by all stakeholders.

[25] BDCP, Chapter 2, 2.3.3.3.1, page 2-26, lines 18-20

[26] BDCP, Appendix 5C, 5C.0, page 5C.0-1, lines 4-11

[27] Sacramento River Watershed Sanitary Survey 2010 Update, Section 3

[28] BDCP, Attachment 5.C.C.

[29] BDCP, Attachment 5.C.D.

[30] BDCP, Appendix 5D

[31] BDCP, Chapter 1, 1.4.1, page 1-21, lines 21-25

Incomplete Analysis in Areas Adjacent to CM1 and CM2

The BDCP does not substantially evaluate the effects of CM1 and CM2 in the "near-field" action area where these projects are proposed, specifically the Lower Sacramento River between Fremont Weir and the northern boundary of the statutory Delta. The BDCP concludes that the evaluated starting operations (ESO) water operations will have few to no effects on contaminants in the Delta (page 5.D-53). However, the evaluation should consider the impact of removing higher quality Sacramento River water and the increased contribution from lower quality San Joaquin River water into the Delta, especially in the areas adjacent to the proposed North Delta intakes and diversions. The area-specific impacts of the increased influence of the San Joaquin River on the Delta and effects near to the proposed BDCP North Delta intakes on the Sacramento River should be considered.

The BDCP must be revised to include a more detailed water quality assessment of the impacts of CM1 and CM2 on the Lower Sacramento River and the North Delta.

Temperature Effects and Impacts on Drinking Water Supply

Changes in water temperature due to the BDCP alone will be significant and were either not evaluated in key locations (the Lower Sacramento River downstream from the Feather and American Rivers) or were considered non-significant. In fact, even small changes in water temperature can impact municipal water supply beneficial uses by changing source water quality (such as increasing pathogen or algal growth), changing treated water quality (such as accelerating disinfection byproduct formation), and impacting treatment facilities (such as altering existing processes or potentially requiring additional processes).

Temperature modeling on the Sacramento River was conducted using the Sacramento River Water Quality Model, but the modeling only evaluated locations between Shasta and Knights Landing/Hamilton City.[32] No temperature evaluation was presented on the Lower Sacramento River between Hamilton City and the Delta[33], which is included as part of the Study Area.[34] The temperature modeling on the Trinity, Feather, and American Rivers was conducted using the Recreation Temperature Model.[35] The lack of temperature modeling on the Lower Sacramento River is especially concerning, because Oroville Reservoir[36], which contributes to the Sacramento River via the Feather River in this stretch of the river, is the only reservoir that was determined to have significant impacts to flow and temperature in warm months. Projections of temperature increases on the Sacramento River in the vicinity of the City's Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant (WTP) are not available, as the BDCP did not conduct an evaluation downstream of the Feather River confluence.

Due to the shallow depth of Folsom Reservoir, the most profound temperature impacts occur at this reservoir and the downstream Lower American River.[37] Also, since Folsom Reservoir is much smaller than all the other upstream reservoirs and is located furthest south in the system, it is projected to have greater impacts from climate change than all the other reservoirs[38]. Mean monthly water temperature increases on the Lower American River were calculated by the Recreation Temperature Model. The temperature at Watt Avenue in September will vary based on reservoir storage. For storage less than

[32] BDCP, Appendix 5C, 5C.4, page 5C.4-6, Table 5C.4-2
[33] BDCP, Appendix 5A, 5.A.2.5.2, page 5A.2-53 through 5A.2-55
[34] BDCP, Chapter 5, 5.2.1, page 5.2-1, lines 23-28
[35] BDCP, Appendix 5C, 5C.4, page 5C.4-5, Table 5C.4-2
[36] BDCP, Chapter 5, 5.3.1, page 5.3-3, lines 15-17
[37] BDCP, Appendix 5A, 5.A.2.5.4, page 5.A.2-73, lines 21-23
[38] BDCP, Ibid, lines 30-32

300,000 acre-feet, the temperatures are generally greater than 70°F for all future cases without the BDCP [Existing Biological Conditions (EBC) 2, EBC2_Early Long Term (ELT), EBC2_Late Long Term (LLT)].[39] Storage above 300,000 acre-feet ranges between 65 and 70°F[40]. Implementation of Evaluated Starting Operations (ESO), Low-outflow Scenario (LOS), and High-outflow Scenario (HOS) BDCP operational scenarios further increase these projected temperatures. These are significant increases from current levels and would impact drinking water treatability and treated water quality.

The BDCP or DEIR/EIS must identify and evaluate the significance of the BDCP's temperature impacts on drinking water use.

Total Maximum Daily Load Compliance

The BDCP does not specifically evaluate compliance with the Delta Methylmercury TMDL, which specifies load allocations for subareas of the Delta. Several of the proposed conservation measures (2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11) are restoration or habitat enhancement activities that have the potential to increase methylmercury concentrations within or tributary to the TMDL area. The BDCP does not propose how these activities will affect the subarea load allocations or the allocations for wetlands in the TMDL. Other TMDLs, such as those for pesticides, are also not specifically addressed when activities may not support the TMDL goals.

The BDCP effects analysis must make specific evaluations and clear statements of compliance or non-compliance with TMDLs, the associated wasteload allocations, and water quality regulations. The evaluation must also consider whether the BDCP will change the TMDL compliance timeline, including the expected date of compliance with the TMDL wasteload allocations for each subarea or reach.

Salinity, Clarity, and Other Constituents

Salinity, clarity, and all other constituents were only evaluated in the Delta.[41] The BDCP did not look at upstream impacts related to flow changes, especially those just outside of the Plan Area (such as the City's drinking water treatment plant intakes on the Lower Sacramento and Lower American Rivers), which may be impacted by propagation of intrusion/reverse flow caused by operation of CM1 and CM2 or from revised upstream reservoir operations to meet the BDCP biological goals and objectives.

The BDCP should not be constrained by lack of assessment tools or data. The BDCP should comprehensively identify the known science shortcomings and propose a means to fill these data gaps. Subsequently, an evaluation can be performed to determine whether such unknowns can be feasibly resolved. It is insufficient to determine that there are no significant BDCP impacts simply because the tools and data do not exist. As the system management failed in the past to protect the covered species, the BDCP should identify the critical science uncertainties.

Moreover, the discussion suggests that a wide base of science inputs was used, but the list of contributors does not include local agencies.[42] The BDCP describes the science that was considered, but it does not include science developed by local agencies. For example, the City participated in the Central Valley Drinking Water Policy Workgroup to evaluate the effects of expected long-term urban growth

[39] BDCP, Appendix 5A, 5A.2.5.4, page 5.A.2-76, Figure 5.A.2.5-24
[40] BDCP, Appendix 5A, 5A.2.5.4, page 5.A.2-76, Figure 5.A.2.5-24
[41] BDCP, Chapter 5, 5.3.2
[42] BDCP, page 5.1-1, lines 31-36

and hypothetical contaminant controls. The Workgroup used computational models to examine differences between alternatives on the entire Delta watershed area downstream from dams.

The BDCP must conduct a wider evaluation of water quality impacts in the area upstream of the Delta, which could be impacted by operational changes to the system. The BDCP should develop appropriate evaluation tools, utilize a wide base of science inputs, identify critical science uncertainties and data needs, and provide a plan for obtaining additional necessary data.

COMMENT 6 - INADEQUATE FLOW EVALUATION IN THE SACRAMENTO RIVER FOR CONSERVATION MEASURES 1 AND 2

The BDCP flow evaluations did not adequately present nor assess consideration of changes in flow in the Sacramento River near to and upstream of the CM1 North Delta intakes and the CM2 diversions at the Fremont and Sacramento Weirs. Within these areas, there are a number of municipal drinking water intakes and permitted discharges that would be affected by small changes in the volume and direction of flow or influence of tides. While climate change may also have significant effects, the CM1 and CM2 effects should also be evaluated without consideration of climate change to better isolate and understand the BDCP effects.

The BDCP must evaluate the flow impacts on the Lower Sacramento River in the vicinity of Sacramento River WTP including increases in sea level and tidal amplitude combined with reduced Sacramento River flows from CM1 and CM2. This evaluation must include reverse flow, not just as a velocity, but also as a particle tracking assessment in order to see water movement and backwater effects.

Conservation Measure 1 - Reverse Flow Evaluation on the Sacramento River

The BDCP states that the Sacramento River at Freeport is unidirectional;[43] however, modeling and data review conducted by Sacramento County Water Agency as part of its planning for its Freeport diversion shows that this is not true at all times[44]. The BDCP model runs to simulate Sacramento River flows at the North Delta Intake show that there can be negative velocities in the vicinity as well[45].

This statement must be revised to indicate that this is generally, or most commonly, unidirectional but can have periods of reverse flow during low Sacramento River flows combined with high tidal events.

In the future, if sea level rise is as significant as projected in the BDCP[46], then reverse flow and backwater effects may further propagate upstream. The BDCP did not evaluate outside of the Plan Area for reverse flow potential or backwater propagation. The only flow assessment was related to the Sacramento River flows near Georgiana Slough.[47] Also, the salinity evaluation was only conducted for Delta locations,[48] and no particle-tracking was performed in the Sacramento River outside of the Delta.

The Conservation Strategy listed in Chapter 3 of the BDCP includes an operational constraint to manage the North Delta Intakes (CM 1) to avoid increasing the magnitude, frequency, or duration of flow

---

[43] BDCP, Appendix 5C, 5C.5.3.13.1.11, page 5C.5.3-378, lines 19-21

[44] Volume 3: Modeling Technical Appendix to the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement, Freeport Regional Water Project; Attachment A – Results of Preliminary Modeling of "Worst-Case" Reverse Flow Events. Flow Science. July 23, 2002.

[45] BDCP, Attachment 5C.A, 5C.A.6.3.1, page 5C.A-217, lines 20-44

[46] BDCP, Chapter 5, 5.2.4, page 5.2-11, lines 11-12

[47] BDCP, Appendix 5C, 5C.4.3.2.6, pages 5C.4-90 through 5C.4-96

[48] BDCP, Chapter 5, 4.3.2.4, page 5.3-25, lines

reversals in Georgiana Slough,[49] but it makes no mention of those events on the main stem of the Sacramento River. The flow evaluations presented in Appendix 5C of the BDCP are focused on the reverse flow occurring only at Georgiana Slough, and they do not provide any effects analysis of that flow upstream of this point on the Sacramento River[50]. Upstream effects could include reverse and zero-flow scenarios, which could also result in upstream propagation of backwater effects, not just a net negative flow in the river. Attachment 5C.A of the BDCP presents additional information on the flow analysis and indicates that future conditions without the BDCP could result in a two foot elevation increase of the Sacramento River at Hood, but that the BDCP CMs (3-22) could almost eliminate that impact[51]. One of the key uncertainties identified for CM1 to be addressed includes an investigation of the impacts of tidal effects and diversions on flows in the vicinity of the proposed intakes[52].

The combined impacts of sea level rise and tidal amplitude increase with reduced Sacramento River flows due to CMs 1 and 2 must be evaluated and this study should be expanded to see how far upstream on the Sacramento River these impacts are possible.

Finally, when determining the X2 location and Delta outflow requirements, which support export diversions and upstream reservoir releases, the BDCP models used a median value for X2.[53] Based on Figure 5.A.2.6-8, the model predicted that the median of two kilometers upstream could be half of the peak daily value.[54] Since the location of X2 is used in the evaluations to determine the Delta outflow requirements, it seems that the model predictions may underestimate flow requirements since it was based on median location and not the maximum.[55] This could result in either significant upstream propagation of tidal influences or increased reservoir releases to maintain the X2 location downstream.

The BDCP must be evaluated using a more frequent occurrence of the X2 location, such as the 75th percentile or higher, to identify the range of potential operational requirements for the CVP/SWP system.

Conservation Measure 2 – Flow Directional Evaluation for the Lower American River

The BDCP states that Sacramento River flow into the Yolo Bypass at the Fremont Weir currently occurs when main stem flows exceed 55,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) in about 70 percent of years.[56] It further states that during major storm events additional water enters the Yolo Bypass from the Sacramento Weir, which includes flows from the Sacramento and American Rivers.[57] The Sacramento Weir flows when Sacramento River flows at Freeport exceed 80,000 cfs (contributed by Sacramento and American Rivers).[58] Both of these weirs are located on the Sacramento River, upstream of the confluence with the American River. The BDCP documents that there is potential upstream movement of American River water toward these diversions during high flow events.

---

[49] BDCP, Chapter 3, 3.4.1.4.1, page 3.4-13, lines 22-23
[50] BDCP, Appendix 5C, 5C.4.3.2.6, pages 5C.4-90 through 5C.4-96
[51] BDCP, Attachment 5C.A, 5C.A.6.2, page 5C.A-216, Figure 5C.A-93
[52] BDCP, Chapter 3, 3.4.1.5.1, page 3.4-32, Table 3.4.1-5
[53] BDCP, Appendix 5A, 5A.2.6.2, page 5.A.2-91, lines 34-37
[54] BDCP, Appendix 5A, 5A.2.6.2, page 5.A.2-97
[55] BDCP, Chapter 5, 5.3.2.4, page 5.3-26, lines 5-11
[56] BDCP, Chapter 3, 3.4.2.2.1, page 3.4-43, lines 28-33
[57] BDCP, Chapter 3, 3.4.2.2.1, page 3.4-44, lines 11-13
[58] BDCP, Attachment 5C.A, 5C.A.3.4.4, page C.A-30, Figure 5.C.A-68

The CALSIM model for the BDCP only examined volumes of water and did not assess direction or particle tracking in the reach around the Fremont and Sacramento Weirs near the confluence of the Sacramento and American Rivers. The passage evaluation of the Yolo Bypass flows did not evaluate the flow impacts to the main stem of the Sacramento River[59]. The Sacramento River flows were evaluated between Keswick and Verona[60] and then at Fremont Weir[61]. There does not appear to be any evaluation of the flow conditions between Verona and Freeport. CM2 has not been fully developed, and a Yolo Bypass Fisheries Enhancement Plan (YBFEP) will be developed separately, along with an DEIR/EIS, by Year Four of the project[62]. This CM is expected to include a variety of phased options to improve Yolo Bypass, including 20 potential components. Three of those potential components may result in physical changes, which could change the flow diversions from the Sacramento River: components 8, 15, and 20[63]. The BDCP needs to clarify if the model evaluations included all the potential parts of the YBFEP or if they only included component 15 (the gated notch). If all potential parts were not included, the evaluation should be revised to include the full scope of CM2.

Component 15 (gated notch at Fremont Weir to increase flows to Yolo Bypass) will be achieved by lowering a portion of the Fremont Weir so that diversions from the Sacramento River will begin at lower flow rates (15,000 cfs).[64] This will significantly increase the number of days per year that it will operate, from 25 to 81 days per year, and extend the season (September through June vs. December through April)[65,66]. The flow will also have a significant increase, particularly from December through April[67]. This could have a significant impact on the quality of the City's Sacramento River WTP source water, since American River water could be siphoned upstream to the weirs and would not be available as a major component of the source water for the City's diversions downstream of the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers.

Adequate modeling of the impact of CM1 and CM2 on the Sacramento and American River confluence area was not conducted. Additional flow directional evaluation must be conducted prior to completion of the BDCP planning.

