

				Comment Log	
					T
ADMIN USE ONLY	REVIEWER				
COMMENT ID (DO NOT Edit this Column)	REVIEWER CONTACT INFO (Name, Agency)	LOCATION IN REPORT/DOC (Ch, Section, page, etc.)	DATE OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT MM/DD/YY	ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	
	Kristal Davis-Fadtke	Chapter 1, Page 1-2	4/14/2021	This does not accurately reflect the role of DWR. DWR is not the administering agency for ecosystem benefits and does not represent the State of California in that respect. Also, funding decisions by the CA Water Commission should be separated from DWR. DWR cannot represent other state agencies on behalf of the State of California.	
	Kristal Davis-Fadtke	Chapter 1, Page 1-2	4/15/2021	Under Prop 1, ecosystem benefits are considered public benefits; whereas, water supply is not. Prop 1 can only fund public benefits. Ecosystem public benefits should be distinct from water supply benefits of the project.	
	Kristal Davis-Fadtke	Chapter 1, Page 1-3	4/14/2021	Suggest including statement that the Authority will also need to enter into a contract with the administering agencies for the public benefits prior to determining a project's final funding award.	
	Kristal Davis-Fadtke	Chapter 1, Page 1-7	4/15/2021	This is one of Sites' ecosystem benefits, but there is no mention of IL4 Refuge Water Supply being an objective of the project. Because Prop 1 requires project to provide a net ecosystem improvement, CEQA documents should analyze any potential impacts from providing said benefits. Additionally, any benefits provided by the project under WSIP, cannot be used to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts. Suggest including all WSIP ecosystem benefits as clear objectives.	
	Kristal Davis-Fadtke	Chapter 1, Page 1-7	4/16/2021	Benefits funded by Reclamation will need to be separate than the quantity of benefit provided to the state under WSIP.	T
	Kristal Davis-Fadtke	Chapter 1, Page 1-8	4/15/2021	Suggest adding CDFW will use this RDEIR/SDEIS to evaluate if Sites Reservoir provides a net ecosystem benefit, in order to make a finding that the project is consistent with Prop 1, as required by the WSIP regulations. CWC can only issue a final funding award after CDFW has made a finding and a contract for ecosystem benefits between CDFW and the Sites Authority has been executed.	Ī
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-1	4/9/2021	The Appendices were not included in the document library or in the comment solicitation, so no comments were made concerning them.	
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-2	4/13/2021	Please, clarify exactly the who, what, when, where, why how of this statement. The way that the statement is written, it could be construed that CDFW had significant input in shaping the alternatives, which it did not.	
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-3	4/13/2021	This cannot happen without first fully mitigating the impacts of the project.	1
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-4	4/9/2021	Peak winter and spring flows are essential for lateral channel migration, floodplain inundation, and maintenance of riparian habitat. Altering peak stream flows in the reach between Red Bluff/Hamilton City and Colusa may have significan effects on vital riverine ecosystems, ground water recharge, and flood waters directed through the Sutter/Yolo Bypasses, and the DEIR should analyze and mitigate this potentially significant impact.	t
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-5	4/13/2021	CEQA requires EIRs to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. CDFW recommends a summary table showing which significant effects of the project are avoided or substantially lessened by each alternative.	
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-5	4/13/2021	CDFW requests that "similar" be defined and described for each use in this table.	1
	CDFW CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-7 Chapter 2, Page 2-16	4/9/2021 4/13/2021	Please distinguish between benefits to water right holders and ecological function. There should be a difference between existing conditions and the "No-project" Alternative and the "No-project" Alternative should include an analysis that is comparable to the other Project Alternatives. The purpose in CEQA of the "No-project" alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project so the impact analysis of the "No-project" alternative should include all foreseeable future impacts based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. The existing conditions should be a set point in time (typically the NOP or the current conditions at the time of analysis), but the "No-project" Alternative would also include any future foreseeable changes in implementation of the SWP ITP and other projects that should not be included in existing conditions if they are not the current condition or baseline. CDFW commented on this in our DEIR letter that the existing conditions should more accurately reflect practice, not potential for water contractors and diverters to use their total allocation. Since we do not have the Existing Conditions section of the REIR to review, we cannot yet see how that comment was addressed.	
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-16	4/13/2021	Need clarification on what this means.	ł
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-17	4/9/2021	CDFW recommends the DEIR include an impact analysis to fisheries from increased winter diversion of water into the GCID oxbow, including survival rate of listed winter and spring-run Chinook Salmon, and predation rate within the oxbow during peak emigration. The increase proportion of flow will likely change the migratory path of emigrating fish species (salmon, sturgeon, etc.).	
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-20	4/9/2021	Please specify river flow conditions that would justify a 2,500 cfs pump rate.	1
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-20	4/9/2021	The DEIR should describe the monitoring protocols needed to ensure the new setbacks do not increase fish entrainment.	
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-38	4/9/2021	CDFW recommends listing existing fish population in Funks reservoir, detailing the work window when the excavation will occur, and where the excavated material will be deposited.	T

