Appendix A
NOP Scoping and Other Public Meetings

Appendix A

NOP Scoping and Other Public Meetings

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tables

A.1 Introduction

This appendix summarizes the public involvement activities implemented during the pre-scoping and scoping phase of the environmental review process for the Clearwater Program. Public input on the proposed amendments to the Bay Delta Plan was sought to help prioritize objectives and evaluate alternatives. Public involvement was part of the environmental review process and allowed the following:

- Identify and involve interested stakeholders
- Identify issues and concerns of stakeholders
- Notify stakeholders of the proposed plan as required by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) standards

A.2 Notice of Preparation

CEQA requires the preparation and circulation of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) at the onset of the environmental review process process. An NOP must provide sufficient information describing a project and potentially significant environmental impacts such that it enables responsible agencies to provide a meaningful response. At minimum, the NOP needs to include:

- Brief description of the proposed project
- Description of the proposed project's location
- Probable environmental effects of the proposed project
- Date, time, and place of the public hearing
- Address where documents or files relating to the proposed project are available for review
- Address where written comments on the scope of the SED may be sent
- Deadline for submitting comments

In accordance with CEQA, the State Water Board issued an NOP on February 13, 2009, indicating that an SED would be prepared. The NOP was posted on the State Water Board's website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/bay_delta_plan/water_quality_control_planning/ The scoping period extended between February 13 to March 19, 2009. A revised NOP was issued on April 1, 2011 and posted on the State Water Board's website. The scoping period for the revised NOP extended between April 1 and May 23, 2011.

A.3 Scoping Meetings

Scoping is the process by which input is solicited from agencies and stakeholders on the nature and extent of issues and impacts to be addressed in an SED and the methods by which they will be evaluated. Scoping assists with identifying the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, methods of assessment, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in greater detail. It also helps

eliminate those issues that are not relevant to the decision at hand. Two public scoping meetings for were conducted on March 30, 2009 and June 6, 2011. Notice of the scoping meetings was included in the NOP and revised NOP.

A.4 Other Public Meetings

In addition to the scoping meetings conducted in March of 2009 and June of 2011, other public meetings and workshops were held to facilitate the water quality control planning process. Below is a list of the meetings and workshops.

- April 22, 2009 Public Staff Workshop Concerning Potential Amendments to Bay-Delta Plan Relating to southern Delta Salinity and San Joaquin Flow Objectives
- August 13, 2009 Public Staff Workshop and Availability of Draft Study Report regarding Salt Tolerance in Southern Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta
- November 22, 2010 Notice of Opportunity for Public Comment for any additional information related to the San Joaquin River flow and southern Delta salinity objectives included in the 2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary
- January 6-7, 2011 Presentation and Discussion of Draft Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives
- March 20, 2012 Informational Session on the Substitute Environmental Document for Potential Changes to the San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Water Quality Objectives and Associated Program of Implementation

A.5 NOP Scoping Comments

Brief summaries of comment topics received on the NOP during the two scoping periods (February 13th through March 19th 2009 and April 1st through May 23rd 2011) are presented in Table A-1. Copies of all written comments and the transcripts of oral comments received during the scoping periods and at the scoping meetings and other public meetings are on the State Water Boards Website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/bay_delta_plan/water_quality_control_planning/

Table A-1 Summary of Scoping Comments

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
The Bay Institute		
Commenter: Gary Bobker, Program Director		
19-Mar-09	San Joaquin River flow objectives need to be considered in conjunction with Delta export criteria.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	San Joaquin River flow objectives need to be considered in conjunction with the Plan's narrative objective for salmon protection.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	In amending water rights to implement the flow objectives, the Board should not exclude any major water rights holders or water users from potentially being required to help meet these objectives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	In amending water rights to implement the flow objectives, the effect of changing release patterns from upstream storage facilities on instream biological resources in each sub-basin should be evaluated, in order to ensure that compliance with downstream requirements occurs in a manner that avoids adverse impacts to those instream resources.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
Commenter: Gary Bobker, Program Director; John Cain, Conservation Director		
23-May-11	The Institute strongly agrees that more flows and more natural flows are needed in the San Joaquin River.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The draft narrative objective is too imprecise and broad to ensure full protection of beneficial uses. Beneficial uses outside of the February–June period are inadequately protected by the draft narrative objective.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Specify that the flow rate for the February–June Vernalis objective be a designated percentage of unimpaired runoff (including an initial rate and an adaptive range).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Specify the initial flow rate and the adaptive range based on the best available scientific information for protecting fish and wildlife beneficial uses.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Clarify the relationship between flow conditions and other measures for purposes of adaptive management of the flow rate in the objective.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Include an objective for July–January period base flows.	-
23-May-11	The Institute supports the proposal to link Vernalis flows to the unimpaired hydrology of the San Joaquin River basin.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Vernalis flow objectives should be amended from a cfs flow rate by water year type to a specific (or range) percentage of unimpaired runoff flow rate from the San Joaquin basin.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	If the SED adopts a percentage range, then the initial condition should be determined by the best available scientific evidence.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	Based on literature in Appendix A of the comment letter, the Institute suggests that the minimum initial flow rate be set at a level that supports Chinook positive population growth in every year (i.e., flows ≥5000cfs in all weeks of April and May) until the abundance target is met (see Table 1).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The initial flow rate should include adequate spring outmigration flows. Flows >10,000 cfs that occur for at least two weeks during the juvenile migration period in at least 80% of years are the minimum necessary to support the abundance target (see Table 1).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The initial flow rate should include flows that frequently inundate San Joaquin floodplains during the fall run juvenile migration period—specifically, flows that exceed 25,000 cfs for at least two weeks in 60% of years (see Table 1).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	If the SED adopts a flow rate percent that is lower than the 2010 public trust flow criterion, then the document should: 1) detail the basis for doing so; 2) identify the impact to the Public Trust; 3) provide for adequate review and comment; and 4) ensure the rate is not detrimental to beneficial uses.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The Vernalis flow objectives should include a runoff percentage flow rate. The runoff percentage flow rate should either be directly included in the narrative objective along with biological criteria, or separately expressed as a numeric objective in the Plan.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The objective to maintain a viable native population should be made more specific and include biological criteria for other salmonid and other species.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The objective to maintain flows together with "other reasonably controllable measures" is too vague and should be revised to reduce or eliminate the effects of stressors (e.g., DO, contaminates, run-off).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The best scientific information should be used to evaluate the relative effect of implementing flow rates against the effect of other reasonably controllable measures.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources;
23-May-11	The program of implementation should 1) describe the process by which the SWRCB will collect and evaluate data and 2) discuss how the flow rate will be adaptively changed.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	It is critical the implementation program develop clear linkages between the measures, the stressors they are designed to alleviate, and the projected outcomes of the measure.	-
23-May-11	Institute suggests using a logic chain framework to develop the implementation program.	-
23-May-11	Full compliance with the salmon doubling criteria should be achieved by the completion of the FERC proceedings on the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers, or no later than 2020 (same as flow objective).	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	In addition to the salmon doubling, maintenance of the spatial diversity of fall run Chinook salmon in the Central Valley should be considered as biological criteria.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Restoration and maintenance of Chinook salmon spawning, rearing, and migration conditions in the San Joaquin will contribute to maintenance of the spatial extent characteristic of viable populations.	-
23-May-11	Identify actions that will support or improve natural patterns of life history diversity among salmon and critical thresholds of population productivity.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The narrative objective should identify biological criteria for steelhead, Sacramento splittail, and both green and white sturgeon.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The narrative objective should identify biological criteria for the maintenance of the lower San Joaquin River as a spawning ground, rearing habitat, and/or migration corridor.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Flow conditions for Steelhead should 1) maintain 10,000 steelhead in the San Joaquin Basin; 2) maintain a minimum of 2,500 adults/year in the tributaries; and 3) ensure steelhead adults and juveniles are able to migrate to/from spawning and rearing habitats through the lower San Joaquin River.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Vernalis objectives should include flows to support Splittail spawning, rearing, and migration to/from spawning habitats in the lower San Joaquin River.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The flows to support splittail should 1) inundate critical spawning and rearing habitats for a minimum of 30–45 days during the spawning period; 2) maintain a migration corridor in the lower San Joaquin River for juvenile and adult splittail; 3) occur once every Sacramento splittail generation; 4) produce inundations that would last at least 30–45 days of functional floodplain habitat; 5) maintain desired flow conditions within the area of inundated floodplain for 1–3 months.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The fish and wildlife trustee agencies (CDFG and USFWS) should define a performance metric that can discriminate between a successful and a limited spawning event for splittail.	-
23-May-11	Flow conditions for Green and white sturgeon should promote spawning in the San Joaquin basin at least three times within the each twenty-year period.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The flows to support Sturgeon should 1) be in excess of 6400 cfs November –May for at least one month; 2) be >20,000 cfs for at least one month between April and June during years where these sturgeon attraction flows occur; 3) occur once every 7 years	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Spawning success of sturgeon should be determined by presence of YOY sturgeon in traditional fish sampling programs or through analysis of bone microchemistry/isotopes.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The February—June narrative objective must include the following biological thresholds: Achieve Chinook Productivity: Flows (≥5000 cfs) to support an average daily water temperatures of 65°F (18.3°C) or lower on all days April 1–May 31 in the lower San Joaquin River in all years (see Table 2); Achieve Chinook Spatial Extent: Flows (≥2,000 cfs) to limit or eliminate migration impairment for migratory fish species. (See Table 2).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The July–January narrative objective must include the following biological thresholds: Achieve Chinook/sturgeon Spatial Extent: Average weekly flows in excess of 2,000 cfs in all weeks of all years during the San Joaquin River fall run Chinook salmon upstream migration period (see Table 2); Achieve Chinook/sturgeon Spatial Extent: Inflows in excess of 2,000 cfs August–March in the two years following spawning migrations when juvenile emigration from the San Joaquin would occur (see Table 2); Achieve steelhead Productivity: Attraction pulse flows at Vernalis for steelhead that occur for several weeks between late August and early November (see Table 2).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The following language is proposed for the July–January Vernalis flow objective: "Minimum average flow rate of 2,000 cfs in all years."	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
California Department of Fish and Game		
19-Mar-09	Commenter: Carl Wilcox, Chief, Water Branch	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	In developing specific flow recommendations, the State Water Board should consider splitting the flow water quality objectives issue into several sub-issues illustrative of the factors that influence the complex relationship between river flow and migration, spawning, and other fish and wildlife beneficial uses.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	When considering the baseline or alternatives analysis, the State Water Board should use specific definable and measurable metrics to evaluate impact potential (such as fall-run Chinook salmon smolt survival rate or juvenile fall-run Chinook salmon production abundance etc.). Based on the assessment of each of these factors, the State Water Board staff should be able to develop scientifically defensible flow recommendations for the San Joaquin River. The Department will be providing data and information in the coming weeks to support the State Water Board's assessment of SJR flow water quality objectives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
19-Mar-09	The State Water Board should consider a range of feasible alternatives for implementing flow-related water quality objectives for the San Joaquin River. These alternatives should consider at least: Implementation of objectives by water right holders; implementation of objectives using existing study based design (i.e., the existing Vernalis Adaptive Management Program [VAMP]); use of another approach for implementing flow objectives that builds on the successes of VAMP (such as managing flow in the SJR basin to hit flow targets at Vernalis) and avoids VAMP's limitations (e.g., so far the VAMP has not produced its intended study results).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	Any study based design should be flexible enough to seek and incorporate a change in flows and/or study design (i.e., allow for adaptive management) as necessary to apply emerging information.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	The State Water Board should explicitly evaluate the environmental effects of any new flow water quality objectives on riparian habitat and floodplain habitat.	Chapter 6, Flooding, Sediment, and Erosion; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 8, Terrestrial Biological Resources
19-Mar-09	This evaluation of potential environmental effects should include an assessment of longer term climate change impacts on the hydrology of the system, to the riparian corridor, and on the ecological services provided by the SJR.	Chapter 14, Energy Resources and Climate Change
Commenter: Scott Cantrell, Water Branch Acting Chief		
23-May-11	DFG agrees with the direction of the revised NOP and supports increased water flows and more natural pattern in the San Joaquin watershed.	-
23-May-11	DFG supports the use of a narrative value for the San Joaquin River fish and wildlife flow objective.	-
23-May-11	DFG agrees the fish and wildlife objective should be based on maintaining flow conditions in the River sufficient to support natural production of viable fish populations.	-
23-May-11	DFG recommends the fish and wildlife criteria be focused on juvenile salmon production, and then secondarily on adult salmon.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description and Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The base flows must provide adequate adult spawning and juvenile rearing habitat, as well as unimpeded fish passage from the tributaries to the Delta.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The Coordinated Operations Group and adaptive management strategy should focus on providing flows to protect all fish life stages	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	DFG supports Vernalis compliance locations and the additional geographic scope of the NOP. Compliance point(s) should ensure flow benefits to fish are provided through the tributaries and downstream to Vernalis.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The lower rim dams/reservoirs reduce water flows and elevate water temperatures in the lower San Joaquin River; these affects prevent sufficient production of juvenile salmon. The SED will need to demonstrate how flows will be maintained in the San Joaquin River and tributaries (so as to support sufficient production of juvenile salmon).	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Narrative language that limits diversions of more flow than is necessary for a covered benefit use should be included in the SED.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The NOP does not indicate the percent of unimpaired flows (UIF) to be evaluated. DFG recommends current conditions be the baseline and two alternative flow rates be considered: 40% UIF and 60% UIF[1].	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	It is not clear how the percent UIF will be calculated. DFG recommends using the example provided in the Feb 7, 2011 comment letter, which uses a 3-day averaging period with a 3-day lag.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Additional discussion on how key issues related to the determination of percent UIF for the project alternatives and adaptive management program should be provided. Specifically 1) range of variables 2) use of a percent UIF that may not be measureable and 3) affect to inflow to export (I/E) ratios.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	DFG supports the formation of a coordinated operations group (COG) and San Joaquin River Monitoring and Evaluation Program (SJRMEP), but will need additional funding to participate.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	DFG recommends the following be clarified/provided regarding the COG and SJRMEDP: 1) how the groups will be supported (including an evaluation of alternatives); 2) definition of agency roles; 3) information on the process used for decision making; 4) information on the development of definable and measurable goals; and 5) information on safeguards to assure strong scientific standards.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	A clear and concise definition of adaptive management should be developed.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Describe how the amendment process will be coordinated/integrated with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
23-May-11	Urgent action to address vulnerable populations of fall-run Chinook in the San Joaquin River tributaries is needed. Consider increasing instream flows in the Merced and Tuolumne River prior to issuance of the FERC licenses.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