COMMENT 7 - INSUFFICIENT INCORPORATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE EFFECTS

The BDCP predicts that the most significant climate change impacts will be related to changes in precipitation type and pattern, which would then in turn impact reservoir inflow and outflow as well as sea level rise and potential tidal amplitude. In addition to changes in hydrology, there are anticipated changes to human activities due to climate change. For example, an increase in air temperature is expected to increase the demand for power. Much of the upstream reservoir system is used for hydropower generation. There could be planned/expected changes to the hydropower facilities, which

[59] BDCP, Appendix 5C, 5C.5.3.12, page 5C.5.3-341, lines 5-8

[60] BDCP, Appendix 5C, 5C.5.3.13.2, page 5C.5.3-382 through page 5C.5.3-397

[61] BDCP, Attachment 5C.A.3.4.3, page 5C.A-57

[62] BDCP, Chapter 3, 3.4.2.3.2, page 3.4-48, lines 21-22

[63] BDCP, Chapter 3, 3.4.2.3.3, page 3.4-51, lines 41-42 and page 3.4-52, lines 1-2, page 3.4-53, lines 1-22, and page 3.4-54, lines 19-27

[64] BDCP, Attachment 5C.A, 5C.A.3.4.4, page 5C.A-58, lines 10-11

[65] Ibid, page 5C.A-58, lines 43-44 through page 5C.A-59, lines 1-2

[66] BDCP, Appendix 5C, 5C.5.3.2, page 5C.5.3-33, Table 5C.5.3-17

[67] Ibid, page 5C.5.3-35, Table 5C.5.3-18

may additionally impact CVP/SWP reservoir inflow or operations for outflow. The hydropower changes were not accounted for in the modeling nor identified as an uncertainty for future evaluation through the Adaptive Management program. It is noted in the BDCP that Adaptive Management must be used to address the uncertainty associated with climate change projections and the ecological responses.[68] Yet, the only monitoring programs listed are those related to ecological responses, not the climate change variables like water quality, sea-level rise, and hydrology.[69] These impacts could change the inflow projections into project reservoirs, such as Folsom Reservoir[70] since it is highly dominated by upstream reservoir releases that are related to power generation.

The BDCP must reconsider other impacts caused by climate change that are not specifically included in the current evaluation to determine their significance and ability to affect the impacts analysis.

The NEPA baseline analysis is required to account for changes in patterns, but should also include known/planned change in operations. The BDCP notes that reservoir operations are impacted by numerous factors, including flood control requirements from the US Army Corps of Engineer's Water Control Manuals for each reservoir[71]. There will be a significant change on the Lower American River due to the US Army Corps of Engineer's Joint Federal Project at Folsom Dam and changes in the Water Control Manual for Folsom Reservoir, expected to be completed in 2017[72]. In addition, DWR is completing a System Reoperation Program in response to Senate Bill X2 1, which is reassessing reservoir operations and will include climate change adaptation and mitigation opportunities.[73] The CALSIM II Modeling Assumptions listed in Table C.A-1 of Attachment 5C.A[74] include Operations Criteria, which state that all future model evaluations were conducted using existing conditions. Given the status of both of the above projects, these should have been more accurately included in the future analyses. In addition, the BDCP's approach to climate change does not appear to anticipate or include any CVP/SWP operational changes likely to occur in response to the predicted climate change impacts, which is unrealistic and difficult to support, particularly in light of this year's experience in responding to ongoing drought conditions.

The future conditions analyses must be revised to include known/planned efforts, as well as realistic projections of future operational changes, that will be implemented to adapt to or mitigate impacts from climate change.

Appendix 5.C presents the CALSIM model results for projections of reservoir storage and flows in the downstream rivers. There was significant uncertainty associated with the CALSIM modeling related to reservoir operations, especially related to climate change predictions. These uncertainties need to be verified in the future by the BDCP to determine if the assumptions made in the effects analysis are valid or need to be revised, potentially impacting the results and subsequent operational conditions.

The BDCP must develop an outline of the information needed to improve the climate change

---

[68] BDCP, Appendix 5A.2, 5.A.2.0, page 5A.2.0-3, lines 3-4

[69] Ibid, lines 7-13

[70] BDCP, Appendix 5A, 5.A.2.4.6, page 5.A.2-34, lines 4-6

[71] BDCP, Attachment 5.C.A, 5.C.A.3.4.1, page 5C.A-52, lines 39-44

[72] American River Watershed Sanitary Survey 2013 Update, pages 4-108 - 4-109

[73] Ibid, pages 4-94 – 4-95

[74] BDCP Attachment 5C.A, page 5C.A-9, table row 7

assumptions used in the modeling evaluations in the future as part of the Adaptive Management program.

COMMENT 8 - TECHNICAL ERRORS AND OMISSIONS

The BDCP inaccurately characterizes several issues as general knowledge. Characterization of urban runoff and its impacts on the Delta, the use of outdated orthophosphate (OP) pesticide data, and the ambiguity around the Plan Area are three issues that necessitate better clarity and justification.

Characterization of Urban Runoff

On page 3.4.327, the BDCP states that "Stormwater runoff is a leading source of water pollution in the United States and is a large contributor to toxic loads present in the Delta (Weston et al. 2005; Amweg et al. 2006; Werner et al. 2008). The Weston, et. al. and Amweg studies neither evaluate the pesticide loading to the Delta nor conclude that stormwater is a "leading source of water pollution". On page 3.4.327, it is stated that "Pyrethroid chemicals used as pesticides on suburban lawns are of particular concern, and are delivered to the Delta system by runoff."

These Weston and Amweg studies evaluated upstream creek sediments, primarily outside of the Delta. Additional studies by the same researchers that evaluated instream water column concentrations did not find the same toxicity signal in the downstream Delta, which is consistent with the City's assessment through the SSQP and Coordinated Monitoring Program (CMP). To date, the connection between Sacramento urban runoff pyrethroid concentrations and toxicity in the Delta has not been established. It is an unfounded technical leap to assume that urban runoff is a large contributor to toxic loads in the Delta. In addition, this also ignores the significant benefits of water quality management programs upstream of the Delta, as noted at the beginning of these comments.

The 2004 EPA 305(b) (EPA 2009) report, which is likely the basis for the assertion that stormwater runoff is a leading source, though it is not specifically cited, is inappropriately used. That report does not show urban stormwater runoff as the leading source for any of the receiving water types. The assessments in this document are primarily based on 303(d) impairment listing causes, which can be biased by more frequent sample collection and targeted source sample collection.

The BDCP must provide more specific (e.g., primary source, page number, etc.) references to the general statements regarding urban runoff as a water quality issue and provide a more balanced evaluation of the benefits of existing municipal stormwater management programs and their impacts on downstream covered species.

Historic Organophosphate Pesticide Data Not Relevant

Data from 2006 and before are consistently used through the analysis and discussion to draw conclusions on pesticides. Page 5.D-48 the BDCP states:

> *Surface water data indicate that concentrations are high for both diazinon and chlorpyrifos in back sloughs and small upland drainages, and concentrations are lower in both the main channels and main inputs to the Delta. High concentrations of chlorpyrifos also are found in Delta island drains, but concentrations of diazinon remain low in the same drains (McClure et al. 2006). In the past, elevated concentrations of diazinon and chlorpyrifos have been detected in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and in the Delta during particularly wet springs and after winter storm events (McClure et al. 2006). This could suggest that increased flow with accompanying increased suspended loads will result in increased mobilization of both diazinon*

and chlorpyrifos. Alternatively, the elevated concentrations may be attributable to irrigation or stormwater runoff from late winter/early spring dormant season spraying of orchard crops.

Characterization of OP pesticides based on data collected prior to 2005 should not be considered as representative of current conditions due to the fact that the urban use bans have been in effect since 2005. Numerous studies have characterized the lack of urban sources and absence of aquatic life effects from urban source OP pesticides. More recent data is readily available and should be referenced.

The pesticide evaluation must be performed with a more recent data set that reflects current conditions. The BDCP and DEIR/EIS must use robust datasets and evaluations that are available from DPR, USGS, local agencies, and regional partnerships.

Definition of the Plan Area and Inclusion of Conservation Measure Areas

The scope of the Plan Area is ambiguous with regard to areas directly impacted by conservation measures, and it is unclear if the omission of most of the urban Sacramento area is intentional. On page 1-3, the BDCP Plan Area is defined as covering "the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta, as defined by California Water Code Section 12220 (statutory Delta), as well as certain areas in which conservation measures will be implemented such as Suisun Marsh and the Yolo Bypass" (Section 1.4.1, Geographic Scope of the BDCP and Figure 1-1). The referenced map does not identify significant upstream areas, but the use of "such as" implies "but not limited to." This statement and Figure 1-1 confine the Plan Area to the legal Delta area and some restoration areas and suggests that the urban areas used for stormwater treatment in CM19 and the Lower Sacramento River downstream of Fremont Weir (CM2) are not included in the Plan Area. The description of the Plan Area should clearly define the actual areas or describe the implication to areas not within the Delta, but included in conservation measures or other BDCP actions.

The BDCP must provide precise definitions of the Plan Area and justification for inclusion of the areas selected for the Plan Area.

Other Errors and Omissions

The City understands that a document the size and scope of the BDCP would have technical and editorial errors.

Various errors and omissions are identified in Attachment 3 and need to be reviewed and addressed.

If you have any questions please call Jim Peifer, Supervising Engineer at (916) 808-1416.

Sincerely,

John F. Shirey
City Manager

Copy to: Mayor and City Council
Dave Brent, Director of Utilities

Attachment 1 City of Sacramento Specific Comments on Bay Delta Conservation Plan Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement
Attachment 2 Letter from NRDC dated January 16, 2013
Attachment 3 City of Sacramento Specific Comments on Bay Delta Conservation Plan