SITES PROJECT AUTHORITY - RECLAMATION REVIEW

Cooperating Agency Review Administrative Draft REIR/SDEIS

April-21								
Comment Log								
			RESPONDENT					
	RESPONDENT CONTACT INFO (Name)	DATE OF RESPONSE MM/DD/YY	RESPONSE	CONCUR	NON-CONCUR	FOR INFO ONLY	CARRY FORWARD	CL
the administering agency for ecosystem benefits and does ding decisions by the CA Water Commission should be encies on behalf of the State of California.								
fits; whereas, water supply is not. Prop 1 can only fund from water supply benefits of the project.								
to enter into a contract with the administering agencies for ng award.								
on of IL4 Refuge Water Supply being an objective of the system improvement, CEQA documents should analyze any any benefits provided by the project under WSIP, cannot be g all WSIP ecosystem benefits as clear objectives.								
n the quantity of benefit provided to the state under WSIP.								
Sites Reservoir provides a net ecosystem benefit, in order to equired by the WSIP regulations. CWC can only issue a final for ecosystem benefits between CDFW and the Sites								
r in the comment solicitation, so no comments were made								
of this statement. The way that the statement is written, it g the alternatives, which it did not. of the project.								
migration, floodplain inundation, and maintenance of veen Red Bluff/Hamilton City and Colusa may have significant and flood waters directed through the Sutter/Yolo Bypasses, hificant impact.								
tives to the project, or to the location of the project, which ect but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the ary table showing which significant effects of the project are								
ach use in this table.				+				
d ecological function. If the "No-project" Alternative and the "No-project" the other Project Alternatives. The purpose in CEQA of the are the impacts of approving the proposed project with the analysis of the "No-project" alternative should include all stent with available infrastructure and community services. If the NOP or the current conditions at the time of analysis), re foreseeable changes in implementation of the SWP ITP and ons if they are not the current condition or baseline. CDFW ions should more accurately reflect practice, not potential for Since we do not have the Existing Conditions section of the dressed.								
heries from increased winter diversion of water into the				+				
g-run Chinook Salmon, and predation rate within the oxbow ikely change the migratory path of emigrating fish species								
cfs pump rate. ensure the new setbacks do not increase fish entrainment.				+				

	R	EVIEWER
SED	DATE	BACK CHECK COMMENT
N	MM/DD/YY	(Needed Only If NOT Closing Comment)