[1] Any reference in this appendix to 20% Unimpaired, 40% Unimpaired, and 60% Unimpaired is the same as LSJR Alternative 2, LSJR Alternative 3, and LSJR Alternative 4, respectively. Any reference to 1.0 EC Objective and 1.4 EC Objective is the same as SDWQ Alternative 2 and SDWQ Alternative 3, respectively.

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	Explain how the SWRCB will use its Public Trust and Clean Water Act authority to ensure future FERC license instream flow terms are in agreement Bay-Delta Plan standards.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
23-May-11	Describe how coordination/integration with other state and federal programs (e.g., San Joaquin River Restoration Program, Central Valley Project Improvement Act) will be managed.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
23-May-11	Provide a more robust description of how SWRCB will phase the implementation of the flow objectives and the projected timeline.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	DWR recommends the project timeline be front loaded with action to quickly stabilize the anadromous fish population.	-
23-May-11	DWR supports changes to the southern Delta agricultural water quality objectives but recommends all actions that result in an increase in flows do not also increase the salt loading downstream.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
California Department of Transportation		
Commenter: Gary Arnold, Statewide Local Development-Intergovernmental Review Coordinator		
19-Mar-09	CalTrans would like to establish ongoing consultation and collaboration with the State Water Board to ensure existing Best Management Practices related to water quality and runoff in the relevant area are coordinated with the State Water Board's updates where applicable.	-
California Department of Water Resources		
Commenter: Erick Soderlund, Staff Counsel		
19-Mar-09	It is an appropriate time to review and potentially modify South Delta salinity objectives.	-
19-Mar-09	DWR supports a staged approach.	-
19-Mar-09	Recommends that SWB narrow its scope of review to focus on South Delta salinity and prepare an EIR for the single purpose of proceeding with review and potential modifications to the South Delta salinity objectives and WR implementing those objectives.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
19-Mar-09	Baseline must take into account existing conditions and problems associated with diverting water from Bay-Delta.	Chapter 2 Existing Water Resources and Management; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; All
19-Mar-09	No project alternative should address existing conditions as well as future consequences of current objectives, which requires the SWB to study future consequences of implementation of the current South Delta salinity objectives and program of implementation, such as effects on supply and fish.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Appendix D
19-Mar-09	DWR recommends the SWB consider the following: variations in precipitation and hydrology each year; WQ on SJR upstream of the South Delta.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
19-Mar-09	DWR recommends the SWB consider the following: influence and characterization of dischargers into the SJR; effects of local dischargers into South Delta channels; and illegal water diversion affecting the South Delta salinity and flows; illegal diversions affecting the South Delta salinity and flows.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
19-Mar-09	DWR recommends the SWB consider the following: variation in WQ needs of crops during different growth stages; relationship between leaching, rainfall, applied WQ, and crop production in South Delta.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
19-Mar-09	DWR believes that SWB should review these objectives following other actions (ESA consultation with NMFS) that may affect this review.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
19-Mar-09	DWR believes more time is needed to determine the best course of action for establishing SJRF objectives that protect all relevant beneficial uses, such as the BO to protect several salmonid species and green sturgeon, expected in June 2009.	-
19-Mar-09	Need for SJRF entering Delta may change depending on outcomes of BDCP.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
19-Mar-09	DWR recommends that the SWB postpone beginning any EIR of the SJRF objectives until NMFS is issued this summer, and a draft BDCP is scheduled to be available for public review this summer.	-
Commenter: Erick Soderlund, Staff Counsel		
23-May-11	DWR questions whether: 1) "flow-only" objectives are appropriate in a water quality control plan, and 2) if considered appropriate, are "flow-only" objectives the best approach to efficiently manage the system to protect those beneficial uses.	-
23-May-11	Conflict between the basic purposes of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Water Code § 13000 et seq.) (Porter-Cologne Act) and proposed the project. Essentially, by making flow itself a water quality objective, the State Water Board has expanded the scope of the Porter-Cologne Act beyond that which it was intended to control.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	It is imperative that the State Water Board distinguish those problems and/or solutions which have flow patterns or diversions at their root from those which are inherently connected with flow itself.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	DWR recommends that the State Water Board adapt its current approach to allow for the development of objectives that are based on causal mechanisms, such as habitat, predation and diversion avoidance, etc., where flow may be used to achieve an objective but is not necessarily the objective itself.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 1, Introduction
23-May-11	It is DWR's understanding that an appropriate life-cycle model has not yet been developed for salmonids. Nonetheless the lack of such a model should not prevent the State Water Board from recognizing its necessity in this process and even encouraging the fishery agencies to develop an appropriate model.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Throughout the process to review and potentially modify the San Joaquin River flow objectives, the State Water Board has stated that a comprehensive discussion or analysis of such issues as the flow split at the Head of Older River (HOR) and the effects of diversion by DWR and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) on flows through Old and Middle Rivers (OMR) is not necessary because these issues are not the subject of the State Water Board's current review. DWR has agreed with the Board that these issues are outside the scope of the current review but they continue to be discussed as possible issues for future proceedings.	-
23-May-11	DWR provides information in these comments to help inform the Board of the current studies regarding SWP and CVP operations and impacts on salmonid survival in the Delta.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The conclusions in the Draft Technical Report on OMR are not supported by the best available science and the Draft Report should be revised.	Appendix C
23-May-11	Kimmerer and Nobriga 2008 article and other PTM studies analyzing salmon smolts in the Delta do not support the concept that the export facilities create a "zone of influence" effecting salmonid smelt behavior. In addition, nowhere do the authors state or make any assertion that supports the statement contained in the Draft Technical Report that "any fish that enters the central or southern Delta has a high probability of being entrained and lost at the pumps. DWR respectfully requests that this statement be removed from the report, since it is not an accurate statement as to the conclusion of the report, and scientific studies do not support it.	Appendix C