Attachment 1. City of Sacramento Specific Comments on Bay Delta Conservation Plan Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
Highlights	5		WQ, WS	The environmental review process has the following key objectives:Identify environmental impacts. Identify economic impacts. Evaluate reasonable alternatives that could avoid or minimize those impacts. Develop mitigation (ways to reduce or avoid environmental impacts). Provide information for public review and comment. Disclose to decision makers the project impacts, mitigation, and public comments.	The BDCP asserts that the environmental review process has identified environmental and economic impacts; however, this is not provided in the EIR/EIS. Also, it states that it has evaluated reasonable alternatives to avoid or minimize those impacts or provided mitigation, which is also not provided in the EIR/EIS.
Highlights	5		WQ, WS	Provided a comprehensive review and analysis of the following: ... The effects of Delta conveyance alternatives on water quality.	The BDCP asserts that the water quality review was comprehensive. However, there are many errors and omissions in the data assessment and a complete focus on Delta water quality for exporters, with very limited evaluation of upstream of Delta.
Highlights	14		WS	The Draft EIR/EIS also addresses cumulative impacts on the environment that could result from implementation of a BDCP alternative in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects.	The BDCP asserts that it has addressed cumulative impacts on the environment. Yet it has not included State and Federal plans for climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies in the future conditions assessments.
ES	1	19-21	WQ, CM19	The BDCP EIR/EIS has been prepared for the purpose of analyzing and disclosing the potential environmental effects and effects on the human environment associated with the alternatives and to identify potentially feasible ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects.	While there are options available to manage stormwater (e.g., pollutant source control, runoff treatment, and maintenance of conveyance systems), some elements are beyond local agencies' control, including the timing, duration, and magnitude of rainfall or the air deposition of pollutants, such as mercury and some pesticides. Furthermore, some best management practices are effective on only some pollutants. Identifying a local management program as a mitigation for the BDCP provides the potential for inconsistent goals between the regulatory programs and those of CM19, which are focused on protection of the two smelt species of fish and green sturgeon by generally reducing stormwater loading.
ES	1	26-27	WQ, WS	The conservation strategy is designed to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supply, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework.	The EIR/EIS states that the conservation strategy is to restore and protect water quality. Water quality should be protected upstream of the proposed North Delta intake, including all beneficial uses.
ES	1,3	19-21, 3-5	WQ, CM19, WS	The BDCP EIR/EIS has been prepared for the purpose of analyzing and disclosing the potential environmental effects and effects on the human environment associated with the alternatives and to identify potentially feasible ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects. Impacts on human, physical, and biological resource areas (see Section ES.8.1 for a list of resource areas/topics included in the evaluation) are presented in the document.	The EIR/EIS has significant omissions on analysis and disclosure of the potential environmental effects and the effects on the human environment, and on identification of potentially feasible ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
ES.1.1	3	37-40	LOCAL, CM19	For BDCP CM2–CM22, the EIR/EIS intends to present a program-level analysis consistent with the level of detail provided in the BDCP. Therefore, for CM2–CM22, the potential exists for additional CEQA/NEPA environmental review and associated permit actions to be required prior to implementing these conservation measures.	The BDCP unfairly shifts environmental documentation costs to agencies performing conservation measures. As a program-level analysis, the BDCP should evaluate these costs and develop funding plans.
ES.1.1	4	8-9	LOCAL, CM19	The degree of specificity in a program EIR s impact analysis need only to be as detailed as the description of the elements in the program (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15146).	The EIR/EIS insufficiently assesses the impacts CM19 . Examples of stormwater treatment are specific, but omit a number of current preferred means of managing stormwater. A detailed assessment would quantitatively evaluate the benefits and impacts of CM19 for a wide range of constituents and conditions.
ES.1.1	4	14-16, 17-24	WQ, CM19, WS	NEPA and the CEQ's regulations for implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1502.14) require federal agencies to prepare an EIS for major federal actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The EIS must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate (CEQ 40 questions) the environmental effects of an action, including a range of reasonable alternatives, and identify mitigation measures to minimize adverse effects for the range of impacts of the proposal when they propose to carry out, approve, or fund a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. To ensure environmental effects of a proposed action are fairly assessed, the probability of the mitigation measures being implemented must also be discussed and the EIS and Record of Decision should indicate the likelihood that such measures will be adopted or enforced, and when they might be available (40 CFR 1502.16[h] and 1505.2).	The EIR/EIS has significant omissions for the proposed actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment, the environmental effects of an action (including a range of reasonable alternatives), and identification of mitigation measures to minimize adverse effects for the range of impacts. The EIR/EIS should have a clear discussion of the means of compliance with these statutory requirements, including an assessment of the likelihood of implementation of each conservation measure and how the project would be modified if a conservation measure is not implemented.
ES.2.2.2.1	10-11	37-41, 1-2	WQ, CM19	In addition, urban development, large upstream dams and storage reservoirs, water diversions, hydraulic mining, and the development of a managed network of navigation, flood control, and irrigation canals have all affected water flow patterns and altered fish and wildlife habitat availability. These changes, coupled with higher water exports, declines in water quality from urban and agricultural discharges, and changes in the dilution capacity from managed inflows and diversions, have led to a decline in ecological productivity in the Delta.	This broad statement is misleading and not entirely correct. Urban runoff quality has improved since the implementation of municipal stormwater management programs as demonstrated by the Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership. Agricultural interests could likely make the same assertion based on improved control measures. Moreover, the Central Valley Drinking Water Policy modeling, as summarized in a variety of reports suggests that urban development actually has a net benefit on a number of water quality constituents. The statement should be revised to match conclusions from other groups, including the Contaminant Synthesis Report (http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/delta_water_quality/comprehensive_monitoring_program/contaminant_synthesis_report.pdf) and the Delta Science Program.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
ES.2.2.2.2	11	15-16	WQ,WS	Regulations for the combined SWP and CVP Operations are intended to protect the beneficial uses of Delta water.	The City of Sacramento's Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant intake is within legal definition of Delta. Potential water quality impacts (MUN) to Sacramento River source water quality for the City's residents or mitigation measures were not specifically addressed in the BDCP or BDCP EIR/EIS.
ES.2.2.2.2	11	19-24	WQ, WS	The water rights of the SWP and CVP are conditioned by the State Water Board to protect the beneficial uses of water within the Delta under each respective project's water rights. In addition, under the COA, SWP- and CVP-coordinated reservoir releases and Delta exports enable each water project to achieve benefit from their water supplies and to operate in a manner protective of beneficial uses. It is the responsibility of the SWP and CVP to meet these beneficial uses regardless of hydrologic conditions.	Hydrologic and reservoir conditions are intrinsically related to water quality conditions. Water quality impacts from the proposed diversion and related reservoir operation must be carefully considered so that health risk and cost are not placed on local water agencies.
ES.3.1	12-13	35-36, 1	WQ, WS	For the purposes of the EIR/EIS, the Delta Region—or Plan Area and Areas of Additional Analysis (Figure ES-2)—encompasses the statutory Delta, as well as the areas where CM1–CM22 would be implemented outside the statutory Delta.	The Delta Region includes the Plan Area (statutory Delta) and areas where CM1-22 would be implemented. CM2 includes diversions at Fremont Weir, and yet the reach of the Sacramento River between Fremont Weir and the northern boundary of the Delta are not included. This decision seems inconsistent with the definition of the Delta Region. The reach of the Sacramento River between Fremont Weir and the northern boundary of the Delta should be included in the analysis.
ES.4.4	17	20	CM19	Provide, where feasible, quantitative targets and timeframes for achieving the desired outcomes	There are insufficient quantitative targets in CM19. The grant program should provide funding where there is most benefit for reducing contaminant related impacts to the specific species.
ES.4.4	17	23-25	CM19	Provide metrics for the monitoring program by which to evaluate the effectiveness of the conservation measures and, if necessary, provide a basis to adjust the conservation measures to achieve the desired outcomes.	There are insufficient metrics for effectiveness and basis for adjustments in CM19.
ES.4.5	18	26-28	WQ, CM19	Species. Species-specific conservation measures are designed to reduce the adverse effects of various stressors on one or more covered species. These include measures addressing toxic contaminants, nonnative predators, illegal harvest, and genetic threats.	CM19 should be more specific in addressing the sources of the contaminants impacting the specific covered species affected by urban runoff. It is not appropriate to include CM19 to generally see if reducing stormwater pollutant loading will help the two species or their habitats. A detailed assessment of the benefits of control measures to covered species from a range of source types should be performed before implementation of any contaminant-based control measure. This evaluation should prioritize actions and consider the cost of the control measure compared to the established benefit to the covered species.
ES.4.5	18	34-36	WQ, CM19	The remaining conservation measures, CM12–CM21, are intended to reduce the adverse effects of various stressors, including but not limited to, environmental contaminants, nonnative predators, and illegal harvest on covered species.	The evaluations provided in the BDCP and EIR/EIS are insufficient. Environmental contaminant reduction should look at all sources and prioritize efforts and resources where there will be most benefit.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
ES.5	21	5-6	SCOPE, WQ, WS	CEQA and NEPA require that an EIR and EIS include a detailed analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project.	An insufficient range of alternatives is provided. There are other alternatives besides just multiple alignments of conveyance that may have less impact on the Delta, such as regional independence, offline storage, and a wider portfolio of tools. This wider range of alternatives should be evaluated.
ES.5	21	6-11	WQ, WS	CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate alternatives to the proposed project that are potentially feasible and would achieve most of the basic project objectives while avoiding or substantially reducing project impacts. NEPA requires that a reasonable range of alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the proposed federal action be analyzed in an EIS at an equivalent level of detail to that of the proposed action. Under NEPA, a range of reasonable alternatives is analyzed to define the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among the options.	There has been an insufficient review of water quality impacts upstream of North diversion. No mitigation is provided for such potential impacts to beneficial uses.
ES.5	21	18-20	SCOPE, WQ, WS	Alternative 4 was refined and improved to identify a form of the proposed BDCP (Proposed Project) that is grounded in solid science and reaches what DWR considers to be an optimal balance between ecological and water supply objectives.	An insufficient range of alternatives is provided. The Alternate Portfolio should be evaluated as it would have less environmental and human impacts.
ES.5	21	20-27	SCOPE, WQ, WS	Notably, identification of Alternative 4 as the preferred CEQA alternative is tentative, and is subject to change as DWR and its partner lead and responsible agencies receive and consider public and agency input on the EIR/EIS. It is therefore possible that the final version of the BDCP may differ from Alternative 4 as described herein, either because Alternative 4 itself was further refined, because another alternative was determined to be preferable, or because the Lead Agencies, in response to input, developed a new alternative with some features from some existing alternatives and other features from other existing alternatives.	A wider range of alternatives should be developed that are consistent with the California Water Plan, ensure reliable water supply for all of California, and protect all beneficial uses.
ES.5.2.2	32	30-38	WQ, WS	While meeting biological goals and objectives of the Plan, the applicable Delta operational rules evaluated for BDCP alternatives are intended to address how much of the Delta inflow can be exported at the south Delta CVP and SWP pumping plants; how much of the Delta inflow can be exported at the BDCP north Delta intakes; and how much of the inflow is needed for Delta outflow. Addressing these three factors requires determining the most limiting (lowest) objective for south Delta exports, the most limiting (lowest) objective for north Delta intakes, and the most limiting (highest) objective for outflow. Because each alternative has a slightly different set of applicable rules with varying north Delta intake capacities, each BDCP alternative would have different Delta operations in many months.	Within the determination of exports and outflows, there does not appear to be any consideration for the volume of storage remaining in the upstream reservoirs. Since the volume of storage is critical to water supply and water quality in the upstream of the Delta area, as well as the ability to meet future outflows and exports, it seems that this factor should be considered in the rule and operational scenario development. Since all the model runs used reservoir storage as a parameter based on federal and state requirements (Section 5.3.1.1), it should be possible to evaluate the impacts.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
ES.5.9.1.5	53	25-29	WS	Fremont Weir overtops when the combined flow of Sutter Bypass and the Sacramento and Feather Rivers surpasses 55,000 cfs as measured at Verona; flows through an operable gate could begin when Sacramento River flow at Verona is more than 23,100 cfs. The additional flows to the Yolo Bypass would be limited to 6,000 cfs and would reduce the Sacramento River flow at Freeport by this same amount.	This summary of the Fremont Weir operations is inconsistent with the summary provided in the BDCP Document, Chapter 3 (3.6.4.2 on page 3-187), and some of the modeling appendices. This data should be reviewed and revised as appropriate in the various documents.
ES.8.3.2	48	35-38	CM19	In general, mitigation related to restoration and other activities in CM3-CM22 will be the responsibility of a larger group of agencies as set forth in relevant portions of the BDCP. Responsiblities for particular measures will be described in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to be issued in connection with the Final EIR/EIS.	The mitigation, monitoring, and reporting details are critical pieces that local agencies should have a chance to review. The cost of these activities is potentially significant. The BDCP proponents and the State should fund these efforts, not local agencies. The benefit of these studies is to evaluate the success with regard to covered species, which is a direct benefit to the BDCP proponents and the State and is not a direct benefit to the local agency ratepayers.
1.5.1	1-12		SCOPE	1.5.1 Upstream of the Delta Region The Upstream of the Delta region is shown in Figures 1-5 through 1-8. This region comprises those areas in the SWP and CVP system upstream of the Delta. Operational changes at SWP facilities in this area may be necessary to move fresh water through and/or around the Delta consistent with operations of CM1.	The project area does not consider the land area tributary to the Plan Area or Project Area affected by the BDCP. In particular, the communities where CM19 is performed and upstream watersheds need to be addressed.
1.5.1	1-12	2-5	WQ, WS	The Upstream of the Delta region is shown in Figures 1-5 through 1-8. This region comprises those areas in the SWP and CVP system upstream of the Delta. Operational changes at SWP facilities in this area may be necessary to move fresh water through and/or around the Delta consistent with operations of CM1.	This statement indicates that upstream reservoir operations are expected to be changed under the BDCP. Subsequent downstream river flows and water quality changes need to be assessed in the reaches between the upstream reservoirs and the Delta.
1.5.1	Figure 1-7		SCOPE	Project Area definition	The project area does not consider the land area tributary to the Plan Area or Project Area affected by the BDCP conservation measures. The Plan Area and Study area are not sufficiently described in the EIR/EIS. Areas should be defined with specific boundaries.
1.6	1-13	3-9	WQ, WS	In assessing environmental effects associated with CM1, the EIR/EIS also refers to environmental commitments and other BDCP conservation measures that are intended to reduce, avoid, or minimize these effects. Additional site-specific environmental compliance documents, however, will likely be required for implementation of some conservation measures (including, for example, wetland permitting actions by the Corps of Engineers). Additional information and/or documentation may be necessary during consideration of related permit application and decision-making processes.	This statement indicates that the overall assessment of CM1 was completed assuming implementation of the other environmental commitments and CMs. It is unclear how CM1 can get project-level approval without the guaranteed implementation of the supporting conservation measures. If the other commitments and CMs are not implemented, the assessment environmental effects of CM1 will not be accurate and would need to be re-evaluated.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
1.7	1-28	1-14	WQ, WS	Water Supply, Surface Water Resources, and Water Quality. Water supply and surface water resources—key drivers for development of the BDCP—remain controversial issues for a wide array of stakeholders (e.g., agricultural interests, hunting and fishing interests, water agencies, local jurisdictions) because of the changes in water operations, surface water flow conditions, and diversions that could occur with changes to the SWP and CVP systems. Water quality is an issue of concern because of uncertainties regarding activities associated with conveyance facilities and their operations and restored habitat that could lead to discharge of sediment, possible changes in salinity patterns, and water quality changes that could result from modifications to existing flow regimes.	The BDCP states that water quality is an uncertain impact of great significance that was documented as a concern in the public scoping. Yet, the water quality evaluation was very limited geographically as well as limited in relation to constituents of interest for key beneficial uses just outside of the Delta boundary.
3.1	3-2	37-46	SCOPE	With respect to particular components of the BDCP that must be implemented separately through individual permit actions or other discretionary decisions, the EIR/EIS intends to provide a mixture of project- and program-level components. Specifically, the EIR/EIS is intended to provide project-level assessment of the potential effects of modified and/or new conveyance facilities (CM1), including project-specific mitigation. All other conservation measures are presented and analyzed at a program level, with the expectation that more detailed, site-specific analysis and associated site-specific environmental documents will be prepared later, prior to implementation of specific projects, as the BDCP (or an alternative) is implemented over time, as appropriate. (See Chapter 4, Approach to the Environmental Analysis, for more detail on agency decision making related to project- and program-level approvals using this EIR/EIS.)	There are a number of actions within the BDCP that should be considered on a project level approach, such as any specific diversion or additional intake. The EIR/EIS assessment could better evaluate these details since they are known in much detail. Sufficient detail is needed for a sufficient evaluation of interactions and cumulative impacts.
3.2	3-4, 3-5	31-2	SCOPE	Under these principles, the EIR needs to describe and evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasonable choice and "to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making" (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). Consideration of alternatives focuses on those that can either eliminate significant adverse environmental impacts or substantially reduce them; alternatives considered in this context may include those that are more costly and those that could impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives (Section 15126.6[b]). CEQA does not require the alternatives to be evaluated at the same level of detail as the proposed project.	A wider range of alternatives would be more meaningful, especially broader options such as offline storage and regionally independent supplies.
3.3.1	3-17	Table 3-2	SCOPE	BDCP Covered Activities	Please clarify why some conservation measures are not considered covered actions or activities and if there are future implications if a particular conservation measure was found to have an impact on covered species.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
3.3.1	3-18	8-12	SCOPE	Consequently, the project area encompasses a larger geographic area than the Plan Area, comprising three defined regions: the Upstream of the Delta Region, the Delta Region (as defined in Chapter 1, Section 1.5, BDCP EIR/EIS Project Area—generally referred to as the Plan Area), and the SWP and CVP Export Service Areas (Figure 1-4).	The definition and justification for the Plan Area are insufficient. Some areas affected by the BDCP directly or indirectly through conservation measures are not included.
3.3.2	3-18	38-40	SCOPE	The covered activities outlined in Table 3-2 are included in the conservation measures (Table 3-3) and are discussed in detail in Section 3.6, Components of the Alternatives: Details.	There is an unclear correspondence between covered actions and the conservation measures; however, it is implied that all conservation measures are covered actions.
3.3.2.2	3-23	1-31	WQ	Adaptive Management and Monitoring Program	See comments on BDCP as it is referenced in this Section.
3.4.3	3-39	29-31	SCOPE	BDCP will implement measures intended to address the effects of other stressors (CM12–CM21; Tables 3-3 and 3-4) under all alternatives except the No Action Alternative. Section 3.6.3 provides a detailed description of these components.	It is not clear if these conservation measures are considered "covered actions". Urban stormwater treatment, in particular, is not in the referenced table (Table 2 3-2).
3.5.9.3	3-68	38-41	CM19, SCOPE	Urban Stormwater Treatment (CM19) – Under this conservation measure, the BDCP Implementation Office would provide a mechanism, through funding, for implementing stormwater treatment measures in urban areas that would result in decreased discharge of contaminants to the Delta.	The proposed action does not specify the area nor location where it would take place. It is not possible to adequately evaluate the benefit, impacts, or costs of the alternative without a clear specification of the intended scope of the action.
3.6.3.8	3-162	30-31	CM19	Reducing pyrethroids and other chemicals from urban areas and stormwater, which would improve the health of covered fish species.	It is not an established fact that urban runoff pyrethroids have effects outside of localized locations near to outfalls. In fact, the research cited in the BDCP documents by Weston and Lydy confirmed these localized effects. The benefits of "reducing the amount of pollution in stormwater runoff entering Delta waterways" need to be better understood before implementation of CM19 or any contaminant reduction strategy.
3.6.3.8	3-162	40-41	CM19	This conservation measure would be in effect over the 50-year BDCP period.	The BDCP does not clearly state that CM19 would be in effect for the 50-year period, but it provides funding for only the first ten years. The EIR/EIS should clearly state if the benefits claimed for the EIR/EIS are based on this initial 10 years of funding or continued efforts for the entire 50 years, and who would then fund these continued efforts. Before implementation of any contaminant control measures, a detailed assessment on control of all types of sources and their benefit to the covered species should be performed. This evaluation should consider costs relative to benefits and prioritize any control measure recommendations.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
3.6.3.8	3-163	29-34	CM19	Implementation of this conservation measure will be informed through compliance and effectiveness monitoring and adaptive management, as described in Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy, (Section 3.4.19) of the BDCP. The BDCP Implementation Office, in coordination with the fish and wildlife agencies, may discontinue effectiveness monitoring for this measure in future years if monitoring results indicate a strong correlation between reduction in stormwater pollution loads entering the Delta and responses of covered fish species.	It is insufficient to assess effectiveness with correlations when so many other factors contribute to covered species health. Better assessment tools are needed to be developed and agreed upon before developing the conservation measures.
3B.1.13	3B-28	23-27	WQ, WS	In the event of an accidental spill, personnel will identify and secure the source of the discharge and contain the discharge with sorbents, sandbags, or other material from spill kits and will contact appropriate regulatory authorities (e.g., National Response Center will be contacted if the spill threatens navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines, as well as other appropriate response personnel).	Due to the proximity of the Fremont Weir to the Sacramento River Water Treatment Plant and the limited amount of response time, the City would like to request direct notification of any spills or impacts to source water quality from construction activities related to CM2. Contact information can be provided upon request.
3B.1.20	3B-40	6-7	WQ, WS	Provide Notification of Maintenance Activities in Waterways	If any maintenance activities result in impacts to source water quality, the City would like to request direct notification. Contact information can be provided upon request.
3B.2.1	3B-42	27-36	WS	The BDCP proponents commit to assisting in-Delta municipal, industrial, and agricultural water purveyors that will be subject to significant water quality effects from operation of Conservation Measure 1 (CM1) and effects on dissolved organic carbon (DOC) due to implementation of Conservation Measures 2-22 (CM2–22). This commitment shall apply specifically to those purveyors affected by significant increases in bromide, electrical conductivity, chloride, and DOC concentrations such that the purveyors will bear increased financial costs in order to continue to treat or otherwise supply water to acceptable standards. The assistance provided by the BDCP proponents is intended to fully offset any increased treatment or delivery costs attributable to CM1, or for DOC attributable to CM2–22 and may take the form of financial contributions, technical contributions, or partnerships.	This commitment addresses potential impacts from chloride/EC, bromide, and organic carbon, but is limited to in-Delta purveyors. Some MUN users are just beyond the limit of the Delta, but could potentially be impacted by operations changes from CM1 and CM2. This commitment should be reevaluated to consider an expanded geographic area with specific conditions.
3D.2.2	3D-3	12-16	AM, WQ	As the NEPA baseline, the No Action Alternative, sometimes referred to as the future no action condition, considers no action conditions to include continuation of operations of the SWP and CVP as described in the 2008 USFWS and 2009 NMFS BiOps and other relevant plans and projects that would likely occur in the absence of BDCP actions and which are well-defined enough to allow for meaningful analysis.	As per this definition, it seems that the DWR Reoperation Program should have been included as a relevant plan that would likely occur. The climate change analysis should have considered the potential operational adaptation and mitigation strategies in development. http://www.water.ca.gov/system_reop/
3D.3.2.1	3D-15	13-14	ERROR, SCOPE	Table 3D-4	This table does include reference to the Folsom Dam Safety Project, but additional comment is provided on Table 3D-A regarding its inclusion. Also, there is no inclusion of the DWR Reoperation Program, which needs to be considered in the analysis. http://www.water.ca.gov/system_reop/