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	Researchers have analyzed the relationship between project exports and salmonid survival. The studies conducted during that time have either failed to establish any significant statistical relationship between exports and survival, or, more surprisingly, have shown a positive relationship between exports and survival. While studies fail to show a statistically significant relationship between exports and salmonid survival, studies have shown a positive relationship between San Joaquin River flows and survival.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	DWR believes there are several hurdles that must be overcome before water project operators can use computed unimpaired flow for real time operations. DWR offers the following recommendations: A. The methods developed to date for computing unimpaired flows will require revisiting to overcome deficiencies in the current assumptions and to standardize and streamline the different data sources. B. The uncertainty inherent in measuring the observed data (e.g., streamflows, precipitation) and computed parameters (e.g., evapotranspiration, depletions, stream-aquifer interaction) needs to be considered. Also, the quicker a computed value for unimpaired flow is required, the greater the number of assumptions needed to determine the value. Therefore, establishing the standards so that the errors made in the forecast mode can be rectified in hindsight should be considered. C. Remote sensing and telemetered data have a great potential to be part of the process; however, the maturity of the technology for real-time operations will need to be assessed. D. Buy-in from stakeholders on an agreed upon approach is essential for successful implementation.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Appendix C
23-May-11	There is a serious question whether water levels and, to a lesser extent, water circulation are proper subjects of water quality objectives.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	It is unclear whether water circulation is appropriately addressed in the water quality context. More importantly, however, is that the current proposal makes no effort to quantify the impacts of the SWP and the CVP on water circulation in the southern Delta and, instead, assumes it is sufficient for them to be fully responsible for implementing this new objective.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The potential draft modifications to the numerical salinity objectives accurately reflect the current state of knowledge, are reasonably protective of agricultural beneficial uses, and DWR supports their implementation.	-
23-May-11	While the Board no doubt has the authority to take action necessary to protect the consumptive uses in the southern Delta, the approach to make water levels a water quality objective is flawed by equating its water quality planning function with the protection of water rights.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	DWR is conducting and will provide to the Board a computer modeling analysis that will illustrate the effects SWP and CVP pumping has on circulation, in general, and on the creation or movement of null zones.	Appendix H
23-May-11	Responsibility for achieving the objectives should be assigned among several entities shown to affect southern Delta salinity, and not just the projects. DWR finds it unreasonable that the State Water Board would even entertain assigning responsibility to DWR and the USBR to develop and implement an operations plan that will "avoid localized concentration of salts associated with agricultural water use and municipal discharges."	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Board should develop a comprehensive program to implement such an objective "which will include the projects and other users along the watercourse."	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Any additional reporting and studying requirements be evaluated in conjunction with the many reports, monitoring and coordination DWR currently conducts in response to State Water Board requirements.	-
California Water Impact Network/California Sportfishing Protection Alliance/AquAlliance		
Commenter: Carolee Krieger, President, California Water Impact Network; Bill Jennings, Chairman, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance;		
8-July-08	Questions related to the strategic workplan published by the State Water Board including but not limited to: how much water does the Delta need; how will a comprehensive Delta monitoring plan be created; when will fish screens be installed on Delta export pumps; when will new conditions on export pumping be implemented; how will salt loading in the San Joaquin River and Delta be addressed; when will water storage levels be increased to protect river flows in dry years.	-
8-July-08	Provided specific comments on Draft Strategic Workplan, including but not limited to: water quality and contaminant control; once through cooling; sediment objectives; invasive species management; blue green algae; ambient ammonia concentrations; selenium; comprehensive monitoring program; san Joaquin river flows and southern delta salinity; and comprehensive review of Bay Delta Plan, water rights, and requirements to protect fish and the public trust.	-
8-July-08	Draft Strategic worksplan fails to use its legal authority to protect California's environment and economy.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
Commenter: Carolee Krieger, President, California Water Impact Network; Bill Jennings, Chairman, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance;		
10-June-09	Includes detailed comments regarding the State Water Board's draft staff report for the Periodic Review of the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary.	-
10-June-09	Comments recommend a complete revision of the Water Quality Control Plan, including but not limited to: minimum incorporated reasonable and prudent measures contained in the Salmon and Delta Smelt biological opinions; eliminate the Vernalis Adaptive Management and return to D-1641 pulse flows; evaluate how much water is necessary for Bady-Delta ecosystem health; develop and implement fish screen criteria; develop and implement plan for fish doubling narrative; rescind the waiver of the agricultural water quality standards; consider adoption of land retirement program; conduct water right investigation; provide dedicated cold water storage; investigate salt loading; prevent redirected impacts to Trinity River and other tributaries; develop selenium standards; develop focus on water use efficiency; create comprehensive monitoring program.	-
Commenter: Carolee Krieger, President, California Water Impact Network; Bill Jennings, Chairman, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance;		
6-Dec-10	Includes detailed comments on the SJR Technical Report and attachments related to the detailed comments from others regarding the SJR Technical Report.	Appendix C
6-Dec-10	Temperature needs to be addressed by river reach and identify the spatial and temporal extent of temperature.	Appendix C
6-Dec-10	Omission of upstream flow contributions from the Upper San Joaquin River is unexplained and unjustified.	Appendix C
6-Dec-10	The range of alternatives examined is inadequate and the technical report should address the discrepancy between it and the Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem and include and analyze a 75% unimpaired flow.	Appendix C
6-Dec-10	Build on the Central Valley Water Quality control Board evaluation of salinity published in 2006.	Appendix C
6-Dec-10	The technical report should explicitly identify the additional need for modeling and studies that will be required before the Hoffman report conclusions can be used.	Appendix C
6-Dec-10	The technical report ignores other chemical constituents and should include information necessary to support an antidegradation analysis for proposed alternative that would increase concentration or residence time and lower water quality.	Appendix C
6-Dec-10	The technical report and SED need to address the consequences of altered flow regimes on constituents found in the San Joaquin River and the Delta.	Appendix C; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
6-Dec-10	Technical report needs to identify the requirements necessary to protect fish in each tributary and impacts to specific water users in specific tributaries from implementation of whatever flow regime is identified to be sufficiently protective.	Appendix C; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 13, Service Providers
6-Dec-10	If results from CalSim II modeling are relied upon in the technical report, the assumptions behind the model runs and limitations of the model output must be made explicitly clear.	Appendix C
Commenter: Carolee Krieger, President, California Water Impact Network; Bill Jennings, Chairman, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance; Barbara Vlamis, Executive Director, AquAlliance		
8-Feb-11	To recover fish abundances, it will be essential for the Board to restrict Delta export pumping, increase tributary and mainstem flows of Central Valley rivers, establish sustainable controls on salinity and contaminant sources upstream in the San Joaquin River basin, and invest in restoring critical floodplain and streambank habitat along the mainstem and the tributaries that fish can use to rear and grow and survive migration through the Delta to the Pacific Ocean.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
8-Feb-11	Each proposed flow regime for Vernalis should be analyzed under the following CEQA alternatives: 1) A determined large percent of Vernalis flows is met from New Melones, 2) Responsibility for Vernalis flows is divided among the main tributaries proportional to unimpaired flows from each tributary, and 3) Responsibility for Vernalis flows is divided among the main tributaries and the upper San Joaquin proportional to unimpaired flows.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
8-Feb-11	The central decision the Board will need to make involves the question of balancing protection of the public trust with other Beneficial Uses of water reliant on the Delta.	-
8-Feb-11	The SED must evaluate a range of alternatives, including a no export and reduced export alternative, and take into account (CWC 85021) reducing reliance on the Delta.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
8-Feb-11	The SED must address the over appropriation of water in the Central Valley.	-
Commenter: Carolee Krieger, CWIN President; Bill Jennings, CSPA Chairman; and Barbara Valmis, AA Executive Director		
23-May-11	The Board should incorporate into preparation of the SED its full informational and video record from the Delta Flow Criteria proceeding from January–April 2010. The Board's Delta Flow Criteria Report (August 2010) can and should be used in preparation of the SED.	-
23-May-11	It is the beneficial uses which must receive Board attention in the process of public trust balancing and analysis. The Board's duty now is to credibly balance all of the beneficial uses of water in the estuary so that public trust resources are protected, and so that reasonable uses and methods of diversion of water are employed by all water users.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The exclusion of the upper San Joaquin River basin above the river's confluence with the Merced River is not adequately explained.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Board fails to specify a proposed project for its SJR flow criteria. It does not specify a proposed flow standard as a percent of unimpaired flow in the river basin at Vernalis and does not explicitly discuss compliance points on tributaries.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Board does not include an alternative that would require the bypass of 75% of unimpaired flow on the SJR (even though this was considered on the Sacramento River in the Delta Flow Criteria Report). The SWRCB should explain a 75% criterion in the SED or justify why it is unreasonable.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The proposed San Joaquin River flow language in NOP Attachment 2 does not consider that San Joaquin River exports from Friant Dam to Kern County are an important cause of flow deficiencies to the Delta and of South Delta salinity problems.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Board offers new salinity criteria for interior South Delta locations that would increase allowable salinity (as measured by Electrical Conductivity) by 40–43%, in order to reduce potential violations of salinity objectives by the California Department of Water Resources and the US Bureau of Reclamation. This does not solve salinity problems in the Delta; instead, it defines them away. The Board provides no salinity source control program for agricultural drainage discharged from the western San Joaquin Valley.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Board has not provided adequate rationale to justify excluding the San Joaquin River above its confluence with the Merced River (the "upper San Joaquin River") from the "project area" for purposes of environmental evaluation of proposed San Joaquin River flow criteria.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	In its Water Rights Orders 2010-0029 and 2009-0058-DWR, the Board authorized interim schedules for "experimental flows" sought by the parties to the San Joaquin River Restoration Program and settlement agreement. At minimum, these interim flows should be incorporated into the project description, so that it is clear that upper San Joaquin River flows will contribute to solving flow and water quality problems in the Delta.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)
23-May-11	There needs to be a basic description in the SED of how future contributions from the upper San Joaquin River will contribute to improving the health of the Bay-Delta estuary (in the form of project alternatives).	All and Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)
23-May-11	The NOP's project description of "X percent of unimpaired flow" is not a legally adequate project description for the February through June time period. The State Water Resources Control Board should commit to specified flow criteria for the project description and use the SED's required Alternatives analysis to evaluate the efficacy of alternative percentages of unimpaired flow criteria against the project description.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	Each alternative should include the upper San Joaquin River basin as part of the project area for the San Joaquin River flow and the South Delta salinity objectives revision.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Each alternative should be studied at the same level of detail as that required for the project description.	All
23-May-11	The document should identify an environmentally superior alternative, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act, and specify criteria applied by the Board in the SED.	All
23-May-11	The Board should address terrestrial habitat components that address ecological function in addition to flow and salinity parameters, such as floodplain inundation, etc.	Chapter 8, Terrestrial Biological Resources
23-May-11	The Board should include a 75% of unimpaired flow at Vernalis flow alternative.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Board should also analyze 20, 40, and 60% of unimpaired flow at Vernalis flow alternatives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Board should evaluate the feasibility and impacts of ending exports from Friant Dam through the Friant-Kern Canal out of the San Joaquin River basin to Tulare, Kings, and Kern counties, to see what potential beneficial impacts this would have on the Bay-Delta estuary, San Joaquin River flows, and Bureau of Reclamation compliance with existing and proposed south Delta salinity standards.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Board should evaluate the feasibility and impacts of reducing or ending diversions on the Tuolumne River by the City and County of San Francisco, replacing all or part of San Francisco's supplies with water diverted through the Contra Costa Canal for storage at Los Vaqueros, or through new facilities to a new alternative west-of-Delta storage reservoir. In either case, conveyance from west-of-Delta storage would be made through interties to the South Bay Aqueduct and/or San Francisco's existing water delivery system.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	A "Zero Friant Exports" alternative should be analyzed in a second alternative in combination with the San Francisco west-of-Delta storage alternative.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Each flow alternative should be analyzed with two salinity scenarios: existing south Delta salinity objectives and proposed objectives.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	Each alternative should be analyzed with the assumption that there would be no water transfers forthcoming from the Sacramento Valley under either a drought water bank framework or a long-term water transfer program framework. Similarly, no new diversions from the Sacramento River or new storage in the Sacramento Valley should be included either.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	Each alternative should be analyzed with the inclusion of a complete shutdown or very low volume of export pumps at both the Banks and Jones pumping plants during periods when anadromous fish and other listed species are present, in place of the installation of temporary barriers in South Delta channels.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	Each alternative should be analyzed with an Irrigated Lands Program scenario that assumes full compliance by agricultural drainage dischargers throughout the San Joaquin Valley.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources; Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)
23-May-11	The SED should describe life histories of all listed species as fully as possible.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Chapter 8 Terrestrial Biological Resources
23-May-11	The SED should summarize all existing local fishery restoration efforts on major tributary streams, including the salmon restoration flows and stocking of the upper San Joaquin River under auspices of the San Joaquin River Restoration Program.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The SED should describe the impacts to anadromous and other aquatic fish species of the proposed revisions to the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan of changes in water quality resulting from its implementation, including in particular the effects on aquatic biota of changes in South Delta salinity standards.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The SED must include a listing of the major water rights holders and state and federal project water contractors in the San Joaquin River basin, together with their permitted or licensed diversion rates and contributions to storage, and a description of how they receive their supplies.	Chapter 2, Water Resources
23-May-11	In the Setting, the SED should address the historical/unimpaired flow (near-natural) hydrograph with alterations to the hydrograph resulting from all component streams of the San Joaquin River and Delta by rim reservoir and Delta pumping operations.	Chapter 2, Water Resources; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	If CalSIM II and/or III are to be used to estimate water supply impacts from changes in reservoir and Delta pumping operations, the SED should fully disclose methodological and data limitations of the modeling effort, and should use sensitivity analysis to show the relative volatility of water supply impacts that results from changes in key assumptions. The Board should build into the SED's time schedule the peer review of all CalSIM II and III modeling results, in order to increase the public's confidence in how best to interpret the water supply impact results.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	The analysis in the SED should quantify the degree to which each water right holder is deprived of water supply under each alternative (discuss how reliable are historic and anticipated deliveries, and the face value of water rights, given a range of flows contemplated by the State Water Board in its project description and alternatives).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The SED should include and evaluate reasonable climate change scenarios for the San Joaquin River basin flows.	Chapter 14. Energy Resources and Climate Change
23-May-11	The Setting section of the SED should describe the magnitude and general locations of groundwater overdraft prevalent in the San Joaquin Valley and San Joaquin River basin.	Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources
23-May-11	The Setting should characterize which streams reaches are gaining flows from groundwater and which are losing flows to groundwater.	Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources
23-May-11	The SED should describe expected effects on groundwater levels in geographically differentiated locations.	Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources
23-May-11	The SED should include and evaluate reasonable climate change scenarios for the groundwater resources of the San Joaquin River basin.	Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources; Chapter 14, Energy Resources and Climate Change
23-May-11	The SED should provide in its Setting section adequate descriptions of the State Water Resources Control Board's antidegradation policies, total mean daily load requirements, areas where agricultural waivers of discharge requirements are in place, and other regulatory programs that indicate the full range of the State Board's regulatory authority and capacity in the San Joaquin River Basin.	Chapter 1 Introduction, Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
23-May-11	Mitigation measures should identify programmatic objectives for the State Water Resources Control Board that will avoid or reduce impacts to less than significant levels.	All
23-May-11	The Board's SED must address the impacts to South Delta agricultural diverters and irrigators of relaxing the Board's salinity objective, and accordingly justify this proposed relaxation in light of the Board's stated antidegradation policy.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
23-May-11	Rather than proposing a revision in the salinity standards at this time, the Board should be arranging for peer review of the report and its underlying models, and funding the necessary comprehensive studies to eliminate the significant data gaps acknowledged by Dr. Hoffman.	Appendix C
23-May-11	As a matter of statewide water policy, cost-effectiveness, and the public trust resource protection of the San Joaquin River and the agricultural beneficial uses of the South Delta, it is essential to focus source control efforts on agricultural drainage dischargers located in the western San Joaquin Valley.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
23-May-11	Our organizations note that the Bureau's estimate of flow volumes needed to meet the more stringent irrigation season salinity standard brackets the amount of water involved in our combined "Zero Friant" and rerouted San Francisco flow volumes, 1.3 million acre-feet. This further suggests that our proposed combined alternative merits study in the SED.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The Land Use Setting section should identify floodplains along all the major tributaries and upper San Joaquin River that would be inundated, and the anticipated frequency with which they would be inundated for purposes of slowing and dispersing flood flows and providing floodplain habitat for juvenile salmon preparing to migrate out of the San Joaquin River basin with spring flows.	Chapter 6, Flooding, Sediment, and Erosion
23-May-11	The State Water Resources Control Board should include the following in its analysis of cumulative impacts: • Federal Energy Regulatory Commission potential instream flows and other related water quality studies that have been or will be conducted in relation to relicensing processes under way for the Oroville Facilities the Merced River Project, and the Don Pedro Project. • U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and California Department of Water Resources compliance with the modified Cease and Desist Order in the Board's Water Rights Order 2010-0002. • U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service review of the federal Endangered Species Act status of the Sacramento splittail. • U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service's Biological Opinions for operation of the Trinity River Division (both 2000 opinion and their upcoming opinion, provided it is timely for SED preparation). • U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and San Luis-Delta Mendota Water Authority discharges of salt, selenium, and boron from the Grasslands Bypass Project, and their cumulative impact on Delta salinity objectives, as well as impacts on efforts to restore Chinook salmon to the San Joaquin River upstream of the Merced River.	Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)
Central Delta Water Agency		
Commenter: Dante John Nomellini, Jr., Attorney for the CDWA		
1-Oct-08	The implementation plan for the southern Delta salinity and San Joaquin River flow objectives needs to be modified to address Term 91.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
1-Oct-08	The implementation plan needs to consider and define the project's legal responsibilities with regard to providing salinity control for the southern Delta and San Joaquin River flows before any consideration is given to imposing salinity control or flow burdens on any other water right holder.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
Commenter: Dante John Nomellini, Jr., Attorney for the CDWA		
19-Mar-09	Project too broad—NOP premature. Insufficient information to determine scope and significance of effects of this project. NOP should be set aside until proposed project is developed enough to be described in a future NOP.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
19-Mar-09	Farming operations in South Delta act as a salt reservoir and improve Delta water quality. Refer to DWR's July 1956 Report No. 4, which describes causes of salinity degradation and actions that improve salinity conditions and finds that agricultural practices in the Delta lowlands enhance rather than degrade water en route to Tracy Pumping Plant.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
19-Mar-09	Farming operations in South Delta improve Delta water quality. Groundwater underlying farmlands in the southern Delta is very high and wild vegetation consumes more water than farming operations, as recognized in D-990, 1961, pg. 46.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
19-Mar-09	This process must consider applicable laws and policies related to protecting and promoting South Delta farming operations. Environmental documentation should fully acknowledge laws and policies applicable to topics of southern Delta salinity and SJRF objectives and measures to implement those objectives.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
19-Mar-09	Cumulative impacts should be included in NOP's list of potential environmental effects.	Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)
Commenter: Dante John Nomellini, Jr., Attorney for the CDWA		
6-April-09	Joined in comments submitted by South Delta Water Agency.	Appendix C
6-April-09	Improvement of water quality for all beneficial uses should be the goal and exports of water from the Delta to the west side of the San Joaquin Valley contribute to the degradation of the San Joaquin River and are the source of the problem. The CVP deliveries assisted by the SWP coordinated operations and joint points of diversion are the causes of the salinity problem and should be required to mitigate their impacts to the River before others are required to do so.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
Commenter: Dante John Nomellini, Jr., Attorney for the CDWA		
22-April-09	The Notice of Preparation pursuant to CEQA for any potential amendments to the southern Delta salinity and San Joaquin River flow objectives was prematurely issued.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
22-April-09	Farming operations in the southern Delta act as a salt reservoir and improve Delta water quality.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources; Appendix C
22-April-09	Farming operations in the southern Delta also improve Delta water quantity.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources; Appendix C
22-April-09	This process must discuss and consider all applicable laws and policies related to protecting and promoting southern Delta farming operations.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
22-April-09	The implementation plan for the southern Delta salinity and San Joaquin River flow objectives needs to be modified to forthrightly address Term 91.	

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
22-April-09	The implementation plan needs to consider and define the project's legal responsibilities with regard to providing salinity control for the southern Delta and San Joaquin River flows before any consideration is given to imposing salinity control or flow burdens on any other water right holder.	Chapter 1, Introduction
6-Dec-10	CVP deliveries assisted by the SWP coordinated operations and joint point of diversions are the cause of the degradation of the San Joaquin River. The CVP/SWP should be required to mitigate their impacts on the San Joaquin River before others are required to modify their actions. Portion of the water exported from the Delta by the projects should be required to restore the San Joaquin River water quality.	Chapter 1, Introduction and Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Previous comments made during the public staff workshop on April 6, 2009 are hereby incorporated.	-
23-May-11	CDWA also incorporates December 6, 2010 comments titled, "San Joaquin River Technical Report Comments."	-
23-May-11	Commenters are unable to provide "specific detail" due to the paucity of information regarding "water rights and other actions" spoken of in the NOP.	-
23-May-11	What is the "intended purpose" of the San Joaquin River flows once they pass Vernalis and where is the evidence to support that purpose?	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The SWRCB must comply with all applicable laws and priorities associated with imposing flow restrictions or water diversions.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Consider and fully discuss and analyze in the EIR the following (before the SWRCB can lawfully impose responsibility to meet a flow objective on any Delta water user): SWP and CVP must take full responsibility for mitigations including impacts from reverse or reduced flows, drainage into the SJ River from the west side of the SJ Valley, and damage to spawning areas.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Consider and fully discuss and analyze in the EIR the following (before the SWRCB can lawfully impose responsibility to meet a flow objective on any Delta water user): SWP and CVP must provide adequate salinity control.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Consider and fully discuss and analyze in the EIR the following (before the SWRCB can lawfully impose responsibility to meet a flow objective on any Delta water user): The CVPIA burdens are those of CVP.	-
23-May-11	Consider and fully discuss and analyze in the EIR the following (before the SWRCB can lawfully impose responsibility to meet a flow objective on any Delta water user): SWP and CVP responsible for fish and wildlife preservation with enhanced costs attributed to the State General Fund.	Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
23-May-11	Consider and fully discuss and analyze in the EIR the following (before the SWRCB can lawfully impose responsibility to meet a flow objective on any Delta water user): SWP and CVP must maintain adequate water supply while controlling for salinity by managing releases of storage into the Delta.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	Consider and fully discuss and analyze in the EIR the following (before the SWRCB can lawfully impose responsibility to meet a flow objective on any Delta water user): In allocating the burden within the SWP and CVP, the uses within the Delta and other watersheds of origin must be accorded priority over exports.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Consider and fully discuss and analyze in the EIR the following (before the SWRCB can lawfully impose responsibility to meet a flow objective on any Delta water user): Tributaries above Delta would hold remaining burden allocable among other water users. Exporters other than SWP and CVP must yield priority to users within the Delta.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Consider and fully discuss and analyze in the EIR the following (before the SWRCB can lawfully impose responsibility to meet a flow objective on any Delta water user): If a user yields water that can be replaced with SWP or CVP water, then they should provide said water so long as it's truly stored water.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	SWRCB has been wrongfully imposing responsibility on Term 91 water rights holders and this must stop until the SWRCB addresses the propriety of such an imposition in its water quality control plan and subsequent water rights proceedings. Such imposition (as imposing responsibility on term 91 water rights holders) should also be analyzed in the EIR.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Questions regarding Term 91 Water Rights including: What specific water quality objective is the Term 91 water right holder being held responsible for? Does the Term 91 water right holder's water use actually negatively impact those water quality objectives? Is it legal to impose those responsibilities on a water right holder to meet SWRCB objectives?	-
23-May-11	It is not clear that Term 91 agricultural users impact salinity objectives and may actually be a benefit.	-
23-May-11	Agricultural use in Delta may benefit outflow as the SWRCB recognized in its Decision 990 (page 46).	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
23-May-11	Reclamation of Delta waters has reduced plants that consume more water than crops grown on these lands. Therefore, water consumption has likely decreased and more stream flow entering Delta reaches the lower end to repel saline invasion.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
23-May-11	SWRCB has not said who is responsible to meet Bay-Delta water quality plan objectives on Term 91 water right holders in its 1995 or 2006 water quality control plans or subsequent proceedings.	-
23-May-11	The current imposition of responsibility to meet existing water quality objectives on Term 91 water rights holders is contrary to law as is any future imposition of responsibility on holders of southern Delta salinity requirements.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
Central Valley Clean Water Association		
Commenter: Debbie Webster, Executive Officer		
19-Mar-09	The State Water Board must evaluate the water quality objectives and program of implementation as applicable to municipal wastewater discharges in accordance with Water Code Sections 13000 and 13241. Specifically, the Board must address the changes made to the 2006 Plan that have implications on POTWs.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 13, Service Providers
19-Mar-09	The State Water Board must consider the environmental effects of the existing, new or revised objectives and implementation program as well as project alternatives with regard to POTWs. For example, if POTWs are required to meet more stringent requirements that require construction of new treatment facilities etc. those impacts must be addressed.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 13, Service Providers
19-Mar-09	The State Water Board should coordinate with the CV-SALTS and the Drinking Water Policy Development Processes.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative); Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
Commenter: Debbie Webster, Executive Officer		
23-May-11	The State Water Board should adopt the southern Delta salinity objectives in a manner consistent with the Writ of Mandate directing it to conduct the required Water Code Section 13241 analysis.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Because the State Water Board did not conduct the required Water Code analysis when it established the southern Delta salinity objectives, the State Water Board should conduct such an analysis as part of its current review of the 2006 Bay-Delta Plan.	Appendix H
23-May-11	The board is required to analyze specific factors when developing water quality objectives pursuant to Water Code Section 13241, and must develop a comprehensive implementation plan under Water Code Section 13242. The factors that the State Water Board must consider when it adopts water quality objectives include: (a) Past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of water. (b) Environmental characteristics of the hydrographic unit under consideration, including the quality of water available thereto. (c) Water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors, which affect water quality in the area. (d) Economic considerations. (e) The need for developing housing within the region. (f) The need to develop and use recycled water. (Wat. Code, § 13241.)	Appendix H