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
3D.3.4	3D-24	1-2	ERROR, SCOPE	Table 3D-6	This table does include reference to the Folsom Dam Safety Project, but additional comment is provided on Table 3D-A regarding its inclusion. It is unclear if the North Bay Aqueduct Alternative Intake Project, which has a Notice of Preparation submitted, has been included in this assessment. http://www.water.ca.gov/engineering/Projects/Current/NBA/. Also, there is no inclusion of the DWR Reoperation Program which needs to be considered in the analysis. http://www.water.ca.gov/system_reop/
3D.A	3D-46		ERROR, SCOPE	Table 3D-A	The DWR Reoperation Program should have been included in this table and identified as included as "YES" in the No Action Alternative and Cumulative Impact assessments. The DWR North Bay Aqueduct Alternate Intake Project should also be identified here and specifically clarified if included in the BDCP or separately.
3D.A	3D-99		ERROR, SCOPE	Table 3D-A	The Folsom Dam Flood Safety Project (Joint Federal Project) is included in the table and the assessments for No Action and Cumulative Impacts. However, the text description seems to indicate that no operational modifications were included in the assessments until a revised Water Control Manual is finalized. This needs to be modified and updated to reflect the current conditions of the WCM development. http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/CivilWorks/FolsomDamAuxiliarySpillway.aspx
3E.3.2.1	3E-19	33-34	WS, ERROR	Delta inflows are mainly driven by precipitation and runoff in the vast watershed that drains into the Delta (not by precipitation falling on the Delta itself).	This statement is incorrect. Delta inflows are significantly influenced by upstream reservoir releases, and the text should be revised to reflect contribution from both sources.
5.3.1	5-43	26-33	WS	The water supply analysis addresses changes to water supply to SWP and CVP water users in the Delta region, upstream of the Delta Region, and Export Service Areas due to implementation of BDCP conveyance facilities (CM1) and other conservation measures, specifically tidal marsh habitat restoration (CM4). The alternatives would modify the operations of the SWP and CVP facilities but would not modify the operations of water resources facilities owned and/or operated by other water rights holders. Therefore, the water supply analysis addresses impacts to DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors, as opposed to other water rights holders, as the BDCP does not include any regulatory actions that would affect any such water rights holders.	The water supply analysis is limited to the impacts on the BDCP proponents, and it is assumed that these actions do not impact the water supply of other users. Since operation of the upstream reservoir greatly influence the availability of water, as well as the quality of that water, it does not seem to be reasonable to assume that analysis should not have included other users.
5.3.1.1	5-49	37-40	WS	If sea level rise and climate change do not occur or occur differently than modeled for these analyses, water supply conditions under the alternatives will be different from the results presented in this section. Time will tell whether current predictions of conditions in 2060, though based on the best science currently available, will prove to be too optimistic or too pessimistic.	Given the uncertainty of the information used in the modeling, it is warranted to plan to include a reassessment of conditions at specified periods during the term of the permit to assess (particularly 2025) the climate change impacts and how those may affect the operational scenarios of the BDCP.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
5.3.3.1	5-57	7-9	WS	Effects and Mitigation Approaches for No Action Alternative	DWR is currently developing a System Reoperation Program that is developing alternative operations scenarios for the CVP/SWP system that will include adaptation and mitigation strategies to address projected climate change conditions. This should have been addressed somewhere in the BDCP as a reasonably foreseeable condition. http://www.water.ca.gov/system_reop/
5.3.3.1	5-58	12-13	WS	Table 5-3	This table should have included the Joint Federal Project at Folsom Dam and revised Water Control Manual which are expected to be operational in 2015. http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/CivilWorks/FolsomDamAuxiliarySpillway.aspx
5.3.3.1	5-61	8-15	WS	The frequency of Trinity, Shasta, and Folsom Lakes dropping to dead pool storage would increase by about 10% under the No Action Alternative as compared to Existing Conditions. These changes in storage would reduce the ability of the CVP and SWP to meet system water demands and environmental water needs. Adaption measures would need to be implemented on upstream operations to manage coldwater pool storage levels under future sea level rise and climate change conditions. As described in the methods section, model results when storages are at or near dead pool may not be representative of actual future conditions because changes in assumed operations may be implemented to avoid these conditions.	This text supports the likely change in system operations to address climate change impacts, which were not included in the NAA evaluation. By not including these adaptation and mitigation efforts, the impacts of climate change have been presented to show a worst case scenario. This may minimize the perceived, or relative, impact of the BDCP.
5A.A.2.1	5A-A5	22-23	WQ, WS, SCOPE	A brief description of the hydrologic, hydrodynamic, water quality, particle transport, reservoir and river temperature modeling tools used in the analytical framework is provided below.	The Lower Sacramento River was excluded from a temperature evaluation. This is a significant flaw since this is a large stretch of river, from Knights Landing to Freeport, where there are numerous beneficial uses. Also, there are projected to be significant impacts on the temperature of the Feather and American rivers downstream of the major reservoirs that could cause compound impact to the Lower Sacramento River. This reach needs to be evaluated.
5A.A.3.3	5A-A21	8-10	WQ, WS	The amount of spill over the Fremont Weir or the notch is computed using the daily patterned Sacramento River flow at Verona and the rating curves included in the model.	The evaluation of flows at the Fremont Weir should have included an investigation of the increase in potential for American River flows being drafted upstream rather than normal discharge downstream on the Sacramento River.
5A.A.3.3	5A-A23	26-32	WQ, WS	The CALSIM II simulations do not consider future climate change adaptation which may manage the SWP and CVP system in a different manner than today to reduce climate impacts. For example, future changes in reservoir flood control reservation to better accommodate a seasonally changing hydrograph may be considered under future programs, but are not considered under the BDCP. Thus, the CALSIM II BDCP results represent the risks to operations, water users, and the environment in the absence of dynamic adaptation for climate change.	The lack of inclusion of adaptation and mitigation strategies to address climate change is an inappropriate assumption. The DWR Reoperation Program is coordinating state and federal agencies on this specific issue, and this needs to be addressed as part of the BDCP. The system will be operated differently to address climate change impacts; therefore, the results of those conditions presented in this assessment will likely not represent future conditions and therefore should not be used for comparison.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
5A.B.5.5	5A-B67		SCOPE, ERROR	Table B-8, Operations Criteria: River-Specific, American River Folsom Dam flood control	The No Action Alternative Assumption is the same as the Existing Conditions Assumptions. This is incorrect because it does not account for the Joint Federal Project and Revised Water Control Manual that will be in place in 2015. This condition needs to be revised to reflect the dam modifications, as well as the revisions to operations.
5A.B.5.5	5A-B102		ERROR	Table B-13 - Fremont Weir/Yolo Bypass	The description of this item does not match all other sections of the BDCP and the EIR/EIS. This should be evaluated and confirmed, and all sections should be revised to reflect the actual proposed conditions and modeled scenarios.
5A.D.4	5A-D97	5-8	WQ, WS	The derived rating curves are used directly in the CALSIM II model to define the monthly and daily spills over the Fremont Weir and Sacramento Weir when integrated with the system operations and other components of the BDCP Alternatives.	This analysis should have been expanded to look at the direction of flow of the American River under this new operational condition; this is important to see if the river is drafted upstream under any range of combined flows on the Lower Sacramento and American rivers to identify operational conditions to prevent that upstream flow from occurring.
5A.D.7	5A-D133	5-7	WQ, WS	For the selected sea level rise scenarios, three-dimensional UnTRIM Bay-Delta model was simulated to evaluate the Delta hydrodynamic and salinity conditions under historical conditions.	This evaluation should have been expanded to see how far upstream the projected effects of sea level rise extends, to determine if there is an increase in reverse flow impacts or an increase in the reach of the upstream of the Delta area that could be affected by reverse flows or backwater effects.
5A.D.10.2	5A-D157	9-14	WQ	The results show that the effects on the upstream operations are primarily due to the climate change effect on the reservoir inflows, river temperatures, and the increased salinity intrusion in the Delta due to the projected sea level rise. The proposed BDCP operations did not impact the upstream reservoir conditions, both at end-of-May and end-of-September, because of the increased flexibility in the system. The proposed restoration under BDCP has limited effect on the overall system operations.	The information presented in this section is unclear and difficult to review. The data cannot be reviewed to confirm the conclusion stated by the BDCP. This section should be revised to allow better review of the information.
5A.D.10.3	5A-D167	8-11	WQ	The incremental changes between the No Action Alternative and the BDCP Alternative without considering the projected changes in climate and sea level were found to be similar to the results presented in the EIR/EIS, which included the climate change and sea level rise effects.	The information presented in this section is unclear and difficult to review. The data cannot be reviewed to confirm the conclusion stated by the BDCP. This section should be revised to allow better review of the information.
5B.B.2.2	5A-B14	17-23	WQ, WS	CALSIM II simulation for the No Action Alternative Late Long-Term, does not consider any adaptation measures for future climate change, which may result in managing the SWP and CVP system in a different manner than today to reduce climate impacts. For example, future changes in reservoir flood control reservation to better accommodate a seasonally changing hydrograph may be considered under future programs, but are not considered under the BDCP.	See comment on Appendix 5 A regarding lack of inclusion of adaptation and mitigation strategies.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
6.1.2.3	6-7	3-30	WS	Influence of Delta Tidal Flows	This section describes the variability in tidal flows on shorter-term basis, defined as daily, and indicates that the riverine conditions in the Sacramento River at Freeport can be influenced by tides related to flow, velocity, and elevation. This supports the need to extend the reverse flow evaluation upstream to define the extent of the impact as well as associated backwater effects.
6.1.3.3	6-16	7-10	WS	Because of its relative proximity to the Delta, and because the American River provides a large flow contribution, Folsom Dam's operation also can influence on Delta flood management and can increase flows in the Sacramento Bypass, which diverts water into the Yolo Bypass.	This statement indicates that American River flows can influence flows on the Sacramento River, toward Yolo Bypass, and that this should have been evaluated further as part of the modeling exercise. Changes in flow direction of the Sacramento River and related impacts to water quality are significant potential impacts to beneficial uses; this issue should be evaluated and mitigated.
6.3.1.2	6-43	3-15	WS	Existing Conditions precipitation assumptions are consistent with historical patterns. These historical patterns have been used by USACE and DWR to develop reservoir storage criteria to reduce flood potential in the watersheds. The assumptions for snowfall and rainfall patterns for the alternatives have been modified to reflect climate change that is anticipated to increase surface water runoff from rainfall in the winter and early spring and to decrease runoff from snowmelt in the late spring and early summer, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply. However, the flood management criteria for maintaining adequate flood storage space in the reservoirs (as defined by the USACE and DWR for flood control release criteria) were not modified to adapt to the changes in runoff due to climate change. No changes in monthly allowable storage values related to CALSIM II model assumptions were included because these changes were not defined under the alternatives to achieve the project objectives or purpose and need for the BDCP. If USACE and DWR modify allowable storage values in the future in response to climate change, it is anticipated that the surface water flows and related water supply and water quality conditions would change.	This statement clarifies that although future hydrologic conditions were modified for project climate change impacts, there were no parallel modifications to the operations of the reservoirs to mitigate those impacts. This is an unreasonable assumption because the state and federal management agencies are developing a System Reoperation Program (led by DWR) to address this specific issue. As noted in the final sentence, the proposed modifications will have an impact on water supply and water quality, thus making the No Action Alternative an incomplete assessment. The model for the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives should have included some modifications to the reservoir operational requirements to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
6.3.1.2	6-43	16-25	WS	For this EIR/EIS analysis, it was determined that estimating peak flows in a sub-monthly time step based on monthly flows simulated in CALSIM II would not be reliable for flood risk analysis because CALSIM's flood control considerations are limited to maximum allowable end of month storage. Even weekly or daily time steps would likely be unable to reflect the actual conditions faced by reservoir operators, who, based on policy decisions, could operate in a different way under severe conditions in response to circumstances as they arise in order to try to avoid catastrophic outcomes. Detailed quantitative hydraulic analysis models are currently being improved by USACE, DWR, and CVFPB. Those models are not currently completed and not available for use in this EIR/EIS. Therefore monthly CALSIM II outputs are used to provide only an indication of consistently high storages or flows that may or may not result in flood conditions.	This statement indicates that the model results are not sufficiently robust to make a determination of Less Than Significant related to Impacts SW-1 and SW-2, related to flood control. This should be identified by the BDCP as a key uncertainty that needs to be reassessed when the referenced hydraulic models are available, as part of the Adaptive Management program.
6.3.4	6-154	16-17	WS	Table 6-9	This table should have included the Joint Federal Project at Folsom Dam and revised Water Control Manual, which are expected to be operational in 2015, as well as some consideration of the DWR Reoperation Study related to climate change mitigation/adaptation strategies for the CVP/SWP.
6.3.4	6-157	5-9	WS	The SWRCB is conducting a concurrent program to update the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. This project is still under development, and the potential outcomes are not known at this time. Changes to surface water resources due to this project could result in changes in Delta outflow and Delta outflow patterns (increases and decreases depending on the time of the year for different scenarios) and water quality in the Delta watershed.	Since this project could have a significant impact on flow patterns and therefore impact the water quality, it should be identified as a key uncertainty and added to the Adaptive Management program for reassessment once it is finalized.
8	8-1		WQ	Water Quality	Additional comments are provided on various appendices to Chapter 8 and are incorporated as applicable to the various sections.
8.1	8-1	4-5	WQ	Chapter 8, Water Quality, describes the environmental setting and potential impacts of the BDCP on water quality in and upstream of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.	The BDCP purports that this Chapter describes impacts on water quality upstream of the Delta. Yet there is very little data evaluation to support such evaluation. This Chapter needs to be expanded to provide a complete evaluation of water quality upstream of the Delta in accordance with this statement.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.1.5	8-3	37-43	SCOPE	Potential impacts resulting from water operations and maintenance of Conservation Measure 1 (Conservation Measure 1 provides for the development and operation of a new water conveyance infrastructure and the establishment of operational parameters associated with both existing and new facilities). For the purposes of the assessment, the study area was divided into the three regions which are discussed separately for each constituent for Conservation Measure 1: - Upstream of the Delta (including the Sacramento and San Joaquin River watersheds).	The water quality assessment are stated to cover watershed area, but are not adequately covered. This conflicts with Section 1.5.1 descriptions.
8.1.6	8-5	8-18	SCOPE	In some instances, the NEPA and CEQA discussions differ for a particular impact discussion becaus NEPA and CEQA have different points of comparison (or "baselines" in CEQA terms). The NEPA point of comparison for each alternative is based on the comparison of the action alternative (Alternatives 1A through 9) at 2060, with the no action alternative which supposes conditions at 2060 in the absence of the proposed project. The CEQA baseline is based on the comparison of the action alternative (Alternatives 1A through 9) at 2060 with existing conditions. Consistent with this, the NEPA point of comparison accounts for anticipated climate change conditions at 2060, whereas the CEQA baseline is assumed to occur during existing climate conditions. Therefore, differences in model outputs between the CEQA baseline and the action alternative (Alternatives 1A through 9) are due primarily to both the impacts of proposed alternative as well as future climate change conditions (sea level rise and altered precipitation patterns).	The alternatives examined are insufficient and do not constitute a reasonable range. The alternatives should look at a broader range of alternatives for water quality in addition to the Delta Reform Act covered species-focused activities. Because the baseline is considered continued operation of the existing facilities, additional alternatives that support regionally independent solutions and less conveyance should be required for an adequate evaluation.
8.2	8-5	20-26	SCOPE	This section defines the environmental setting/affected environment for surface water quality, reviews the environmental and regulatory setting with respect to water quality, and provides an assessment of existing water quality conditions in the study area (the area in which impacts may occur), shown in Figure 1-4, which includes the Plan Area (the area covered by the BDCP), upstream of the Delta, and the State Water Project/Central Valley Project (SWP/CVP) Export Service Areas. Water quality conditions refer to the chemical and physical properties of the surface water in the study area. setting/affected environment for surface water quality, reviews the environmental and regulatory setting with respect to water quality, and provides an assessment of existing water quality conditions in the study area (the area in which impacts may occur), shown in Figure 1-4, which includes the Plan Area (the area covered by the BDCP), upstream of the Delta, and the State Water Project/Central Valley Project (SWP/CVP) Export Service Areas. Water quality conditions refer to the chemical and physical properties of the surface water in the study area.	Earlier in Section 8.1.5, the text states that the tributary "watersheds" are covered in the assessment. In this section, it is stated that Figure 1-4 defines the study area. However, Figure 1-4 and the previous discussion include only the upstream waterways, but not the tributary watersheds, which would add a significantly larger area and is more accurate.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.2	8-5	33-35	ERROR	The term nonpoint source is defined to mean any source of water pollution that does not meet the legal definition of point source in Section 502(14) of the CWA and includes urban and irrigation runoff.	Stormwater covered NPDES permits (MS4) is considered a point source within Section 502(14), which does not apply to agricultural "stormwater". Clean Water Act amendments in 1987 clarified this categorization.
8.2	8-6	2-4	WQ	Because the primary concern of water temperature is effects on fish and aquatic organisms, temperature is addressed in Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources.	This assumption is incorrect. Temperature is one of the key general characteristics of drinking water that impacts many aspects of treatability and treated water quality. This is especially evident in the development of disinfection by-products. Higher temperatures significantly increase the rate of reaction and development of both THMs and HAAs in treated water, as documented in the 2013 Update to the American River Watershed Sanitary Survey (pages 3-39 to 3-43). This constituent needs to be included in Chapter 8 for its potential impacts to overall water quality.
8.2.1	8-6	16-17	WQ, ERROR	Finally, water quality data from selected monitoring stations were reviewed for specific constituents in Section 8.1.3.	This section reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.2.1	8-6	20-22	SCOPE, WQ	The Delta environment is much more complex and dynamic than the rest of the study area and requires a more detailed approach. Hence, the water quality conditions in the Delta were reviewed at a greater level of detail.	The detailed assessment should occur in the areas where there are effects. While tidal influence adds complexity to the modeling, the higher level of detail is necessary upstream of the selected water quality locations (e.g., up to Veterans Bridge, etc.).
8.2.1.1	8-6	39-40	WQ, ERROR	The following sections (Sections 8.1.1.2 through 8.1.3.17) describe the Existing Conditions in the study area with respect to surface water quality and are organized in the following sequence.	These section references are incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.2.1.1	8-7	28-29	ERROR	Section 8.1.2, Selection of Monitoring Stations for Characterization of Water Quality, includes detailed discussions of the selected water quality constituents of concern in the study area.	Incorrect reference to previous section.
8.2.1.3	8-10	27-29	WS	The management of the SWP and CVP systems to meet water supply, flood management, and environmental obligations has a substantial effect on the quantity and timing of inflows to the Delta and on water quality in the study area.	We agree with this statement. It supports the need for more significant evaluation of reservoir operations in relation to downstream water quality impacts.
8.2.1.4	8-13	22-23	ERROR	Figure 8-6 shows land uses and major point sources (consisting primarily of municipal WTPs) and nonpoint sources (e.g., urban storm water runoff) of pollutants.	Urban stormwater is considered a point source.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.2.1.4	8-14	14-23	WQ, WS	Both variations in watershed hydrology and SWP and CVP operations affect the variability of water quality in the study area; also both SWP/CVP and non-SWP/CVP water diversions reduce the amount of water available for dilution and assimilation of contaminant inputs and hydrodynamic conditions associated with channel flows and tidal action in the Delta. Water quality can vary seasonally in response to winter-spring runoff and summer-fall lower-flow periods or seasonal agricultural practices and cropping; water quality also can vary from year to year as a result of precipitation and snowpack levels in the upper watersheds and the resulting releases from upstream reservoirs for water supply, flood management, and environmental obligations (e.g., fish flows, Delta water quality objective compliance), operations of the Delta Cross Channel, and seasonal and annual variations in SWP and CVP pumping rates.	This text displays the wide variability in source water quality and supports the need to evaluate constituents for short term impacts. The use of long term averages in the water quality assessment in this chapter needs to be reconsidered, and the data should be reevaluated for shorter term impacts, such as the periods applicable for drinking water regulations.
8.2.1.4	8-13, 8-14	16-40,1-13	WQ	Primary Factors Affecting Water Quality	This section presents a summary of some of the potential sources of contamination in the watershed that could impact water quality and the associated constituents of concern. This section is not comprehensive and does not provide any relative comparison or assessment of the specific sources' ability to impact source water quality. Text should be added to qualify the discussion and discuss the presence of additional sources and constituents of interest, especially at more local levels.
8.2.1.5	8-14	24	WQ, WS	Beneficial Uses	This text needs to be modified to include the State Water Board's Sources of Drinking Water Policy (Resolution 88-63) in addition to the Tributary Rule. Both apply to the Central Valley and indicate where the MUN beneficial use shall be assigned.
8.2.1.6	8-21	20-37	ERROR	*Omission*	This section on other Water Quality Plans does not identify several critical water quality planning efforts that are relevant, including CV-SALTS, salt and boron, pesticide and other TMDLs, Delta nutrient objective development, and the Central Valley Drinking Water Policy.
8.2.1.6	8-21	41-43	WQ, WS, ERROR	The incorporation of the MCLs, which apply to treated drinking water systems regulated by DPH, makes the MCLs also applicable to ambient receiving water with respect to the regulatory programs administered by the Regional Water Boards.	This text is incorrect and must be revised. MCLs are not always applied to treated water and can vary between water systems. The specific regulations in Title 22 indicate whether compliance is based on raw or treated water (Sections 64431/64432, 64442/64443, 64444/64445, 64449). In addition, a water system must continue the compliance location based on historical sites (raw vs. treated) so that may be the controlling factor. MCLs apply at varying locations and the text should reflect those conditions. http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Lawbook/dwregulations-2013-07-01.pdf