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The board must assess the costs of an adopted or amended objective based on: (1) whether it is being attained; (2) the methods available to achieve compliance if the objective is not being attained; and (3) the costs of those methods.	Chapter 18, Economic Analyses; Appendix H
23-May-11	The State Water Board has an "affirmative duty" to consider any information on compliance costs or other economic impacts provided by the regulated community and other interested parties. If the potential economic impacts are significant, the State Water Board must articulate why the objective is necessary to protect beneficial uses in a reasonable manner despite the adverse consequences. Where an amended objective is at issue, the associated staff report or resolution may address the economic considerations.	Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
23-May-11	To comply with Water Code Section 13241, the State Water Board should use modeling tools for the Delta and Delta watershed (e.g., DSM2, WARMF) with some refinements. Specifically, the modeling tools should be used to assess 1) water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors which affect water quality in the southern Delta; 2) the incremental impact that salinity controls on POTWs will have on southern Delta salinity levels as an element of the "coordinated control for all factors;" and, 3) if it is reasonable to require costly POTW improvements that would produce incremental effects.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 18, Economic Analysis
23-May-11	The affirmative duty to regulate water quality reasonably requires the State Water Board to consider the costs of compliance. Consider the economic factors related specifically to wastewater dischargers. Undertake an analysis as to the costs of applying the southern Delta salinity objectives to POTWs or locations beyond the original compliance locations. Consider information regarding the need and costs of installing and operating advanced treatment technologies. For example the costs associated with treatment technologies, such as microfiltration/reverse osmosis. The State Water Board must carefully balance the environmental and economic factors when undertaking a Section 13241 analysis to ensure its regulations are ultimately reasonable as applied to POTWs.	Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
23-May-11	The State Water Board must develop an adequate program of implementation that describes the actions necessary for municipal dischargers to achieve the EC objectives, provides a reasonable time schedule for the actions to be taken, and includes a description of the monitoring required to determine their compliance.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	CVCWA supports the proposed removal of the minimal implementation plan requirements in the 2006 Bay-Delta Plan that requires the Central Valley Regional Water Board to impose discharge controls on in-Delta discharges of salts by agricultural, domestic, and municipal dischargers. However, the draft program of implementation in the NOP fails to provide clear direction as to how EC water quality objectives shall be applied to POTWs. If the State Water Board intends to delay application of the southern Delta EC objectives to POTWs until the Central Valley's CV-SALTS program has been fully implemented, which CVCWA would support, then the program of implementation needs to state this clearly.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Also, the program of implementation needs to include a clear schedule of compliance for POTWs to comply with either the existing southern Delta EC objectives, those proposed in the revised NOP, or whatever is ultimately adopted by the State Water Board or through CV-SALTS. In the absence of clear direction and schedule of compliance, POTWs will be subject to the southern Delta water quality objectives immediately because the State Water Board's compliance schedule policy would not apply.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Further, as part of the CEQA environmental review process, an assessment of the potential environmental effects of how POTWs would comply with the southern Delta salinity objectives should consider impacts that may result from the need to modify or expand treatment facilities, or obtain alternative water supply sources (i.e., switching from groundwater to surface water, or drilling into deeper aquifers for less saline waters).	Chapter 13, Service Providers; Chapter 18, Economic Analyses; Appendix H
23-May-11	Support the State Water Board's consideration of recent scientific studies. Specifically, the State Water Board should continue to consider the recent study indicating that the 700 mhos/cm is more restrictive than necessary.	-
23-May-11	The State Water Board should also consider the available information regarding the extent to which POTWs contribute to existing salinity levels in the Delta. POTW discharges are minor contributors to the salinity in the southern Delta (supported by studies). The Board should evaluate discharges from POTWs and take into account that the effect of POTW discharges on Delta salinity levels is minute as compared to other sources. Consider all pertinent information and studies prior to adopting objectives.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix C; Appendix F.2
Central Valley Salinity Coalition		
Commenter: Daniel Cozad, Executive Director		
16-Mar-09	The State Water Board should integrate its planning for southern Delta salinity and San Joaquin River flows with the CVSALTs effort.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
16-Mar-09	Account for the cumulative effects of the ongoing planning and regulatory efforts of the CVSALTs.	Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)
Chowchilla Water District		
Commenter: Gary W. Sawyers, Sawyers & Holland Attorneys-at-Law		
23-May-11	Improper pre-determination of the Board's plan of implementation (Section 1 of 2 of SJTA's comments).	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The impropriety of utilizing the FERC process to implement flow objectives (Section 2 of SJTA's comments).	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The urgent need for the Board to address illegal downstream diversions before imposing new flow-related obligations on upstream water rights holders (Section 4 of the SJTA's comments).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The need for scientifically supported flow regimes that reflect current conditions (described generally in Sections 7-9 of SJTA's comments).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Flow responsibility allocations must include an analysis of impacts vs. benefits and impacts must be assessed and considered regardless of the allocation methodology.	Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
23-May-11	If responsibility for the new Vernalis flow requirements is determined based solely on a water rights priority system, impacts will not be equally distributed among water rights holders in the San Joaquin River Basin. Disproportional allocation would result, effectively drying up junior appropriators.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 4, Introduction to Analysis
23-May-11	Providing flows for the Chowchilla River system would be inefficient while depriving a substantial area of critically needed and irreplaceable water supplies.	-
23-May-11	Concern regarding the Chowchilla River include: Providing flows for the Chowchilla River system would create a false pathway for salmon; Small contributions from the Chowchilla River to meet new standards would impact the Chowchilla system far more than any benefit derived; and Chowchilla is committed to substantial flows to the San Joaquin River as mandated by the San Joaquin River Restoration Program. Additional flows would be devastating to Chowchilla and those it serves.	-
23-May-11	The impropriety of utilizing the FERC process to implement flow objectives (Section 2 of SJTA's comments).	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development		
Commenter: John Greitzer, Department of Conservation and Development		
23-May-11	The county supports setting flow requirements at Vernalis, but requests these requirements be quantitative for all four major tributaries in the San Joaquin Valley watershed.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The DWR's estimates of unimpaired runoff are accurate enough to be the basis of quantitative flow rates. The failed Salmon Population objective is evidence enough to avoid using of a narrative objective for flow rates.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The SWRCB should not rely on the San Joaquin River Restoration Program to determine flow rates needed to restore spring-run Chinook—quantitative minimum flow rates for the upper San Joaquin River Basin should be adopted as soon as possible.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	A minimum of 20% of the unimpaired flows should be bypassed through the tributary reservoirs at all times.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The SED should analyze an alternative based on the following principles: 1) Each of the four major eastside tributaries bypass at least 20% of unimpaired flow (consistent with Public Trust statues). 2) Additional unimpaired flows to meet higher Vernalis flow requirements should be based on water right priority with the San Joaquin Watershed. 3) A flow requirement should be used to determine whether even more flow is necessary to restore fish populations.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Relaxing the south Delta agricultural objectives would degrade the Delta as a source of drinking water and impact in-Delta water users and Delta ecosystem.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 13, Service Providers; Appendix H
23-May-11	The following two alternatives should be analyzed related to agricultural objectives for South Delta agriculture: 1) Objectives at Vernalis are 0.6 mmhos/cm from April–August and 0.85 mmhos/cm from September–March 2) Objectives for all four South Delta agricultural areas are 0.6 mmhos/cm from April–August and 0.85 mmhos/cm from September–March Analysis of the agricultural objectives will likely disclose there will be no added costs to SWP or CVP exporters.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
Contra Costa Water District		
Commenter: Greg Gartell, Assistant General Manager		
5-Jan-11	There are municipal intakes in the southern Delta and the CCWD pumping does not have a major effect on OMR flows.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
Commenter: Leah Orloff, Water Resources Manager		
8-Feb-11	Regarding evaluating the success of proposed changes to flows the Board should utilize metrics that recognize the cyclical nature of salmon populations (i.e. boom-bust). It may be more appropriate to use metrics that ensure environmental conditions can sustain fish populations rather than fish population metrics.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
8-Feb-11	Adjust actions on an annual basis in an adaptive management framework: increased spring outmigration flows, increased fall attraction flows, adequate temperatures along the SJR and its tributaries, and sufficient flow to mobilize fine sediment.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
8-Feb-11	CCWD does not support the relaxation of water quality standards in the Southern Delta	-
8-Feb-11	The Draft Technical Report does not adequately address impacts on municipal users as a result of poorer water quality. An analysis should be included in the SED of municipal impacts, with mitigation measures proposed, where impacts can be avoided. Impacts include decreased water supply reliability and degraded water quality, increased energy use and greenhouse gas emissions.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 13, Service Providers; Appendix H
8-Feb-11	CCWD pumping does not have a major effect on OMR flows	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
Commenter: Leah Orloff, Water Resources Manager		
20-May-11	CCWD does not support the relaxation of water quality objectives in the southern Delta.	-
20-May-11	Relaxing water quality objectives could result in degraded water quality and is counter to the 2009 Delta Reform Act and State and Federal anti-degradation policy.	Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
20-May-11	The water quality objectives in the NOP would allow higher salinity levels than those presented in the "Draft Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives." The CCWD commented on this report to document the impacts increased salinity levels would have on CCWD operations. Further relaxation of water quality objectives would exacerbate these impacts.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
20-May-11	The comments previously submitted by CCWD on the draft technical report should be considered in preparing the SED (included as an appendix to the comment letter).	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
20-May-11	The SED should include an analysis of the potential impacts the proposed alternative flow and salinity objectives will have on municipal users in the Delta.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 13, Service Providers
20-May-11	The increase in salinity objectives outside the flow objective window, July–January, could lead to degraded water quality and impact beneficial uses.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
20-May-11	Salinity increases at CCWD intakes would both decrease filling of Los Vaqueros Reservoir and increase the need for blending water, resulting in more frequent occasions when CCWD would be unable to meet the delivered water quality goal. Water releases from Los Vaqueros Reservoir to meet water quality objectives would reduce the amount of water available to CCWD during a drought or a catastrophic event.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 13, Service Providers
20-May-11	CCWD's operating permits contain limitations on diversions from the Delta to protect sensitive species; the benefit afforded to these species through the limitations may decrease if less water is available due to increased salinity.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 13, Service Providers
20-May-11	Increased salinity at CCWD intakes would require increased releases, which use energy and generate GHG emissions.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 14, Energy Resources and Climate Change; Appendix H
20-May-11	The SED should include a multiyear, monthly time series of flows and water quality with and without the proposed changes in flow and salinity objectives at each municipal intake in the Delta.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
20-May-11	The SED should include a sufficient range of hydrologic conditions.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
20-May-11	The SED should disclose monthly and seasonal water quality impacts.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
20-May-11	The water quality objectives would minimize the benefit of the Middle River Intake by increasing fall salinity. The SED should include mitigation measures that will mitigate any impacts to a less than significant level.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
Delta Stewardship Council		
Commenter: P. Joseph Grindstaff, Executive Director		
23-May-11	DSC supports and encourages the timely development and enforcement of both flow objectives for protecting fish and wildlife beneficial uses, and water quality objectives for salinity for protecting agricultural uses.	-
23-May-11	DSC supports providing more natural flow conditions, including temporal and spatial patterns, along with using an adaptive management approach to achieve optimal flow conditions to protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses while minimizing water supply costs.	-
23-May-11	DSC encourages the involvement of Natural Resource Agency staff and stakeholders in developing adaptive management and long-term management of SJR flows.	-
23-May-11	DSC supports the proposed development of a comprehensive monitoring, special studies, evaluation, and reporting program to inform real-time adaptive management flow recommendations.	-
23-May-11	DSC encourages the SWRCB to work closely with DSC to help ensure that the proposed SJR monitoring and evaluation program is based on the best available science.	-
23-May-11	DSC supports the proposed approach for development and implementation of salinity objectives and the proposal for special studies, monitoring and reporting requirements.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	DSC recommends that the State Water Board adopt the proposed salinity and flow based objectives as quickly as possible as a first step in revising the remainder of the water quality objectives in the Bay-Delta Plan.	-
23-May-11	DSC recommends an amended Bay-Delta Plan that specifies control actions for implementation by water rights holders, including DWR and Reclamation, since it is clear that the salinity regime in the Delta is driven by both natural flows and water management.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	DSC recommends that the Board adopt flow-based criteria for the SJR and the remainder of the Delta that support achievement of coequal goals.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
Friant Water Authority		
Commenter: D. Zackary Smith, Attorney for FWA		
23-May-11	The ability for junior appropriators downstream of senior appropriators to divert water released to meet objectives needs to be addressed in this process.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Diversion and consumptive use below Vernalis violates the objectives, even if they are met at Vernalis. This problem manifested in VAMP experiment and must be addressed here.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Riparian diversions should cease or be limited based on unimpaired natural flows when stored water is released to meet downstream objectives, and junior appropriator should cease diversion when senior appropriator releases water to meet objectives. State Water Board should implement an enforcement program before additional releases are required.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	If a pure water rights priority approach is used, an impact analysis must be done to show that benefits outweigh the costs.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
23-May-11	Tributary by tributary evaluation of flow regimes must be scientifically supported for the benefit of fishery management programs.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
23-May-11	VAMP should be extended until new flow regimes are implemented.	-
23-May-11	The SED and this process must recognize the Water Management Goal of the Settlement.	Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
G. Fred Lee and Associates		
Commenter: G. Fred Lee and Anna Jones-Lee		
22-May-11	The 2006 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Estuary (Bay-Delta) (2006 Bay-Delta Plan) fails to address two of the SJRJ Delta flow issues that need to be addressed as part of protecting/enhancing the fall run of Chinook Salmon that spawn in the SJR tributaries. 1) Maintaining the flow of the SIR through the Deep Water Ship Channel (DWSC) to eliminate/greatly reduce the low DO conditions that inhibit the fall run of Chinook Salmon to SIR eastside tributaries. 2) Maintaining the flow of SJR water that is present in the SJR at Vernalis so that the Chinook salmon home stream water chemical signal is present at the confluence of the SJR with the Sacramento River.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
22-May-11	The SWRCB should prohibit the diversion of SJR water that would cause SJR DWSC flows to decrease below about 1,000 cfs.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
22-May-11	The SWRCB should require that at least some of the SJR water present at Vernalis be allowed to pass all the way down the SJR to its confluence with the Sacramento River in the Western Delta.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
22-May-11	With adequate flow of the SJR through the DWSC, and by allowing an appropriate averaging of DO water quality objective compliance it is possible to eliminate the current residual low-DO problem in the DWSC. The DSC should consider these issues in developing a Directed Action that impacts the amount of SJR flow through the DWSC.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
22-May-11	It is critical that DSC establish a program that requires that the SWRCB management of the IEP Delta monitoring of the Delta channels be focused on evaluating the impact of permitted water diversions on Delta water quality and Delta resources as required in D-1641.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Formerly National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)		
Commenter: Maria Rea, Supervisor, Central Valley Office		
23-May-11	More modeling may be needed in order to evaluate effects of the proposed plan without more specific parameters on percent of unimpaired flows and cfs values.	Chapter 4, Introduction to Analysis; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Appendix F.1, F.2, and L
23-May-11	Additional modeling should be done to evaluate water temperatures that would be expected with new flow standards.	Chapter 4, Introduction to Analysis; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Appendix F.1 and F.2
23-May-11	Table 3 should include the federally listed Central Valley steelhead and add flow regimes that would benefit the steelhead.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Concerned regarding reliance on FERC proceedings to implement appropriate flow due to conflicting mandates and objectives.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
23-May-11	Also, FERC relicensing for Tuolumne and Merced Rivers will not be completed until 2016 and SWRCB's narrative flow objectives will need to be decided before that. It would also result in delays of benefits to severely depressed anadromous fish populations.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
23-May-11	NMFS recommends that the SWRCB consider a greater range of options, including the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and Delta Plan.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	While NMFS supports the natural flow regime, establishing flows as a percentage of unimpaired flow may result in unsuitable flows for anadromous fish year round. NMFS recommends the SWRCB consider year-round flows when determining percentages of unimpaired flows.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	NMFS is supportive of the Coordinated Operations Group (COG) management for flows from February–June.	-
23-May-11	Concerned that COG will only focus on the adaptive management for flows during February–June .	-
23-May-11	Concerned that due to divergent interests of the COG, they may be unable to reach an agreement on flows in a timely manner, if at all.	-
23-May-11	NMFS would like to see clearer guidance regarding the decision-making process for COG.	-
23-May-11	The USFWS should be considered as a potential group member because of their expertise/authority related to anadromous fish.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The SJRMEP will include, at a minimum, monitoring, special studies, evaluations of flow on viability of fish populations, including abundance, spatial extent, diversity and productivity.	-
23-May-11	The effect of flow during different times of the year will help determine adaptive management and future changes to the San Joaquin River flow objectives.	-
23-May-11	NMFS agrees that the SJRMEP should integrate and coordinate with existing monitoring and special studies programs on the SJ River watershed.	-
Natural Resource Defense Council		
Commenter: Doug Obegi, Staff Attorney		
23-May-11	NRDC supports the NOP, but believes the narrative approach for the fish and wildlife objective is inadequate, based on experience of the existing salmon doubling.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The quantities objectives should be included in the Final NOP. The quantitative objectives should: 1) increase flows and provide more natural variability at Vernalis and in the three San Joaquin River tributaries; 2) include a narrow range of unimpaired flow conditions; and 3) include a minimum and maximum flow condition.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	NRDC suggests a narrow range of water quality objectives, as opposed to a single value, to allow for adaptive management.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	A minimum and maximum flow value should ensure an increase in flow volumes relative to existing conditions; the max value should be set at 20,000 cfs at Vernalis.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	NRDC agrees that the program should consider measures to address stressors, but suggests removing the phrase "together with other reasonably controlled measures…Watershed." This statement is too vague.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Flow conditions are the most important driver of ecosystem health and salmon abundance. Therefore, other measures, like restrictions on the CVP/SWP operations, should be considered in other proceedings or as part of the adaptive management program.	Chapter 17, Summary of Impacts and Comparison of Alternatives; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	NRDC supports the expansion of the geographic scope of the NOP to include Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers.	-
23-May-11	NRDC recommends that quantified objectives for productivity and other attributes of the fall Chinook, as well as quantified objectives for abundance and attributes of other species, be developed.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The adaptive management program should explicitly link flow conditions to achieving biological objectives (consider the Logic Chain Approach)	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	NRDC agrees with DWR and expert witnesses that San Joaquin River inflows are a critically important factor in determining the abundance and survival of salmon and steelhead, and therefore NRDC supports efforts to increase river inflows.	-
23-May-11	NRDC believes additional protections, beyond increased inflows, are needed to 1) project the Public Trust; 2) achieve salmon doubling requirements. NRDC hopes these actions will be addressed in the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan.	-
Northern California Water Association		
Commenter: Todd Manley, Director of Government Relations		
19-Mar-09	NCWA emphasizes that any Bay-Delta Plan updates related to Southern Delta salinity and San Joaquin River flow objectives must ensure that they do not result in any increased river flow objectives for the Sacramento River or other re-directed impacts to the Sacramento River Basin.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
19-Mar-09	NCWA intends to continue to participate in the process and will provide more detailed comments on other issues relating to the Sacramento River basin.	-
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission County of San Joaquin and San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District		
Commenter: Deanne Gillick, Attorney-at-Law		
19-Mar-09	Reliance on BDCP inappropriate, as it is being developed to protect Delta exports by SWP & CVP.	-
19-Mar-09	Impacts on SJ County's economy, industries, agriculture, wildlife, fisheries and recreation must be fully analyzed in the EIR/S.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Chapter 8, Terrestrial Biological Resources; Chapter 10, Recreational Resources and Visual Quality; Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources; Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
19-Mar-09	Any negative changes to salinity objectives will impact assimilative capacity of SJR and legal dischargers and diverters within county and must be evaluated in EIR/S.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
19-Mar-09	The groundwater basin is not in a condition to meet current demand. Due to overdraft conditions, salt water has intruded into the basin and threatens long-term viability of groundwater use within the county.	Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
19-Mar-09	County objects USBR and DWR's current level of reliance on New Melones to meet SDS and SJRF objectives due to decreased water available to farmers overlying the groundwater basin and that impact on the groundwater basin.	Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources
19-Mar-09	Salinity objectives should not be relaxed, and effects of CVP imported salts to SJR, decreased SJRF due to CVP operations, and salts in Delta channels due to altered flow patterns from pumps should be included within any environmental documentation.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix C and F.2
19-Mar-09	Minimum flows and water levels should be analyzed in the EIR/S and standards established by SWRCB for water quality and quantity to protect beneficial uses and support agricultural uses.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources
19-Mar-09	Potential impacts of decreased WQ and flows to levees, infrastructure, F&W, recreation, economy need to be fully evaluated in EIR/S.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Chapter 8, Terrestrial Biological Resources; Chapter 10, Recreational Resources and Visual Quality; Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources; Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
19-Mar-09	Factors outside of the Delta that impact salinity in the Delta need to be evaluated in EIR/S.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix C and F.2
Commenter: DeeAnn Gillick, Attorney-at-Law		
23-May-11	The county supports meeting flow requirements on the San Joaquin River through sources other than the Stanislaus River.	-
23-May-11	The Water Board should evaluate and require flow contributions from the mainstream San Joaquin River. The Water Board should establish enforcement standards for the upper watershed portion of the river.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The Water Board's rational for not evaluating flows from the upper San Joaquin is not justified; you cannot ignore one segment of the river just because the San Joaquin Restoration Program is pending.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The county does not support the Water Board in becoming involved in the regulation of groundwater. Expansion of the Water Board's authority over groundwater would be costly to the state and water users. Groundwater management should remain at the local level.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources
23-May-11	Control of groundwater by the Water Board would in excess of the Board's statutory authority and require changes to State law (commenter cites page 4 of the Draft San Joaquin River Fish and Wildlife Flow Objectives."	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The county does not support the proposal to increase the interior Delta salinity objectives. The objectives are in place to project water quality, pursuant to the Delta Protection Statute, Water Code Sections 12200 et seq.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources
23-May-11	The Hoffman report (used by the Water Board) does not support increasing the salinity objectives. Rather, it concludes additional information is needed to properly understand water quality needs in the Delta and potential agricultural effects of increased salinity.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources; Appendix E
23-May-11	The Hoffman Report's conclusion that water quality standards can be increased due to observed irrigation efficiencies (page 101) cannot be supported by factual evidence from monitoring stations.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources; Appendix E
23-May-11	The Hoffman Report relies on leaching fractions from drainage areas no affected by shallow, salty groundwater.	Chapter 12, Agricultural Resources; Appendix E
23-May-11	The county believes the Hoffman report is flawed and inaccurate and should not be used by the Water Board.	-
23-May-11	The county supports adoption of a narrative standard for southern Delta salinity objectives.	-
23-May-11	The current salinity problem is caused by contributions of CVP imported salts; decreased River flows due to CVP operations; and salt concentrations in the Delta channels due to CVP and SWP pumps.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	Flow and circulation within the South Delta must be addressed as it contributes to salinity problems; the current flow is affected by export projects.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix C, D, F.2, and H
23-May-11	The county supports the requirement for DWR and USBR to develop mitigation to improve South Delta circulation and water levels to meet water quality and agricultural needs.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority		
Commenter: Paul R. Minasian, Attorney for SJRECWA		
20-May-11	Past Board orders and statements require it to review and revise (if needed) the numeric salinity standards at Vernalis and three interior Delta locations. However, the NOP states that no such review or consideration will occur, in lieu of focusing on a more natural flow pattern.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
20-May-11	The Board is in violation of CEQA if continues with current salinity approach. The SWRCB by its past orders and determinations must consider alternative numeric salinity standards and their impacts in its functional equivalent document. The NOP and scoping document impermissibly exclude alternatives, which must be examined under CEQA. No other alternatives are mentioned, and no method of appraising the different impacts and alternatives of different numeric salinity standards or flows that differ from natural pre-human development and presence are suggested.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
20-May-11	The SWRCB has refused to consider and develop evidence of environmental consequences of more natural flow regimes (or more or colder water), in particular the actual and increased numbers and health of fish that cold water or high flows actually benefit. Again, this violates CEQA.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
20-May-11	The SWRCB, under CEQA, must develop baseline analysis and alternatives itself, not rely on others to do formulate alternatives. The notion that natural is better cannot be simply assumed. The SWRCB has not developed a process to assess this conclusion and consider alternatives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
San Joaquin River Group Authority San Joaquin Tributaries Association		
Commenter: Tom O'Laughlin, Attorney-at-Law		
23-May-11	The narrative objectives should not include the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program doubling goal. The Narrative Objective should not include the term "viable native."	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Objective period should be March 15–May 15, not February–June	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The natural flow regime is not applicable to a highly physically altered basin and should not be considered (evidence cited in Appendix A of the comment letter).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Population control of nonnative predators should be the primary management tool.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The state water board doubling goal is inadequate and does not represent the best science.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The "escapement data" used to develop the doubling goal is flawed because: 1) a large portion of the data was hatchery fish; 2) there was no constant fractional marking during the baseline period; and 3) data was collected using bias and unreliable methods.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Appendix C
23-May-11	There is no evidence that instream management and habitat improvements will enable the doubling goal to be met.	Appendix C
23-May-11	The natural production estimate does not provide agencies with an adequate tool to evaluate how soon the doubling goals may be met because it does not include information on 1) origins of fish; 2) age structure; and 3) measurement errors of escapement surveys.	Appendix C
23-May-11	The doubling goal could be met in the near term if ocean harvest was eliminated for several years.	Appendix C
23-May-11	There are few, if any, native salmonid populations in the SJ basin. It is therefore misleading to assume management objectives will support "native" stocks and increased "genetic diversity". The following supports this statement: 1) Offsite releases of hatchery fish have documented benefits (e.g., increased survival), but also negative effectives (e.g., loss of genetic diversity in the natural stock); 2) A large number of hatchery fish were observed in the Stanislaus River in 2009. Given that neither the Stanislaus nor the Tuolumne River have hatcheries, a portion of in-river spawning salmon in the SJ basin must have strayed from their hatchery of origin; 3) Research by ICF Jones & Stokes demonstrates the high rate of straying amongst hatchery fish. Other independent assessments indicate that off-site releases have considerably higher rates of straying and that the rates vary by hatchery. 4) Small contributions from segregated hatchery programs to natural populations can reduce fitness; 5) Hatchery programs are only warranted if the increases in population outweigh the associated fitness loss; and 6) The Central Valley Chinook are homogenized due to hatchery programs.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The majority of fry migrate by mid-March and all juveniles by May 15. The primary cue to migrate is not winter runoff but increased turbidity—there is not a strong response associated with reservoir managed flows as they do not increase turbidity.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7 Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Non-flood flows in the SJ Basin will not accomplish natural flow regime benefits such as supporting native fish, natural food webs, habitat connectivity, floodplain inundation, fluvial hydrogeomorphological processes, and improved temperatures.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Salmonids are known to adapt to manipulated flow regimes. As such, altering the flow regime will not provide tangible benefits.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	It is important that the project focus on ways to manage flows that will actually produce benefits to salmonids (e.g., inundate floodplains that no longer exist, provide channel maintenance).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Flow does not explain low survival rates of juvenile salmon in the South Delta (evidence provided in Appendix A of comment letter).	-
23-May-11	Flows of up to 25,000 cfs have not been shown to increase juvenile salmon survival.	-
23-May-11	Studies suggest that high predation rates in the lower SJ River and South Delta are the primary factor to low survival, not flow rates. Predator control is the primary mechanism that should be considered by the Board to meet water quality objectives.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority and Westlands Water District		
Commenter: Jon D. Rubin, Attorney for SLDMWA		
23-May-11	The State Water Board lacks authority to regulate flow, water level, and circulation under the Clean Water Act or Porter-Cologne Act.	Chapter 1, Introduction
23-May-11	The Authority and Westlands request that the Board insert a section on life-cycle modeling into the implementation program.	Chapter 4, Introduction to Analysis; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	A science plan should be developed to support life-cycle models, including four main components: 1) Identification of available life-cycle models or salmon, steelhead, and smelt species dependent on the Delta, with recommendations for development and prioritization of new models. 2) Identification and synthesis of statistical analysis of existing data, with recommendations for additional data development that will either improve existing life-cycle models or assist with the development of new ones. 3) Identification of hypotheses that if tested will improve life-cycle models or assist with the development of new ones. 4) Description of how the results of analyses from these models and other analytical tools can be integrated to ensure that effects of actions are considered in context with the many species dependent at least in part on the Delta.	Chapter 4, Introduction to Analysis; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The State Water Board must define the baseline	Chapter 4, Introduction to Analysis
23-May-11	In the case of the SJR, the Board will need to consider alternatives protective of beneficial uses that are not flow-centric and evaluate alternatives that have varying degrees of protection and costs.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	State Water Board must evaluate direct and indirect effects caused by changes in water supply that may be available to areas served by the Authority's member agencies including land fallowing, reduced employment, reduced land value, reduced crop production, increased groundwater, and reduced air quality.	Chapter 16, Cumulative Impact Summary, Growth-Inducing Effects, and Irreversible Commitment of Resources
South Delta Water Agency		
Commenter: John Herrick, Counsel and Manager		
20-Mar-09	SDWA adopts the comments submitted by CDWA.	See CDWA.
20-Mar-09	NOP is premature given the lack of defined project, the necessity of maintain and/or improving the requirements for salinity protection, and the need to establish and increase minimum flows on the San Joaquin River.	
Commenter: John Herrick, Counsel and Manager		
22-April-09	Existing objectives were developed with input from a panel of experts. The current effort does not provide for that; it only asks for new information.	-
22-April-09	Underlying scientific principles and soils and crops have not changed substantially since the existing objectives were adopted. So why change now?	-
22-April-09	Until Dr. Hoffman's report is completed there is no basis for suggesting changes to the standards.	-
22-April-09	There is no proposed CEQA project upon which to comment on or propose alternatives.	-
22-April-09	Information was already submitted to the CDO and other processes. Only an independent peer-review of soil salinity models can assure useful output.	-
22-April-09	Prior submittals provide evidence of damage to crop yields when salinity exceeds standards, and the SWRCB has not taken any action to enforce.	-
22-April-09	There is information indicating that a more protective standard may be needed during seed germination and during September through March.	-
22-April-09	Those responsible for importing salts to the San Joaquin River and decreasing flows should be required to mitigate their impacts.	-
22-April-09	It appears that current flow standards have not been protective of either salmon or steelhead. The SWRCB should consider proposals like the Delta Corridors, which reconnects the SJR with the Bay.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
22-April-09	The SDWA submitted the 1980 report on the effect of the CVP, and the SWRCB may need to update how increased consumptive use on the tributaries has affected Delta inflow.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
22-April-09	Pre-CVP and SWP salinity levels in the San Joaquin River and Delta were lower than they are today. Delta users should not be limited by upstream activities that increase salinity.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix F.2
22-April-09	The CVP and SWP operations have changed flow patterns in the south Delta and created null zones with higher salinity	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix F.2
22-April-09	A decrease of cross-Delta flows would not allow standards to be met in the central or southern Delta.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
Commenter: John Herrick, Counsel and Manager		
6-Dec-10	Comments regarding the draft technical report; the analysis does not discuss the required investigations associated with the potential changes to the objectives such as anti-degradation rules/policies; no discussion of legal limits and mandates which affect how much flow may be necessary with respect to Biological Opinions/federal mandates; no mention of sources of impacts on beneficial uses.	Appendix C
6-Dec-10	Documents specific changes to the different sections of the draft technical report.	Appendix C
Commenter: John Herrick, Counsel and Manager		
23-May-11	Further investigation and analysis into the water quality necessary to protect southern Delta agriculture is needed.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources
23-May-11	The Hoffman Report contains numerous flaws and should not be used to support project conclusions. Moreover, the analysis is based on data that does not represent the project area. The following flaws are noted: - Leaching fractions are based on drainage information form areas not subject to shallow, salty ground water. - An applied water quality of 0.7 ED standard is assumed. There is no basis to propose any relaxation to the standards as the NOP is based on faulty conclusions and data within the Hoffman Report.	Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources; Appendix D
23-May-11	The Hoffman Report concluded that an adequate amount of water was flowing through the soil profile for the removal of salts. Laboratory data contradicts this conclusion. Thus, the Hoffman Report does not contain reliable information on which to base a change in the salinity standards.	Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources; Appendix D
23-May-11	The Hoffman Report fails to take into consideration agricultural practices that may affect the ability to apply irrigation water and allow additional time for percolation.	Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources; Appendix D

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The SED should contain a peer review of the Hoffman Report so that independent experts can confirm and comment on the serious problems in the Report.	Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources; Appendix D
23-May-11	The Hoffman Report fails to explain examples on crop damage in the area due to high salt concentrations.	Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources; Appendix D
23-May-11	There is no basis to propose any changes to the water quality standards until further testing and experimentation can be done. Currently, the analysis includes no information on water quality outside of the project monitoring. Because the compliance zones are not located in the stagnant or null zones, the quality of water being used by diverters, and thus potential leaching rates, are unknown.	-
23-May-11	The proposed changes would allow for a degradation of water quality at compliance locations, but includes no analysis on how this degradation of water quality would affect null zones.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	SDWA supports the narrative flow standard, but suggests it further be developed to provide a more specific set of actions and a rigid timetable.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	To ensure salinity objectives are enforced and implemented, export limitations should eventually be linked to meeting the standards, with an automatic decrease or shut down when exceedances occur.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The SED should include an analysis of the effects of proposed changes in export facilities, both on an existing and future time horizon (as required be CEQA).	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	Any change in southern Delta exports would result in less CVP salt being removed from the area, and a worsening of the water for local diverters.	-
23-May-11	An anti-degradation analysis is required.	-
23-May-11	The effects of allowing worse water quality will also affect other beneficial uses.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources; Chapter 13, Service Providers
23-May-11	SDWA has not provided any expert witness or other materials relating to fishery needs/flows on the San Joaquin River.	-
23-May-11	The SED should take into consideration the actual and purported “conservation” efforts by the upstream agencies and other parties, which will result in less flow in the river at many times.	Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)
23-May-11	The analysis should not go forward until the USBR complies with the directives of HR 2828.	Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The amounts of water needed for fish and for salinity control will be different once the Bureau complies with the law and makes the discretionary decisions about how much less New Melones water it will use for these purposes.	-
State Water Contractors		
Commenter: Terry Erlewine, General Manager		
23-May-11	SWP operations do not impact either the timing or quantity of flows in the San Joaquin River at Vernalis because the state operates no storage or diversion facilities on the San Joaquin River.	-
23-May-11	The SWC suggests the Environmental Document recognize that the program of implementation contain no SWP obligations related to flows.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The proposed flow prescriptions must be scientifically justified.	Appendix C
23-May-11	The water quality objectives do not address underlying stressors that may violate the CWA and Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	A collective technical team should be assembled and guided by the following principles: 1) focus on ecological processes and mechanism for fish abundance, and 2) keep the modeling as simple as possible.	-
23-May-11	A full scientific analysis of the expected benefits over the life cycle of the fish of concern from any proposed flow increase needs to be included in the CEQA documentation.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The requirement for a flow rate downstream of Vernalis implies that juvenile salmonids will survive through the Delta if flows are not impacted by diversion. The SWC is aware of no scientific data that support such a statement.	-
23-May-11	The downstream flow rate is too vague and does not allow for appropriate comment.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	As the San Joaquin River passes Vernalis, it moves into an area where tidal action overwhelms river flows. In this tidally dominated area, migratory fish do not respond to changes in flow.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Changes in flow patterns likely have an undetectable effect on migrating juvenile salmonids and provide little reason to expect adverse impacts caused by the export diversions.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Appendix C
23-May-11	Junctions along the San Joaquin River are relatively insensitive to increasing exports.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	The DSM2 HYDRO model to predict fish movement is superior to using Particle Tracking Modeling (PTM).	-
23-May-11	The Delta Passage Model illustrates the effects of exports on salmon survival are very small relative to nonproject stressors.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The SWC suggests that the Board identify 1) scientific evidence it has to support its belief regarding the effects of in-Delta diversions on juvenile Salmonid migration; 2) lifecycle factors that could be affected by in-Delta and export diversions during particular time periods; 3) mechanisms at play; and 4) monitoring and testing schemes to evaluate effects.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Appendix C
23-May-11	Adoption of a flow objective for the San Joaquin River below Vernalis would be unreasonable without additional scientific analysis.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Table 2 should be modified to remove both the —from and —to references to the column labeled —Compliance Locations and footnote 5	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Plans to re-evaluate whether compliance stations properly reflect water quality throughout the South Delta could be clearly by expanding the paragraph discussing this subject in the middle of page 4.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	There is no scientific support the conclusion that elevated salinity in the southern Delta is caused in part by diversions of water by the SWP. DSM2 studies show that SWP diversions improve water quality in some areas of the southern Delta and are neutral, at worst, in the rest of the southern Delta.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	Reduction in pumping by the SWP would likely have far greater negative consequences for southern Delta water quality than current operations	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	Water level issues do not fall within the purview of the Porter-Cologne Act; they are rather water rights issues. Reference to water levels should be stricken from the RNOP and, instead, be reserved for consideration during future water rights proceedings	Chapter 1 Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Studies on water circulation salinity conditions should not fall solely on the SWP and CVP water users. The Board should consider an alternative that provide for these studies to be carried out by the State Board itself, with cooperation from DWR and southern Delta water users.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	SWC considers the State Board's proposed approach to southern Delta circulation/salinity issues to be seriously flawed.	-
23-May-11	SWC is developing additional DSM2 model runs that will examine circulation and null zones under varied conditions and pumping rates. SWC believes the DSM2 runs will show that the problems facing in-Delta diverters are caused by in-Delta diversions in excess of the available flow at Vernalis and that circulation problems and null zones are a function of these excess diversion rates and the bathymetry of the southern Delta channels, not export project operations.	Appendix F.1, F.2, and H
23-May-11	There is no evidence that export project operations need to be regulated, or that regulation will resolve southern Delta salinity issues. The Board should focus on finding the actual cause of southern Delta circulation problems rather than starting with a presumption that the export projects are primarily at fault.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
Stanislaus County Environmental Review Committee		
Commenter: Raul Mendez, Senior Management Consultant		
25-Mar-09	No comments.	-
Stockton East Water District		
Commenter: Karna E. Harrigfeld, Attorney-at-Law, Herum/Crabtree		
18-Mar-09	Must include thorough investigation of all sources of salt entering Delta.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix F.2
18-Mar-09	Must discuss adverse impacts to beneficial uses protected by salinity objectives and analyze and attribute responsibility to water rights holders from these impacts.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
18-Mar-09	Salinity problem caused by deliveries from San Luis Unit of CVP. This should be analyzed as an alternative.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix F.2
18-Mar-09	Salinity also caused by discharges from wetlands/ refuges.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
18-Mar-09	Vernalis salinity objective cannot be maintained by continued releases from New Melones.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
18-Mar-09	Salinity control actions such as subsurface storage of drainage, land retirement, and out of valley disposal should be evaluated.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
18-Mar-09	Evaluate and attribute responsibility to water rights holders for impacts associated with flow objectives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 13, Service Providers
18-Mar-09	Identify specific mitigation measures if appropriate.	All chapters.