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.2.1.7	8-23	Table 8-2	ERROR	*Omission*	The table title should include Sacramento and San Joaquin River tributaries that are referenced in table. It is unclear when the EIR/EIS evaluation is including these watershed reaches.
8.2.1.7	8-24	Table 8-3	ERROR	*Omission*	Delta Methylmercury TMDL adoption status should be included.
8.2.1.8	8-26	34-36	WQ, WS, ERROR	In light of these issues, the constituents of concern identified in Table 8-5 are addressed in detail for the purposes of characterizing existing water quality in the study area (Section 8.1.3, Existing Water Quality) and to support the water quality impact assessments.	This section reference is incorrect, needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.2.1.8	8-26	39-42	ERROR	The constituent-specific sections described subsequently (Section 8.1.3) characterize the potential effects on beneficial uses and various receptors, including known information regarding specific locations in the Delta most affected by the constituents.	Reference to Section 8.1.3 appears in error.
8.2.1.8	8-26	39-42	WQ, WS, ERROR	The constituent-specific sections described subsequently (Section 8.1.3) characterize the potential effects on beneficial uses and various receptors, including known information regarding specific locations in the Delta most affected by the constituents.	This section reference is incorrect, needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.2.1.8	8-29		WQ, WS, ERROR	Table 8-5	For the MUN beneficial use temperature should have an "X", and the evaluation should be presented in this chapter. Also, the trace metals, others category should be further expanded or footnoted to show all of interest to the MUN use.
8.2.2.1	8-27	4-32	SCOPE, WQ	Omission	Section should provide a table or appendix of tables that describe the sources of data for the constituents considered. At a minimum, the table(s) should provide a summary of the year range, reporting limits, type of sample, locations, and number of samples. Also, the database used should be made available for use and review.
8.2.2.2	8-27	34-36	WQ, WS	Based on data availability, data continuity, and geographic location, a total of 20 water quality monitoring stations were selected to characterize the water quality conditions in the study area (Figure 8-7).	Limiting data collection to those sets easily accessed through DWR likely precluded a comprehensive data evaluation in the areas upstream of the Delta. These sites should have been supplemented with reputable local programs, such as current MUN users regulatory compliance monitoring data, to ensure a sufficient number of data points. http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Pages/EDTlibrary.aspx. Moreover there are a number of active data collection efforts by California Department of Pesticide Regulation, the Coordinated Monitoring Program (SSQP permit required river monitoring), and others.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.2.2.2	8-31	Table 8-6	SCOPE, WQ	Delta Source Water Locations	Selection of Sacramento River at Hood over the legislative definition of the Delta is inconsistent with the 'boundary' approach and excludes the upstream reach where a number of existing and proposed municipal drinking water intakes are located. The reach from I Street (or further upstream) to Hood should be evaluated in more detail as this is the area of increased impact from the BDCP intakes and other existing proposed intakes in the vicinity. Certainly, immediately upstream and downstream of the CM1 intakes should be evaluated.
8.2.2.2	8-31	1	WQ, WS	Table 8-6	For the four North of Delta locations the data source is listed as DWR, but this is insufficient reference to identify which monitoring program and time period the data represents. A footnote needs to be added to further clarify the source.
8.2.2.3	8-32	20-38	SCOPE, WQ	However, these locations generally represent the water quality occurring at these perimeter locations in the Delta.	Immediately upstream and downstream of the BDCP intakes should be evaluated in greater detail to understand with higher resolution the effects on water quality in this critical area. Hood is much further downstream than the I Street Bridge.
8.2.3	8-31	30-33	WQ, ERROR	The CEQA baseline, Existing Conditions, is defined in Appendix 3D and for the purposes of quantitative water quality assessments (as described in Section 8.3.4, Effects and Mitigation Approaches) is represented by Existing Conditions modeling runs, not historical water quality monitoring data as presented below.	This section reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised. Also, it is unclear why the basis for existing conditions of the water quality are not based on real data results instead of model runs - which were not available for many of the constituents of interest.
8.2.3	8-34	33-34	ERROR	For more information on the comparisons made to the Existing Conditions modeling run for assessment purposes, see Section 8.3.3.2, Comparisons.	This section reference is incorrect, needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.2.3.8	8-58	35-37	WQ	Data for most EDCs, PPCPs, and nitrosamines in the Delta and the north- and south-of-Delta locations are very sparse because most compounds are not typically part of water quality sampling programs.	The previously mentioned water quality monitoring programs (DWR, BDAT, WDL) do not have significant data on these constituents, but there is data available in the watershed from USGS, MUN users, as well as some industrial dischargers (such as Aerojet on the American River). This data should have been collected to contribute to a more thoughtful evaluation of these constituents. References to studies outside of the Project Area are not technically supported due to the site specific nature of the sources. http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Pages/EDTlibrary.aspx, http://cida.usgs.gov/nawqa_public/apex/f?p=136:1:0, https://ciwqs.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/readOnly/CiwqsReportServlet?inCommand=reset&reportName=esmrAnalytical, http://www.ceden.us/AdvancedQueryTool