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
Commenter: Karna E. Harrigfeld, Attorney-at-Law, Herum/Crabtree		
23-May-11	The following comments are regarding Attachment 2-Draft San Joaquin River Fish and Wildlife Objectives: 1) What "other reasonably controllable measures" are being evaluated? 2) And how do they compare to the alleged need for more flow? 3) If using other controllable measures leads to doubling of Chinook salmon, the SED evaluate reduction in flows on tributaries? 4) What does the SWB mean by "natural Production" and what are "viable native SJ River watershed fish? 5) How does SWB define native migratory SJ River fish populations and are "hatchery" fish included?	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	On what "decisional document" does the SWB determine that more natural pattern of flow is needed from February–June to achieve the narrative SJ River flow objective? And what "decisional document" was used to support the conclusion that more flow is needed from existing salmon and steelhead trout bearing tributaries to Vernalis in order to provide connectivity with the Delta and more closely "mimic the natural hydrographic condition?"	Appendix C
23-May-11	The Draft Technical Report (DTR) was highly criticized as being woefully inadequate and not based on the best science such as the DFG San Joaquin River Fall-run Chinook Salmon Population Model which was discredited by the Scientific Peer Review panel.	-
23-May-11	The DTR fails to consider many significant factors that have contributed to the decline of the fishery other than flows such as predation, introduction of nonnative species, pollution, highly modified Delta conditions, temperature, and dissolved oxygen.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Appendix C
23-May-11	The best available science should be used to evaluate what protections are needed for SJ River fish and wildlife beneficial uses.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	The SWB has no legal, factual, or practicable authority to exclude water from the Upper SJ River as contributing to meet any new SJ River flow or salinity objective. The Upper SJ River watershed comprises more than 30% of the unimpaired flow and excluding it is fundamentally unfair and illegal.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Obtain additional information to inform specific instream flow needs on the Stanislaus River.	-
23-May-11	Any alternative evaluated in the SED that includes flow contribution from New Melones Reservoir must recognize that due to a court order issued when original water rights were issued, the New Melones Reservoir must be limited to 1,250 cfs for the protection of agricultural users along the Stanislaus river.	Chapter 6, Flooding, Sediment and Erosion; Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources
23-May-11	The following comments are regarding Attachment 3-Draft Southern Delta Agricultural Water Quality Objectives: The salinity objective at Vernalis violates both state and federal law (CWA and Public Law 108-361) because the objective is not required for "reasonable protection" of agricultural uses at Vernalis. Proposing a Vernalis salinity objective that this overprotective of agricultural beneficial uses exceeds the authority granted the SWB under the Water Code.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The SED must provide a reasonable range of alternatives to the project. As such, failure to consider a range of potential salinity levels at Vernalis violates CEQA.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	The range presented by the Hoffman Report supporting an evaluation for a water quality objective of anywhere from 0.9-1.4 EC, may be protective of agricultural beneficial uses in the Southern Delta, and this range must be evaluated.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Other alternatives must be analyzed. The salinity problems are caused by deliveries from the San Luis Unit of the CVP.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Completion of a drain was a condition of authorizing the San Luis Unit and because deliveries were made without provision for a drain, pollution of the SJ River has resulted.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	One of the alternatives for achieving the Vernalis salinity objective should be the imposition of a condition on the San Luis Unit permits to release water to comply with Vernalis salinity objective.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	SED must also analyze reducing or eliminating discharges caused from wetlands and wildlife refuges. One mitigation is to require the wetland/wildlife refuges to reserve a portion of their water supply for use to dilute discharge in the spring.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	SED must also analyze agricultural and tile drainage caused from west side agricultural interests. The Grasslands Bypass and West Side Drainage Projects have had success reducing salinity.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Additional salinity controls such as subsurface storage of drainage, land retirement and out of valley disposal should also be considered.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Adoption of salinity objectives for the entire river and implementation through waste disposal permits that would prohibit discharge rather than control its timing should also be considered.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Maintaining the Vernalis salinity objective violates California Constitution's prohibition against the unreasonable use of water. The "[u]se of upstream water to wash our salts downstream is an unreasonable use of water." (Jordan v. City of Santa Barbara (1996); Antioch v. Williams Irrigation District (1922).	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
23-May-11	Maintaining the Vernalis salinity objective imposes a disproportionate burden on New Melones Reservoir. Other means have not been successful and the dilution flows released from New Melones have been the sole means by which the Vernalis objective has been met. As such, the New Melones CVP contractors (which include Stockton East) have had their water supply reduced and the burden has fallen on these contractors which have not caused the problem.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	40 CFR 131.10(a) states, "in no case shall a State adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a designated use for any water of the United States." By admitting that the Vernalis salinity object is not for protection of agriculture, but to provide dilution flow for downstream, is in contradiction and violates federal law.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The Vernalis objective also violates the Congressional directive contained in H.R. 2828 to reduce the use of New Melones Reservoir to meet the existing Bay-Delta water quality objectives.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis ,
City of Tracy		
Commenter: Melissa A. Thorme, Special Counsel for City of Tracy		
20-May-11	Supportive of the modified salinity objectives proposed. Requests that the SWRCB carefully consider and balance each of the factors in Water Code Section 13241 when establishing EC objectives: economic impact to farmers and dischargers, the reasonably achievable water quality conditions, and potential impacts of the objectives and the activities to meet the objectives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
20-May-11	Objectives should be set to apply only at identified, permitted water diversion points used to extract water from the SJR or Delta for irrigation or municipal supply, and only as long term (six month or annual averages).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
20-May-11	Alternatively, explicit mixing zones, dilution credit, or other variance provisions should be included in the Delta Plan amendments incorporating the revised objectives, as should compliance schedules allowing dischargers time to come into compliance.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
20-May-11	The SWRCB should not over-regulate municipal dischargers because they have not been demonstrated to be the major drivers of salinity in the Delta, and should incorporate necessary regulatory flexibility into salinity objectives adopted.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Appendix H
20-May-11	As part of the plan to implement the EC objectives, the SWRCB should describe the actions all dischargers must take to meet the objectives (including municipalities), provide a schedule for implementation of recommended actions, and describe the surveillance required to determine compliance.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Appendix H
U.S. Department of the Interior on Behalf of U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		
6-Dec-10	Comments made on the Draft Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives. Comments include: establishing biological and ecosystem goals and objectives; use of the natural hydrograph; adaptive management; tributary flows; changing environmental conditions; San Joaquin River outflow as a component of Delta outflow; hydrology and water supply including reservoir storage and management. Comments made regarding salinity objectives include these topics: drinking water supplies and riparian rights.	Appendix C
8-Feb-11	DOI supports the Board's consideration of flow objectives based on the percent Unimpaired flow, and these flows originating from the three main SJR tributaries.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
8-Feb-11	The Board should consider apportioning responsibility for mainstem instream flow among as many water users as possible and opposes any assignment of responsibility only on water rights of the CVP.	-
8-Feb-11	The Board should consider: 1) setting well-defined goals, 2) increasing flows to double populations of salmonids, 3) using the natural hydrograph to guide flow decisions, 4) the importance of Delta and tributary flows to salmonids, 5) utilizing appropriate modeling to evaluate flow alternatives, 6) developing an adaptive management framework supported by a strong science program.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Appendix C, D, F.1, and F.2
23-May-11	Interior recommends that the SWRCB concentrate efforts in the early phases of implementation to ensure the rapid stabilization of anadromous fish populations.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Interior supports the Board's consideration of implementing the narrative salmon doubling goal.	-
23-May-11	Interior supports the addition of compliance stations on the tributaries.	-
23-May-11	Interior is in favor of focusing the first stage of implementation on the salmon bearing tributaries while allowing the reintroduction of salmon in the upper San Joaquin.	-
23-May-11	Interior agrees that flow contributions from salmon bearing tributaries are key to ensuring a healthy ecosystem and equitable program of implementation.	-
23-May-11	Interior supports the Board's use of adaptive management, but notes that "true" adaptive management is a scientific process dependent upon testing hypotheses.	-
23-May-11	It appears that the San Joaquin River Monitoring Evaluation Program is geared more toward adaptive management, while the coordinated operations group is geared toward informing flexible flow schedules.	-
23-May-11	The environmental analysis should 1) identify what proportion of unimpaired flow is needed to meet the salmon doubling goal; 2) identify beneficial effects in terms of specific and measurable biological objectives; 3) evaluate alternative programs of implementation; and 4) analyze impacts to storage and reservoir purpose tradeoffs.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Appendix C, D, F.1, and F.2
23-May-11	Reservoir purpose tradeoffs are best accomplished through the use of a general investigations (GI) type model.	-
23-May-11	Consider all flow related salmonid life-cycle requirements to determine the appropriate level of unimpaired flow needed in the mainstream, tributaries, and Delta to achieve the stated doubling goal.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Identify the "other reasonably controllable measures" and clarify who will fund and enforce the control of these other measures.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The narrative salmon doubling goal should be broken down into specific biological objectives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Provide the flows that are hypothesized to meet these biological/survival objectives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix F.1
23-May-11	Ensure that biological objectives can be monitored and successes and failures evaluated.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Interior suggests the development and use of conceptual and other types of models (e.g., empirical and life-cycle) to help determine the flows necessary to meet the biological objectives.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Provide the needed flows for all life-stages of salmonids on each of the San Joaquin tributaries.	Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Clarify the relationship and integration that is expected to occur with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission hydropower relicensing processes on the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
23-May-11	Document the tributary flows needed to meet the salmon doubling goals in the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers during the FERC Section 401 certification process.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 19, Antidegradation Analysis
23-May-11	Adopt measures to ensure that the tributary flows reach Vernalis and beyond.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Compliance points should be equitable.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	A broad range of San Joaquin River flow objectives (20–80% of unimpaired flow) needs to be analyzed.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Appendix C
23-May-11	Alternatives should be based on the functional features of the natural hydrograph and a range of unimpaired flow volumes.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Appendix C
23-May-11	Establishing a flow objective at a higher percentage of unimpaired flow than is initially required would allow for both phasing over time and experimentation within a range of unimpaired flows for the implementation of the adaptive management process.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Monitoring must be in place and robust enough to detect differences in the biological objectives given the various percentages of unimpaired flow tested.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Year-round flows are needed to meet salmonid life-stage requirements.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	During prolonged droughts, a percentage of unimpaired flows will be unsuitable. During these times, higher portions of unimpaired flow may be required.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Exports levels should be part of a basin plan. A range of exports and other permitted diversions should be modeled when analyzing Vernalis flow alternatives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Use an adaptive management to determine the flow objective as a percentage of unimpaired flow over the long-term. Adaptive management should include: 1) modeling; 2) hypothesis testing; 3) monitoring; 4) research on specific objectives; 5) flexible metrics; and 6) range of unimpaired flows. Create an adaptive management planning group as part of SJRMEP to guide the process.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Secure funding for the multi-year plan.	-
23-May-11	The COG should include members from Reclamation, FWS, DWR, Fish and Game, NMFS, and staff from the San Joaquin River tributaries. The goals and objectives of the COG should be clearly articulated.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Alterations to the regulated flow regimes of the mainstream San Joaquin River and its tributaries could have system operations impacts statewide.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality
23-May-11	Adopt a holistic approach for analyzing the operational and environmental impacts of revising San Joaquin River flow and southern Delta salinity objectives.	All
23-May-11	Recession rates of approximately 1 inch elevation per day administered intermittently during the spring and summer should be an additional consideration for the flow objective.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Analyze the effects of altered operations on the downstream thermal regime. If necessary, refine the thermal standards to coincide with the expected changes in flow patterns on the mainstream and the tributaries.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	Ensure compliance with existing water temperature standards.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	During the environmental analysis, consider that the San Joaquin River and its tributaries are impaired by numerous reservoirs.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources
23-May-11	A responsible analysis of San Joaquin River flow objectives should include an analysis of reservoir purposes, operations, and reoperations.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Appendix C, D, and F.1
23-May-11	Interior supports development of a program of implementation, which allows New Melones Reservoir to be operated in a sustainable manner over the long term.	-
23-May-11	Indexing flow objectives to water year type does not necessarily result in prudent reservoir operations.	-

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	Model and evaluate reservoir impacts to drought planning during the alternative flow objective and program of implementation analysis.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix C, D, and F.1 and F.2
23-May-11	Address the potential impacts to all federally authorized purposes of New Melones Reservoir. Impacts include: water supply, fish and wildlife, flood control, power production, water quality, temperature controls, and recreation.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 6, Flooding, Sediment, and Erosion; Chapter 7, Aquatic Resources; Chapter 8, Terrestrial Biological Resources; Chapter 10, Recreational Resources and Visual Quality; Chapter 13, Service Providers; Chapter 14, Energy Resources and Climate Change
23-May-11	Review the benefits and trade-offs of reservoirs.	Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
23-May-11	The annual adaptive management plan should not only consider inflow forecasts, but also carryover storage in decisions on tributary flow requirements.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Interior supports the establishment of the SJRMEP.	-
23-May-11	The Board's conclusion that only the CVP and the SWP will implement the salinity objectives is premature and does not comport with the Board's stated finding, other established facts regarding causes of elevated salinity, and state and federal law.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Interior requests that the Board make available the scientific studies and information relied upon by the Board to determine the following: (1-5): 1) Circulation and water levels are directly related to salinity levels in the southern Delta and thus appropriate metrics of and control variables for salinity management; 2) The SWP and CVP are the only responsible parties for circulation and water level impacts to the southern Delta; 3) The actions of the SWP and CVP are solely responsible for salinity impairment; 4) Contributions of local diversions and discharges to southern Delta salinity are minor; and 5) Changes to the San Joaquin River flow regime from February through June will improve salinity in the southern Delta.	-
23-May-11	The Board needs to further explore the following issue related to the new flow management scheme: 1) Impact of using a percentage of unimpaired flow to manage ecosystem needs on the historic salinity profile.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix F.2
23-May-11	The Board needs to further explore the following issue related to the new flow management scheme: 2) Opportunities or obstacles of the salinity profile on long term salinity control.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Appendix F.2

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
23-May-11	The Board needs to further explore the following issue related to the new flow management scheme: 3) Total water cost to meet the ecosystem needs.	Chapter 18, Economic Analyses
23-May-11	The Board needs to further explore the following issue related to the new flow management scheme: 4) Dr. Hoffman's conclusions regarding rainfall and salinity crop tolerance.	Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources; Appendix C and E
23-May-11	Include opportunities for salinity management when establishing the southern Delta salinity compliance objectives.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Consider relaxing the target from December–March to facilitate the export of salt during high flow conditions.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources
23-May-11	Please provide clarification on the following program component: how does the Board anticipate enforcing compliance along a "stretch" of river?	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Please provide clarification on the following program component: 2) How will the Board define/quantify "circulation"? At what time scale and what unit of measurement?	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Please provide clarification on the following program component: 3) How will null zone violations be measured? How many? When? Where?	-
23-May-11	Please provide clarification on the following program component: 4) How will the southern Delta salinity objectives be enforced?	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
23-May-11	Please provide clarification on the following program component: 5) Who are the responsible parties for the null zones?	-
23-May-11	Please provide clarification on the following program component: 6) Who will pay for the additional studies and monitoring of the channels?	-
23-May-11	Place the southern Delta salinity compliance issues under the CV-SALTS program. A holistic approach (like the SALTS program) will enable an effective, comprehensive, and integrated salinity management plan. Using the SALTS program is consistent with California Water Code Section 13241 (c) and will not burden the CVP or SWP.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency		
Commenter: Karen Schwinn, Associate Director, Water Division		
19-Mar-09	Agree a comprehensive evaluation is needed but question whether beneficial uses would be protected by regulatory provisions of WQCP.	-
19-Mar-09	The State Water Board should consider drinking water in the Delta.	Chapter 5, Water Supply, Surface Hydrology, and Water Quality; Chapter 13, Service Providers

Table A-1. Continued

Date	Comment Summary	SED Chapter
19-Mar-09	The State Water Board should consider restoration of SJR (Friant).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description; Chapter 15, LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative)
19-Mar-09	The State Water Board should consider replacing VAMP.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	It is recommended that State Water Board consider SJ Tributaries (need for a more integrated view of SJR and its tributaries).	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	It is recommended that State Water Board consider reviewing Delta outflow standard.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	It is recommended that State Water Board consider new biological information concerning Delta outflow since 1995 Plan.	Chapter 1, Introduction; Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	It is recommended that the State Water Board consider include spring and fall requirements.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description
19-Mar-09	It is recommended that the State Water Board consider upstream regulatory measures.	Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

- = Beyond Scope of the document and/or not related to impact analysis