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.2.3.9	8-63	Table 8-14	SCOPE, WQ	Omission	Data used is limited. However, significantly more data are available at the locations.
8.2.3.10	8-69	33-37	WQ	The beneficial uses most directly affected by nutrient concentrations include those relevant to aquatic organisms (cold freshwater habitat, warm freshwater habitat, and estuarine habitat), drinking water supplies (municipal and domestic supply), and recreational activities (water contact recreation, noncontact water recreation), which can be indirectly affected by the nuisance eutrophication effects of nutrients (Table 8-1).	The indirect effects of increased nutrients contributing to algal growth on the MUN use should be presented here as well, including taste and odor, interference with operations, increased levels of organic carbon, and the potential for algal toxins.
8.2.3.11	8-77	8-9	WQ, ERROR	Peak concentrations are important to municipal drinking water purveyors because of regulations that require advanced treatment depending on TOC concentrations.	This statement is incorrect. Regulations are based on quarterly and annual running averages. Operations are adjusted for system performance.
8.2.3.11	8-77	8-9	ERROR, WQ	Peak concentrations are important to municipal drinking water purveyors because of regulations that require advanced treatment depending on TOC concentrations.	It is stated elsewhere in the document that drinking water purveyors are concerned about annual averages of TOC, not peak concentrations. The median concentrations are most relevant to facility operation.
8.2.3.11	8-77	Table 8-20	ERROR	Omission	The table does not indicate the Sacramento River site location.
8.2.3.11	8-78	1-13	WQ, ERROR	DOC measured in the Sacramento River shows a trend of gradually increasing DOC with distance from Shasta Dam, where median concentrations of about 1 to 1.5 mg/L increase to about 1.5 mg/L to 2 mg/L at Hood (CALFED Bay-Delta Program 2007b:5–58). Major tributaries such as the Feather and American Rivers contain relatively low DOC as well, with median measured concentrations of 1.5 mg/L–2 mg/L. DOC on the lower San Joaquin River is comparatively greater but generally decreases with downstream distance, where median concentrations at Stevinson are nearly 6 mg/L and median concentrations at Vernalis are about 3 mg/L (CALFED Bay-Delta Program 2007b:5–49). This decrease in DOC can be attributed to inputs from tributaries such as the Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus Rivers, with median DOC concentrations of 2 mg/L. Mean values for the north-of-Delta area during water years 2001–2006 ranged from 1.5 mg/L at the Feather River at Oroville to 2.0 mg/L at the Sacramento River at Veterans Bridge (Table 8-21). South-of-Delta mean values were higher than north-of-Delta stations examined (3.2 to 3.4 mg/L), and comparable to the mean at the Banks headworks (3.3 mg/L, Figure 8-38).	The discussion is confusing in its characterization of concentrations in various waters and the implied quality of the water as a drinking source. A maximum value is discussed as the critical assessment at first; however, mean values are then used. There exist many conceptual models which better explain the sources, relative loadings from tributaries, and the general organic carbon discussion. We recommend revising this paragraph to more accurately describe the high quality of the Sacramento River so that it is more consistent with the Drinking Water Policy Workgroup conclusions on organic carbon.
8.2.3.11	8-78	22-23	ERROR	The lowest observed mean concentrations of TOC in the Delta during the water years 2001–2006 ranged from 2.7 to 3.0 mg/L, occurring at the Sacramento River at Hood	It is not clear if the range of mean values at Hood is seasonal mean, annual mean, etc. It does not seem to match the median value shown in Table 8-20.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.2.3.11	8-78	Figure 8-42	ERROR	*Presentation*	In presenting side-by-side plots from different sites, it would be useful to use the same scale, especially if the intent is comparison. More information should be provided on whether monitoring programs have sample collection targets. For example, Sacramento River at Veterans Bridge is known to be biased to wet weather events.
8.2.3.11	8-78, 8-79	19-20, 4-5	WQ	Tables 8-21 and 8-22	There is a wide variety in the number of samples available for the various locations. Direct comparison of these values is not valid if the data sets do not represent the same period or frequency.
8.2.3.11	8-79	7- 8	WQ	There are no state or federal regulatory water quality objectives/criteria for organic carbon or any USEPA-recommended criteria.	The Central Valley Delta Drinking Water Policy, adopted in July 2013, clarifies that organic carbon is included in the chemical constituents narrative. This text needs to be revised accordingly. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/r5-2013-0098_res.pdf
8.2.3.11	8-79	17-20	WQ	Existing Delta water quality regularly exceeds 2 mg/L TOC, and existing treatment plants already are obligated to remove some amount of TOC. Nevertheless, changes in source water quality at municipal intakes may trigger additional enhanced TOC removal, and associated increased treatment costs.	It should be noted that this evaluation does not address the area upstream of the North Delta, where source water TOC levels are generally at or below 2 mg/L on a running annual basis and no treatment technique for TOC removal is required (as documented in the American and Sacramento Rivers Watershed Sanitary Surveys and their updates). Any increase above the current baseline levels may trigger increased treatment and associated costs.
8.2.3.12	8-80	14	WQ	The term pathogens refers to viruses, bacteria, and protozoa that pose human health risks.	The term pathogen is used in a very broad manner, and it should be noted more specifically that the prevalence, human health impact, and drinking water treatability for this group of constituents should not be generalized.
8.2.3.12	8-80	16-19	WQ	Most data that exist regarding pathogens are for coliform bacteria, which are indicators of potential fecal contamination by humans or other warm-blooded animals because of their relative abundance and ease of measuring in water samples.	The text needs to be modified to add language to clarify that fecal coliform or E. coli are indicators of fecal contamination, not total coliform.
8.2.3.12	8-80	20-22	WQ	Sources of pathogens include wild and domestic animals, aquatic species, urban stormwater runoff, discharge from WTPs, and agricultural point and nonpoint sources such as confined feeding lots and runoff.	Another source of pathogens in the watershed is related to spills associated with wastewater, whether from collection systems or treatment failures.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.2.3.12	8-82 to 8-83	38-44, 1-2	WQ, WS, ERROR	USEPA's surface water treatment rules require that systems using surface water, or groundwater under the direct influence of surface water, to: (1) disinfect water to destroy pathogens and (2) filter water or meet criteria for avoiding filtration to remove pathogens, so that the following contaminants are controlled at the following levels (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2009d). Total coliform: no more than 5% positive samples in a month (for water systems that collect fewer than 40 routine samples per month, no more than one sample can be positive per month). Every sample that has total coliform must be analyzed for either fecal coliforms or E. coli. If two consecutive total coliform positive samples occur, and one is also positive for E. coli/fecal coliforms, the system is deemed as having an acute MCL violation.	This section is incorrect and needs to be revised. This section presents an insufficient description of the Surface Water Treatment Rule, Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, and the Long Term 1/Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rules. In addition, it inaccurately refers to the requirements of the Total Coliform Rule (which apply to treated water quality in the distribution system). See descriptions in Title 22, Chapter 17 - http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Lawbook/dwregulations-2013-07-01.pdf
8.2.3.13	8-83	13-16	WQ	Current use pesticides include carbamates (e.g., carbofuran), organophosphates (e.g., chlorpyrifos, diazinon, methyl parathion, malathion), thiocarbamates (e.g., molinate, thiobencarb), and more recently pyrethroids (e.g., permethrin, cypermethrin), a class of synthetic insecticides applied in urban and agricultural areas.	The identification of current use pesticides is incomplete and does not consider use of the pesticides in the upstream watersheds. This process should be reevaluated to include DPR reporting (http://calpip.cdpr.ca.gov/main.cfm) to identify pesticides of key interest to various beneficial uses. The MUN use potential pesticides of interest for consideration of monitoring and/or evaluation in the Sacramento Valley have been identified to the Central Valley Regional Board as part of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program by the Sacramento River Joint Source Water Protection Program (TDC Environmental; Rice Pesticide Prioritization memo dated 9/13/13 and Sacramento River Watershed Pesticide Prioritization memo dated 10/7/13).
8.2.3.13	8-83	25-28	WQ	The critical pathways for pesticides entering the rivers, streams, and the Delta include agricultural and urban stormwater runoff, irrigation return water, drift from aerial or ground-based spraying, and periodic release of agricultural return flows from rice production (Werner and Oram 2008).	Another pathway documented by the Central Valley Regional Board in the Irrigation Lands Regulatory Program is seepage through levees (Rice Pesticides Program 2013 Annual Monitoring Report) and subsurface tile drains (Attachment A to the WDR [R5-2014-XXXX] for Sacramento Valley Rice Growers), and these should be added to the text.
8.2.3.13	8-83	35-36	WQ	The timing of pesticide input to Delta waters is related to application rates, when pesticides are applied to farmed land, runoff events, and other transport processes (Kuivila and Jennings 2007).	Another factor affecting pesticide input to waters is the application method as well as best management practices (such as pesticide hold times) implemented through management programs such as the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program.
8.2.3.13	8-85	Table 8-23	ERROR	Diazinon Concentrations, by Water Body Category	Data is irrelevant and not representative of current conditions, because it is based on a 2006 study. More recent data should be used after the diazinon and chlorpyrifos bans became effective.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.2.3.13	8-85	Table 8-24	ERROR	Table 8-24. Chlorpyrifos Concentrations, by Water Body Category	Data are irrelevant and not representative of current conditions because it is based on a 2006 study. More recent data should be used after the diazinon and chlorpyrifos bans became effective.
8.2.3.13	8-85	4- 5	WQ	Monitoring efforts at the north-of-Delta stations since 2001 have resulted in no pesticide detections, while monitoring at the south-of-Delta stations resulted in various detections.	This text needs to be expanded to explain that the evaluation was based on a few selected sites (four), and three of those were located above the major agricultural areas in the Central Valley. The conclusion that this is not a significant concern is based on too little data not sufficiently representing source contributions. This evaluation could easily be supplemented with data from the Central Valley Regional Board Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/water_quality_monitoring/index.shtml
8.2.3.16	8-100	42-43	WQ	Trace metals such as arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, iron, lead, manganese, nickel, silver, and zinc occur naturally in the environment.	The Screening Analysis (Appendix 8C) indicated that aluminum should have been evaluated as part of this process. This is a critical constituent in drinking water treatment and must be evaluated for its impacts. This section must be revised to add aluminum to the evaluation.
8.2.3.16	8-101	29-31	WQ	Additional background for arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, iron, lead, manganese, nickel, silver, and zinc is provided below.	This section does not provide background for chromium, iron, or manganese as noted in the text. This section needs to be revised to include these constituents in the background, as well as the evaluation as per the Screening Analysis (Appendix 8C) and Trace Metals Analysis (Appendix 8N). Also, aluminum needs to be added to the evaluation as noted above.
8.2.3.16	8-101	25-28	WQ	Their study showed that cadmium, copper, and zinc were transported primarily in dissolved form upstream of major agricultural activities but primarily in colloidal form downstream. Iron and lead were transported primarily in colloidal form at all mainstem Sacramento River sites.	The source analysis of the trace metals needs to be expanded to evaluate the contribution of the reservoirs to dissolved metal concentrations and better explain the transformation in downstream rivers.
8.2.3.16	8-102	35-36	WQ	Sources of copper contamination include natural deposits, industrial and urban wastewater, and urban stormwater runoff (Buck et al. 2006; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2009j).	Another source of copper in the Central Valley watershed is from agricultural use as an herbicide (http://calpip.cdpr.ca.gov/main.cfm). This text needs to be expanded to include that source, and the evaluations need to be expanded. Senate Bill 346 initiated the phase out of copper in brake pads, which is a signifcant source of copper in urban runoff.
8.2.3.16	8-103	34-36	WQ, WS	In 2000, the Association of California Water Agencies conducted a study to summarize arsenic data from across the state and to assess the effect of USEPA's arsenic standard on California's drinking water programs (Saracino-Kirby 2000).	The use of groundwater data evaluation is not applicable to the surface water quality evaluation and should be removed. Also, this data is representative of statewide data, which can vary significantly from the waters of the Project Area. This data needs to be reviewed and refined further to present applicable data to this project if it is intended to be used in this assessment.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.2.3.16	8-104	41-44	WQ, WS	Based on water quality criteria and objectives, and typical levels in surface waters, it is generally the case that arsenic, iron, and manganese are of primary concern for drinking water, while cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc are of concern because of potential toxicity to aquatic organisms.	It should be noted that hexavalent chromium has been determined by CDPH and USEPA as a more significant human health risk and that primary MCLs are in development. In August 2013 CDPH proposed an MCL of 10 ug/L. This regulation is anticipated to be final in 2014 and should have been included in the metals assessment. http://www.cdph.ca.gov/services/DPOPP/regs/Pages/DPH-11-005HexavalentChromiumMCL.aspx
8.2.3.17	8-110	11-13	WQ	The construction and operation of dams in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River system have the effect of reducing TSS concentrations downstream because sediments become trapped in the reservoirs.	The dams and associated reservoirs of the SWP and CVP system do provide a sedimentation process frequently, but the operation of the reservoirs can also contribute to turbidity in downstream rivers. Low lake levels leave significant shoreline exposed and exacerbate the "first flush" effect of fall storms, low lake levels can also result in stratified anoxic zones containing dissolved metals being discharged downstream, and rapid or large releases can cause instream erosion in downstream rivers. These impacts need to be identified and assessed further.
8.2.3.17	8-110	17-20	WQ	Given that the dam and levee systems in place are unlikely to be removed, the human activity that most likely affects sediment delivery to the Delta is soil erosion associated with agricultural and urban land uses. These activities are pertinent because they occur downstream from the major dams on the system (Schoellhamer et al. 2007b).	Although turbidity generally increases from upstream to downstream, this statement is not true in all instances. Consideration of reservoir operations on the impact of turbidity levels in the downstream rivers needs to be assessed.
8.2.3.17	8-112	1-7	WQ, WS	USEPA's Surface Water Treatment Rules require systems using surface water or groundwater under the direct influence of surface water to implement the appropriate disinfection and/or filtration techniques to minimize turbidity in treated drinking water (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2006a). At no time can turbidity go above 5 NTU; systems that use filtration must ensure that the turbidity go no higher than 1 NTU (0.5 NTU for conventional or direct filtration) in at least 95% of the daily samples in any month. As of January 1, 2002, turbidity may never exceed 1 NTU, and must not exceed 0.3 NTU in 95% of daily samples in any month.	This text is incorrect and needs to be revised. This is an incorrect summary of the current versions of the Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule. There needs to be distinction between the primary standards for turbidity associated with the SWTR and the secondary standard for turbidity (5 NTU). See Title 22, Chapter 17 - http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Lawbook/dwregulations-2013-07-01.pdf
8.3	8-112	11-12	ERROR	The federal and state agencies responsible for regulating water quality in the study area are:	This text needs to be revised to add the California Department of Public Health as the primacy agency over drinking water in California.
8.3.1.5	8-115	32-34	WQ	The owners and operators of public water systems are required to comply with primary (health-related) MCLs and encouraged to comply with secondary (nuisance- or aesthetics-related) MCLs.	This text is incorrect and needs to be revised. This text does not accurately reflect California regulatory requirements. Although the Federal secondary standards are non-enforceable for water agencies, the State of California's drinking water program has adopted those as enforceable standards. A sentence should be added to clarify that for water agencies in California all primary and secondary standards are enforceable and the standards must be met. See Title 22, Chapter 15, Article 16 - http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Lawbook/dwregulations-2013-07-01.pdf

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.3.1.5	8-115	35	WS, ERROR	SDWA drinking water standards apply to treated water as it is served to consumers.	This text is incorrect and must be revised. MCLs are not always applied to treated water and can vary between water systems. The specific regulations in Title 22, Chapter 15 indicate whether compliance is based on raw or treated water (Sections 64431/64432, 64442/64443, 64444/64445, 64449). In addition, a water system must continue the compliance location based on historical sites (raw vs. treated), so that may be the controlling factor. MCLs apply at varying locations, and the text should reflect those conditions. http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Lawbook/dwregulations-2013-07-01.pdf
8.3.1.5	8-116	1-6	WQ, ERROR	Some constituents of Delta water are of particular concern to municipal contractors because they are either not removed, only partially removed, or are transformed by the treatment process into hazardous substances by community-used water treatment processes. Constituents of concern include TDS, chlorides, bromides, and organic compounds. These substances can be removed from raw water by advanced water treatment processes, but to do so substantially increases the cost borne by municipalities.	This text is not complete and should be qualified or corrected. There are many other constituents of concern that are not fully removed by conventional filtration, such as trace metals, or that have the potential to transform during treatment, such as organics. In addition to the cost for removal being higher, when source water levels are elevated there is greater possibility of detectability in treated water which can increase the risk to public health.
8.3.1.6 and 8.3.1.7	8-116	7-38	WS, ERROR	Summary of the Surface Water Treatment Rule and Stage 1 and Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule and Long-Term 1 and Long-Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule	We have concerns about how these sections are written and organized; we recommend that they be rewritten and organized to reflect the requirements more clearly and accurately. The microbial rules should be written in one section with correct references to all four SWTRs, including the Interim Enhanced SWTR. The disinfection by-product rules should be written separately with their requirements. See Title 22, Chapters 15.5 and 17 - http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Lawbook/dwregulations-2013-07-01.pdf
8.3.2.11	8-121	22-28	WS, ERROR	DPH is designated by USEPA as the primary agency to administer and enforce requirements of the federal SDWA in California. Public water systems are required to monitor for regulated contaminants in their drinking water supply. California's drinking water standards (e.g., MCLs) are the same or more stringent than the federal standards and include additional contaminants not regulated by USEPA. Like the federal MCLs, California's primary MCLs address health concerns, while secondary MCLs address aesthetics, such as taste and odor. The California SDWA is administered by DPH primarily through a permit system.	This section is inaccurate. DPH is the "primacy" agency. The text needs to be revised to accurately reflect California enforcement of primary and secondary standards (Title 22, Chapter 15). California secondary standards are enforceable for water agencies, and this needs to be reflected in the text. California has developed standards for numerous constituents without a Federal MCL, and those should be addressed. Also, California point of compliance with MCLs varies depending on the specific constituent and water system. http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Lawbook/dwregulations-2013-07-01.pdf
8.3.2.13	8-123	4- 16	WQ, WS, ERROR	Summary of the Central Valley Water Board Drinking Water Policy	This text needs to be revised to reflect the known conditions of the Drinking Water Policy. This section is outdated and should have been updated to include the July 2013 Regional Board-adopted version of the Policy. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/r5-2013-0098_res.pdf

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.1	8-127, 8-128	37-40, 1-2	WQ, SCOPE	1. Would implementation of the Alternatives result in water quality changes to the Plan Area, Upstream of the Delta, or SWP/CVP Export Service Areas that would result in exceedances of water quality criteria/objectives, or substantially degrade water quality, of/by sufficient frequency, magnitude, and geographic extent as to cause or substantially contribute to significant adverse effects on the beneficial uses of water in these areas of the affected environment?	This assessment is incomplete. Why is the assessment limited to the Plan Area? If there are effects in other areas they should be assessed as well.
8.4.1	8-128	3-4	WQ, SCOPE	2. Would implementation of the Alternatives result in beneficial effects on water quality in these areas?	Does "beneficial effects on water quality" refer to support of beneficial uses? This phrase should be revised for clarity.
8.4.1	8-128	11-15	WQ	Moreover, models available for use in addressing such questions have been previously developed for the effects of operations of the SWP-CVP facilities for only a few water quality parameters (e.g., EC, DOC, and temperature) in defined portions of the affected environment (i.e., the Delta), and are poorly developed or not developed at all for nearly all other water quality parameters and locations, nor for most of the conservation measures proposed for implementation.	There are other models that cover the same area for additional constituents (ammonia, nitrate, phosphorus, and others) or could be expanded to consider other constituents (methylmercury, pesticides, etc.). It is within the scope of this larger project to better develop these tools. The Central Valley Drinking Water Policy modeling efforts could be built on to better develop this. (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb5/water_issues/drinking_water_policy/dwp_wrkgrp_synthesis_rpt.pdf)
8.4.1	8-128	14-17	WQ	Conservative parameters were evaluated using available models used for SWP-CVP planning and operations (i.e., California Water Resources Simulation Model [CALSIM II, Delta Simulation Model 2 [DSM2], and Reclamation's Temperature Model) wherever applicable, as well as constituents directly addressed by these models, and included EC, DOC, and temperature.	DOC should not be considered a conservative constituent over large areas or time scales.
8.4.1	8-128	28-30	WQ, AM	In general, the fewest water quality changes of importance are expected to occur Upstream of the Delta, followed by the SWP/CVP Export Service Areas, with the greatest number and magnitude of water quality changes expected for the Plan Area.	We are concerned about the assumption that it is expected that the fewest water quality changes of importance are expected to occur upstream of the Delta. Potential water quality changes associated with revised CVP and SWP system operations to upstream waterbodies could be very significant to local users. This statement needs to be supported by water quality evaluations and verified in the future through the Adaptive Management program.
8.4.1	8-128	34-35	WQ	Models are available to simulate hydrodynamic and water quality changes within the Delta region.	Modeling should be performed in all BDCP affected areas so that all impacts can be sufficiently assesed. There are models such as WARMF that have also been developed for the watershed areas tributary to the Delta that were successfully integrated with CALSIM and DSM2.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.1	8-129	3-13	WQ	The constituents of concern in the affected environment included both physically and chemically conservative and non-conservative parameters. The concentrations of conservative constituent tend to not be affected substantially by physical, chemical, or biological mechanisms that woul result in a loss of the constituent from the system. Thus, the concentrations of conservative constituents can be reasonably estimated and changes assessed with mass-balance accounting of the mixing of known volumes and concentrations of different water sources.	Conservative constituents can also have complex sources and sinks within the system that need to be accounted for, and simple mass balances over large areas and time periods must be accounted for in a model. This mass balance is essentially a conceptual model when it is used over these larger areas. The mass balance approach over large areas leads to additional uncertainty; incorrect conclusions can be drawn when time scales cannot be aligned properly.
8.4.1	8-129, 8-130	41-43, 1-4	WQ	It was determined that the action alternatives would result in all three categories of potential water quality effects within the Plan Area. However, based on the description of BDCP alternatives (see Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives) for construction activities or other conservation measures in the Upstream of the Delta and the SWP/CVP Export Service Area, water quality changes were expected to be minimal and, hence, are not addressed in as much detail. For those Alternatives that include specific CM1 measures in the Plan Area, however, a project specific level of analysis is included.	Insufficient information in the "Upstream of the Delta" areas is provided, especially impacts due to reservoir operations and reservoir stage. The areas just upstream from CM1 intakes past the CM2 diversions to the Feather River, in particular, could see thermal, flow, and reservoir impacts that could affect water quality and drinking water treatment. This reach of the river should be examined in detail.
8.4.1	8-130	28-30	WQ	Quantitatively evaluates constituents of primary concern where modeling tools were developed and were available for doing so, and qualitatively assesses effects where appropriate modeling tools were unavailable	Limiting assessment to available tools and science is insufficient for the scale of the project. The EIR/EIS does not adequately discuss the evaluated tools.
8.4.1	8-130	17-21	WQ	If the estimated water quality conditions for a constituent under an Alternative triggers one or more of the five water quality conditions defined as effects assessment criteria (NEPA) and thresholds of significance (CEQA) (see Section 8.3.2.3) at one or more of the assessment locations, then that Alternative was determined to have an adverse water quality effect (under NEPA) and a significant impact on water quality (under CEQA) for that water quality constituent or parameter.	This section reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.4.1.1	8-130, 8-131	38-41, 1-39	WQ	*Ommissions*	The model assessment should include additional models or frameworks to evaluate non-conservative constituents and larger model domains (WARMF, HSPF, etc.). Also, the areas nearest to the proposed intakes should have higher resolution modeling for the adjacent areas.
8.4.1.2	8-131	41-43	WQ, SCOPE	Water quality changes in the affected environment upstream from the north-Delta boundary, which includes the Sacramento River to Shasta Lake, the Feather River to Lake Oroville, and the American River to Folsom Lake, were primarily assessed qualitatively.	The model domain and areas need to be described more specifically (e.g., Sacramento River at I Street to Keswick, etc.). Also, it is not clear where the 'detailed' modeling in the Sacramento Urban Area starts.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.1.2	8-132	3- 11	WQ, WS	The assessment of water quality changes in water bodies upstream of the Delta relied, in part, on making determinations as to how reservoir storage and releases would be changed. Specific changes in reservoir storage and releases were determined from CALSIM II modeling of the SWP and CVP system (Appendix 5A describe the CALSIM II modeling performed in support of this assessment). Reservoir storage and river flow changes were then evaluated to make determinations regarding the capacity for the affected water bodies to provide dilution of watershed contaminant inputs. Also, if a particular parameter was found to be correlated to seasonal reservoir levels or river flows, how the parameter would be altered seasonally by operational changes in reservoir levels or river flows was assessed.	Consideration of upstream water quality impacts was very limited. The revised operation of CVP and SWP reservoirs could impact not only dilution ability but also the constituents present, such as trace metals, organic carbon, and pathogens, as well as changes due to temperature variability. A qualitative assessment of pesticides only considering dilution impacts is insufficient and does not take into consideration significant water quality factors, such as application and fate and transport. This qualitative assessment needs to be expanded for most constituents in the upstream of Delta area.
8.4.1.3	8-132	14-17	WQ	Using the methodology described below, changes in boron, bromide, chloride, mercury, methylmercury, nitrate, organic carbon, and selenium, within the Delta were determined quantitatively at 11 assessment locations (Figure 8-7),	The referenced Figure 8-7 has more than 11 "monitoring" points identified, and it is unclear which constituents were evaluated. Please provide a table that shows the constituents, types (e.g., quantitative), and locations of the assessments.
8.4.1.6	8-139	34-36	WS	Actions associated with new conveyance facilities and operations criteria that resulted in water quality changes associated with altered hydrodynamics, which were captured in the DSM2 modeling, were assessed quantitatively and discussed in Section 8.3.4.	This section reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.4.1.6	8-139	37-39	WS	Restoration actions that would result in water quality changes associated with altered hydrodynamics, which were captured in the DSM2 modeling, are discussed in Section 8.3.4 as operations-related water quality changes (CM1).	This section reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.4.1.6	8-140	8	WS	Table 8-38	This table indicates that CM 1 was the only conservation measure included in the CALSIM model evaluation to assess water quality impacts from revised hydrologic conditions. Since CM 2 includes a significant new diversion away from the Lower Sacramento River, CM 2 should have been included in that assessment as well, to identify water quality impacts to MUN users between Fremont Weir and Freeport.
8.4.1.7	8-141	4-6	ERROR	Water quality constituents are also discussed in section 8.1. Data in section 8.1 is meant to characterize general conditions in the affected environment, and water quality criteria and objectives presented in section 8.1 are a comprehensive set of all applicable criteria and objectives.	These section references are incorrect, and need to be reviewed and revised.
8.4.1.7	8-145	Table 8-42	ERROR	Table Footnote C - In some cases, data were reported as non-detects, and the entry contained an accompanying reporting limit. "Yes" indicates that at least one non-detect was replaced with the reporting limit in order to calculate summary statistics, while "No" indicates that this was not done, generally because no data were reported as non-detect.	For the purposes of calculating summary statistics it is not accurate to substitute "non-detects" with the reporting limit. The table should be updated to use an alternate presentation that is more reflective of conditions. See <http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/es053368a> for a discussion of appropriate methods.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.1.7	8-146 to 8-147	42-45, 1-2	WQ, WS	Bromide concentrations at a particular location and time in the Delta are determined primarily by the sources of water to that location, at a given time. Hence, long-term average concentrations at a particular Delta location are determined primarily by the long-term average sources of water to that location, and the long-term average concentration of bromide in each of the major source waters to the location. The major source waters to any given Delta location are: (1) Sacramento River, (2) San Joaquin River, (3) Bay water, (4) eastside tributaries, and (5) agricultural return water.	The use of long term average concentrations of bromide is unsupported given that the regulatory framework that this is applied to (disinfection by-products in the treated water) is based on a running annual average, calculated quarterly. The MUN beneficial use of the Sacramento River could be impacted very quickly if there is seawater intrusion occurring seasonally. Consideration should be made in this evaluation for the potential for seawater intrusion to impact water quality during a shorter interval period, similar to the evaluation for chloride.
8.4.1.7	8-149	16-18	WQ,WS	The effects of other conservation measures (i.e., CM2, CM3, and CM5–CM22) which do not substantially affect flows or Delta hydrodynamic conditions also were assessed qualitatively.	This statement is not correct, and the text needs to be revised. CM2 involves significant diversions from the Lower Sacramento River during an extended period of the year, which will significantly impact flows on the Sacramento River between Fremont Weir and the Delta.
8.4.1.7	8-162	2-7	ERROR	However, because nitrate concentrations vary considerably between the source waters to the Delta, conservative modeling via DSM2 and the mass-balance approach described in section 8.3.1.3 was employed to provide a characterization of changes in nitrate concentration anticipated as a result of changes in source water fractions throughout the Delta alone (using mean concentrations from Table 8-51, above).	This section reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.4.1.7	8-162	30-32	ERROR	As discussed in the Methods For Analysis section (Section 8.3.1 above), DSM2 was utilized directly to model and predict DOC at 11 locations across the Delta, and the degree DOC changed under the various project alternatives.	This section reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.4.1.7	8-162	32-36	ERROR	Because DOC is a precursor to the formation of DBPs which represent a long-term risk to human health, and because the existing source water quality goal is based on a running annual average, the quantitative assessment focuses on the degree to which an alternative may result in change in long-term average DOC concentrations at select locations upstream of the Delta, within the Delta, and in the SWP/CVP Export Service Areas.	The definition of long-term averaging needs to be specifically provided.
8.4.1.7	8-162	44	WQ	DOC in the Delta is generally considered to act conservatively; thus, the mass-balance modeling approach employed.	DOC is not a conservative constituent. Provide the basis for this assumption over the scope of the Delta residence time.
8.4.1.7	8-163	1-3	WQ	Moreover, the POC fraction would be largely removed through conventional drinking water treatment (State Water Project Contractors Authority 2007:3-2 19).	This statement is far too general to apply to the wide variety of water treatment facilities utilizing water in the Project Area. This should be revised to reflect that POC is more likely to be removed via physical processes than DOC but that removal rates can vary, as noted by the USEPA in the Stage 1 and 2 D/DBP Rules.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.1.7	8-163	11-16	WQ	In light of these source water goals and EPA's TOC removal action thresholds, the assessment of alternatives evaluates how each alternative would affect the frequency with which predicted future DOC concentrations would exceed 2, 3, and 4 mg/L on a long-term average basis at the assessment locations. Because, in many cases, the existing condition is one already exceeding 2 and 3 mg/L, the frequency with which DOC exceeds 4 mg/L becomes a key focus of the assessment, as well as the change in long-term average DOC concentration.	This statement reflects only the water quality conditions in the Delta. The areas upstream of the Delta have different water quality conditions related to organic carbon and have been able to maintain median source water levels below the 2 mg/L threshold as documented in the American and Sacramento Rivers Watershed Sanitary Survey and its Updates.
8.4.1.7	8-163	11-16	WQ	*see above*	References (for above comment): American River Watershed Sanitary Survey, 1998 Update, December 1998, Archibald & Wallberg Consultants, MWH American River Watershed Sanitary Survey, 2003 Update, December 2003, Archibald & Wallberg Consultants, MWH American River Watershed Sanitary Survey, 2008 Update, December 2008, Starr Consulting, Palencia Consulting Engineers American River Watershed Sanitary Survey, 2013 Update, December 2013, Starr Consulting, Palencia Consulting Engineers Sacramento River Watershed Sanitary Survey, 2000 Update, December 2000, Archibald & Wallberg Consultants et. Al. Sacramento River Watershed Sanitary Survey, 2005 Update, March 2006, MWH, Starr Consulting, Archibald & Wallberg Consultants Sacramento River Watershed Sanitary Survey, 2010 Update, December 2010, Starr Consulting, Palencia Consulting Engineers
8.4.1.7	8-163	35-37	WQ	Assessing pesticide-related effects is substantially challenged by: 1) limited available monitoring data in the Delta and other water bodies of the affected environment, and 2) a continually changing pesticide use market.	Although there are many challenges associated with assessing pesticide effects, monitoring data is not a controlling issue in the Central Valley. The Central Valley Regional Board Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program has collected and evaluated large amounts of data that should have been reviewed as part of this assessment. These evaluations can contribute to a better understanding of the priorities and vulnerabilities of the watershed. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/water_quality_monitoring/index.shtml and http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/monitoring_plans_reports_reviews/index.shtml

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.1.7	8-164	23-32	WQ	Perhaps more challenging than a limited monitoring effort is the dynamic state of the pesticide market. Regulatory and pest resistance pressures have left the pesticide market, namely the insecticide market, in a state of flux. Pesticide use varies from year to year depending on numerous external factors such as climate and associated pest outbreaks, cropping patterns, and economic trends in housing construction and urban development. Layered upon this year-to-year variation is an overall trend of decreased OP insecticides use and increased pyrethroid use, primarily due to the early regulatory phase-out of many OP insecticide uses initiated in early 2000. The market has yet to balance and reach equilibrium, and what limited and relatively short-term monitoring data that is available ultimately only represents a snapshot of a trend in the gradual replacement of many OP uses with that of pyrethroids. Until markets stabilize, trends will inevitably continue to develop.	Pesticide use is registered and relatively well understood. While urban uses are difficult to track, product availability is a good indicator. The "equilibrium" actually seems to be reached relatively quickly, and the noted paragraph should be further researched and updated for accuracy.
8.4.1.7	8-164, 8-165	44-46, 1-7	ERROR	And finally, if transported to surface waters, sufficient amounts of pesticide must be present that once diluted by surface water flows, the resulting concentration is of a magnitude capable of eliciting a measurable effect in aquatic life. All of these factors contribute in the end to the potential for adverse beneficial use effects, but of the many factors involved, CVP/SWP operations only affect river flows and, thus available dilution. In an estuary environment, where substantial dilution capacity typically occurs, duration of aquatic life exposure in addition to pesticide concentration is important. While the capacity of the Delta to dilute pesticide inputs is largely unaffected by CVP/SWP operations, the duration of exposure, or residence time, can be affected by operations. Therefore, in the Delta, changes in source water fractions represent long-term changes in exposure potential.	Concentrations of contaminants could increase in areas of lesser flow downstream from the North Delta intakes as the higher quality Sacramento River water is exported. Therefore, the qualitative conclusion should be that an increase is expected due to CM1.
8.4.1.7	8-165	22-24	WQ	Effects of alternatives on pesticides are primarily incidental and indirect, as existing and future sources of pesticide loading are largely unrelated.	Concentrations could increase in areas of lesser flow downstream from the intakes as the higher quality Sacramento River water is exported. Therefore, the qualitative conclusion should be that an increase in pesticides is expected.
8.4.1.7	8-169	12	ERROR	Water quality criteria used in the assessment of trace metals are presented in Table 8-51.	This table reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.4.1.7	8-170	3	WQ	Table 8-58	This table does not include aluminum, which should have been included in the evaluation as per the Screening Assessment (Appendix 8C). This table needs to be updated, and the evaluation needs to be expanded.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.1.7	8-170	6-15	WQ	Throughout the trace metals assessment dissolved metals concentrations are utilized, because the dissolved fraction better approximates the bioavailable fraction to aquatic organisms. Furthermore, drinking water treatment plants readily remove particulate and suspended matter from raw water. While maximum contaminant levels for treated drinking water are measured on a total recoverable basis, the dissolved fraction of these metals is taken as the more accurate predictor of metals concentration post-treatment. This is particularly the case with iron and manganese which are both naturally abundant in soil. Total recoverable iron and manganese concentrations can be very high in water carrying a substantial load of suspended matter (i.e., TSS). Therefore, assessment of aquatic life and drinking water effects utilizes the dissolved fraction of trace metals in the environment.	The use of dissolved metals concentrations for MUN evaluation is fundamentally flawed and incorrect. The evaluation for trace metals relative to the MUN beneficial use needs to be reassessed based on total fraction. Compliance can be based on either raw or treated water levels, as per Title 22 Section 64432 (e), and needs to be considered. Conventional water treatment processes include coagulation, flocculation, sedimentation, and filtration, typically referred to as conventional filtration. The specific design parameters vary from facility to facility. The removal rate of a constituent will also vary from facility to facility, depending on source water quality and water treatment operations. The American Water Works Association has published a general treatment effectiveness table for a variety of constituents (Water Quality and Treatment, A Handbook of Community Water Systems. American Water Works Association,4th Ed. Table 3-1 General Effectiveness of Water Treatment Processes for Contaminant Removal (p 184-185)) . This table indicates that iron and manganese have a wide range of removal for conventional filtration, from 20 to 100 percent. Chromium also has a wide range of removal that depends on the species present, from zero to 100 percent. Aluminum generally has a fair removal rate, 20 to 60 percent, through conventional filtration. The statement also does not account for the additional costs associated with performing additional levels of removal associated with higher source water loading and potential increase in public health risk due to higher treated water levels.
8.4.2.1	8-173	15-36	WQ, ERROR	Screening Analysis and Results	See Separate Comments on Appendices 8 C-N
8.4.2.1	8-173	26-28	WQ	Of these, 15 are addressed further in the Screening Analysis itself in Appendix 8C because they did not warrant alternative-specific analyses, and 1—temperature—is addressed in Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources.	This evaluation needs to be expanded to include Temperature effects related to the MUN beneficial use. Temperature is a key general water quality parameter that has an impact on the source water quality, treatability (related to rate processes), and treated water quality for drinking water (Water Quality and Treatment, A Handbook of Community Water Systems. American Water Works Association,4th Ed.).
8.4.2.1	8-174	1	WQ	Table 8-61	Footnote 'e' needs to be revised to include chromium and iron.
8.4.2.2	8-174 to 8-175	9-10, 1-2	WQ	The CEQA baseline, "Existing Conditions", is defined in Appendix 3D, and for the purposes of the quantitative water quality assessments, is represented by Existing Conditions modeling runs, not historical water quality monitoring data as presented in Section 8.1.3.	The section reference is incorrect and needs to be reviewed and revised. Also, it is unclear why modeling output was used over real data to provide the basis for the Existing Conditions water quality assessment.
8.4.2.3	8-176	8- 9	ERROR	(applicable objectives/criteria are identified in Appendix 8A and the constituent-specific assessments in Section 8.3.1.7)	This section reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.2.3	8-177	30-35	WQ	As such, effects criterion/threshold #1 will identify significant impacts under CEQA when water quality under an alternative is anticipated to change substantially, thereby causing adverse effects to beneficial uses, and will avoid making such determinations when the violation of a water quality standard is too infrequent, low in magnitude, and/or isolated geographically to actually cause any adverse effects on beneficial uses of the water body or water body segment.	It is not clear what the phrase "low in magnitude" is intended to refer to relative to water quality standard exceedances. The 303(d) impairment listing guidance does not consider the magnitude of exceedances when finding impairments to beneficial uses. More specific guidance that demonstrates consistency with water quality regulation should be used and cited so that the review can properly evaluate the assessment of water quality impacts.
8.4.3.1	8-178	5 -7	ERROR	Per the description of comparisons made in this chapter which are discussed in section 8.3.2.2, this section contains the comparison of the No Action Alternative vs. Existing Conditions for CEQA purposes.	This section reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.4.3.1	8-184	9-12	WQ, WS	While greater water demands under the No Action Alternative would alter the magnitude and timing of reservoir releases north and east of the Delta, these activities would have negligible, if any, effect on the sources, and ultimately the concentration of bromide in the Sacramento River, the eastside tributaries, and the various reservoirs of the related watersheds.	The No Action Alternative has climate change and sea level rise associated with it; therefore, the potential for reverse flows in the Sacramento River and increased tidal influence should have been included in the evaluation for bromide. These influences could impact the frequency and concentration of peak bromide levels (shown to be 100 ug/L at Hood in Table 8-43).
8.4.3.1	8-187	19-22	WQ, WS	Consequently, changes in the magnitude and timing of reservoir releases and river flows upstream of the Delta would have negligible, if any, effect on chloride sources, and ultimately the concentration of chloride in the Sacramento River, the eastside tributaries, and the various reservoirs of the related watersheds.	The No Action Alternative has climate change and sea level rise associated with it. Therefore, the potential for reverse flows in the Sacramento River and increased tidal influence should have been included in the evaluation for chloride. These influences could impact the frequency and concentration of peak chloride levels (shown to be 33 mg/L at Hood in Table 8-45).
8.4.3.1	8-194	40-43	WQ, WS	Based on these considerations, EC levels (highs, lows, typical conditions) in the Sacramento River and its tributaries, the eastside tributaries, or their associated reservoirs upstream of the Delta would not be expected to be outside the ranges occurring under Existing Conditions.	The No Action Alternative has climate change and sea level rise associated with it; therefore, the potential for reverse flows in the Sacramento River and increased tidal influence should have been included in the evaluation for EC. These influences could impact the frequency and concentration of peak EC levels.
8.4.3.1	8-204	13-16	WQ, WS	Consequently, long-term average DOC concentrations under the No Action Alternative would not be expected to change by frequency, magnitude and geographic extent, relative to Existing Conditions and, and thus, would not adversely affect the MUN beneficial use, or any other beneficial uses, in water bodies of the affected environment located upstream of the Delta.	The evaluation of DOC concentrations does not take into account timing of reservoir releases and impacts on dilution of downstream sources, the potential for diverted flows at Fremont Weir to siphon lower organic carbon water from the Feather River and American Rivers away from the Lower Sacramento River, and climate change impacts. Climate change impacts have the potential for increased temperatures to impact algal growth that can increase organic carbon levels and for increased intensity storm events to transport more organic carbon from the watershed. These should be considered in the evaluation.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.3.1	8-206	41-43	WQ, WS	Pathogen concentrations in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers have a minimal relationship to flow rate in these rivers, although most of the high concentrations observed have been during the wet months (Tetra Tech 2007).	Coliform concentrations in the Sacramento area do show an increase in wet periods as well (American and Sacramento River Watershed Sanitary Surveys and Updates); since climate changes include the increase in precipitation in Northern California and the increase in storm intensity, an evaluation should be conducted to determine if climate change could impact the concentrations of source water levels of pathogens.
8.4.3.1	8-208	9-14	WQ	Cryptosporidium and Giardia, Data were available only for the Sacramento River, limiting the ability to make comparisons between sources. Often not detected and when detected, concentrations typically less than 1 organism per liter. There may be natural/artificial barriers/processes that limit transport to water. Significant die off of those that reach the water contribute to the low frequency of detection.	This comment is typical to all the pathogen evaluations for the NAA and all action alternatives. Related to protozoa, there has been a gross misrepresentation and interpretation of the evaluation conducted as part of the Conceptual Model for Pathogens and Pathogen Indicators in the Central Valley. The Conceptual Model notes that there was limited data availability for protozoa for the study and presents what was available as a general indicator, not a confirmed source assessment or quantification of risk. It should be noted that Cryptosporidium and Giardia source water concentrations of 1 organism per liter would trigger additional treatment requirements under the SWTRs, and these levels are not considered low. The statement that there is significant die off contributing to low frequency of detection is incorrect on two fronts. First of all, protozoa are notable resistant in the ambient environment with low rates of decay as shown in Table 4-1 and Figure 4-1 and discussed in Chapter 2 of the Conceptual Model. In addition, they can be resistant to conventional filtration, so high source water concentrations require additional treatment. Finally, the Conceptual Model shows that Giardia was detectable in 45 to 70 percent of samples, Figure 3-4, which is frequent.
8.4.3.1	8-208	23-28	ERROR	The effects of the No Action Alternative relative to Existing Conditions would be changes in the relative percentage of water throughout the Delta being comprised of various source waters (i.e., water from the Sacramento River, San Joaquin River, Bay water, eastside tributaries, and agricultural return flow), due to potential changes in inflows particularly from the Sacramento River watershed due to increased water demands (see Table 8-55) and somewhat modified SWP and CVP operations.	This table reference is incorrect, and needs to be reviewed and revised.
8.4.3.1	8-210	2-3	WQ	Therefore, the pesticide assessment focuses on the present use pesticides for which substantial information is available, namely diazinon, chlorpyrifos, pyrethroids, and diuron.	The basis for selection of present use pesticides assessed in this report is insufficient. More information needs to be presented to explain why other pesticides of interest were not included, other than a lack of data for the limited sites included in the data evaluation.

Section	Page	Line	Type	Key Document Text	Comment
8.4.3.1	8-211	19-24	WQ, WS	However, summer average flow reductions of up to 12%, relative to Existing Conditions, are not considered of sufficient magnitude to substantially increase in-river concentrations or alter the long-term risk of pesticide-related effects on aquatic life beneficial uses. Greater long-term average flow reductions, and corresponding reductions in dilution/assimilative capacity, would be necessary before long-term risk of pesticide related effects on aquatic life beneficial uses would be adversely altered.	More information is needed to support the lack of sufficiency of flow reductions to impact ambient water concentrations of pesticides. The reliance upon assimilative capacity may not be valid if discharging to a high quality waterbody since it may show a trend of degradation.
8.4.3.1	8-219	34-42	WQ, WS	Relative to Existing Conditions, under the No Action Alternative sources of trace metals would not be expected to change substantially with exception to sources related to population growth, such as increased municipal wastewater discharges and development contributing to increased urban runoff. Facility operations could have an effect on these sources if concentrations of dissolved metals were closely correlated to river flow, suggesting that changes in river flow, and the related capacity to dilute these sources, could ultimately have a substantial effect on long-term metals concentrations. On the Sacramento River, available dissolved trace metals data and river flow at Freeport are poorly associated (Appendix 8N, Figure 1).	This section has not included a fair and complete assessment of impacts on source water concentrations upstream of the Delta of trace metals and needs to be revised. The BDCP has asserted that the construction of the upstream dams has allowed downstream levels of metals to be reduced by trapping the particulate matter containing those metals. An assessment of reservoir storage volumes relative to dissolved metals concentrations should have been conducted. Low lake levels can result in stratifications and diversions from anoxic zones, which may have higher concentrations of dissolved metals that are resuspended from sediment. Metals concentrations should be evaluated for total fraction and compared with reservoir storage levels as well as flow.
8.4.3.1	8-220	4-11	WQ, WS	Given the poor association of dissolved trace metal concentrations with flow, river flow rate and reservoir storage reductions that would occur under the No Action Alternative, relative to Existing Conditions, would not be expected to result in a substantial adverse change in trace metal concentrations in the reservoirs and rivers upstream of the Delta. As such, the No Action Alternative would not be expected to substantially increase the frequency with which applicable Basin Plan objectives or CTR criteria would be exceeded in water bodies of the affected environment located upstream of the Delta or substantially degrade the quality of these water bodies, with regard to trace metals.	This section has a conclusion which is not proven, since no comparison was made with the total fraction of the metals and no correlations were assessed between the metals and reservoir levels. This statement needs to be revised based on a reevaluation of the data.
8.4.3.1	8-220	30-32	WQ	The arsenic criterion was established to protect human health from the effects of long-term chronic exposure, while secondary maximum contaminant levels for iron and manganese were established as reasonable goals for drinking water quality.	This text incorrectly states that MCLs for iron and manganese are "reasonable goals". California water systems are required to comply with these drinking water standards, and the text needs to be revised to reflect the condition. See Title 22, Chapter 15 (http://www.cdph.ca.gov/certlic/drinkingwater/Documents/Lawbook/dwregulations-2013-07-01.pdf)
8.4.3.1	8-220	33-34	WQ	The primary source water average concentrations for arsenic, iron, and manganese are below these criteria.	This text is misleading since the total fraction of iron and manganese are both higher than the criteria. A reassessment needs to be conducted to evaluate the total fraction, and this text needs to be clarified.