ADMIN USE ONLY	REVIEWER	1	-	
COMMENT ID (DO NOT Edit this Column)	REVIEWER CONTACT INFO (Name, Agency)	LOCATION IN REPORT/DOC (Ch, Section, page, etc.)	DATE OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT MM/DD/YY	ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-49	4/9/2021	CDFW recommends describing the depth of the water table, impacts would be to the region if the groundwater was affect
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-54	4/9/2021	The DEIR should include a reservoir profile modeling to justify
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-54	4/9/2021	flexibility that would be feasible based on the location of the CDFW is concerned that having a 340-foot elevation port as t temperature and turbidity releases, or access to the coldest ports are located throughout the profile of the reservoir to al
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-56	4/9/2021	The DEIR should include documentation supporting a projected analyze projected impacts as result of these flows.
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-59	4/9/2021	The DEIR should include monitoring provisions to ensure that appropriate.
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-62	4/9/2021	The DEIR should describe why riprap was chosen over other e
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-65	4/9/2021	The DEIR should include fish monitoring protocols that includ releases), and appropriate measures that will be implemente
	CDFW CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-65 Chapter 2, Page 2-67	4/9/2021 4/9/2021	Please clarify if all of the water conveyed to the Sacramento The DEIR should include baseline conditions for Bird Creek.
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-67	4/6/2021	CDFW recommends defining exact use planned to be allowed reservoir is likely to attract a large contingent of migratory we fluctuating water level will likely result in regions of green veg increase tule elk usage. CDFW recommends considering coor increased populations.
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-72	4/13/2021	Please clarify if the temporary roads will be removed restore
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-76	4/13/2021	The DEIR should disclose project impacts related to the increation considered significant, the DEIR should disclose additional average the impacts.
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-78 Chapter 2, Page 2-78	4/13/2021 4/9/2021	As written it sounds like these conditions are mutually excluse CDFW recommends the DEIR discuss diversion window overlar release operations. Increasing withdrawals during the propose actions to avoid and minimize impacts to listed fish species. The proposed operational window has the potential to impact water in the upper Sacramento River during the September to reducing releases from summer deliveries to an operational releases are driven by water needed for rice decomposition at metric at Wilkins Slough, while at the same time trying to mini- dewatering and juvenile stranding). Withdrawing additional w potential measures available to minimize impacts to listed fish
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-78	4/13/2021	Please describe how water quality will be monitored and pro
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-78	4/13/2021	CDFW cannot fully evaluate this project without reviewing th
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-78	4/13/2021	Please, provide documentation supporting this assertion.
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-78	4/9/2021	CDFW is concerned that there may instances where "excess" Opinions that may interfere with Sites diversions. These limit calculating yield estimations.
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-78	4/13/2021	What about excess with restrictions? (i.e. conditions are excerned are gulatory restrictions that are curtailing exports.)
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-79	4/13/2021	Does this mean that exports are at maximum capacity at the that San Luis Reservoir is full?
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-79	4/13/2021	Would this include SWRCB Water Quality Control Plan update
	CDFW CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-79 Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021 4/9/2021	What does the term 'losses' mean and what is the magnitude This comment is regarding the minimum bypass flows at RBP flows listed for RBPP, Hamilton City, and Wilkins Slough are n requirements are typically driven by diversion elevation and a highlight flow/survival relationships that indicate flows higher considered sufficient for anadromous fishes. Additional diver decrease the number of instances when anadromous fish ma conditions and will therefore need to be minimized or mitiga

SITES PROJECT AUTHORITY - RECLAMATION REVIEW

Cooperating Agency Review Administrative Draft REIR/SDEIS

	•		
An	rı	I-21	
' 'P		. ~ -	

Comment Log								
			RESPONDENT					
	RESPONDENT CONTACT INFO	DATE OF RESPONSE		CONCUR	NON-CONCUR	R INFO ONLY	CARRY FORWARD	CLOS
describing the likelihood of it being affected, and what the	(Name)	MM/DD/YY	RESPONSE	8	NO	FOR	S	Y /
ted. Ty the different elevations of ports and to analyze operational							_	
ese ports.								
the lowest port may not be sufficient to allow for appropriate water when reservoir levels are low. CDFW recommends that llow for maximum operational flexibility.								
ted release flow of up to 100 cfs into Stone Corral Creek and								
t these velocities and temperatures of releases are								
erosion control methods. de triggers that will affect water operations (diversions and ed to minimize the impacts to migrating listed fish species.								
River will be released through the CBD.								
d in the recreation area regarding angling and hunting. The vaterfowl, and deer, dove, and turkey populations. The egetation due to receding water, creating a potential for rdination and use of lawful public hunting to manage								
ed to pre-project conditions.								
ase of traffic as a result of this project. If these impacts are voidance, minimization and or mitigation measures to offset								
sive.	EH	5/14/21	Adjusted to remove the second "when"					
aps with Shasta/Trinity Reservoir and Keswick Reservoir sed window could place additional constraints on potential								
ct Shasta/Trinity Reservoir operations by diverting additional through December period, when Keswick Reservoir is typically minimum for the winter. During this time, Keswick Reservoir and meeting downstream requirements such as the flow inimize juvenile impacts to Chinook salmon (e.g. redd water from the Sacramento River could limit the range of sh, such as altering water flows and timing of releases.	EH	5/14/21	Noted. Releases from Shasta will not be diverted into Sites unless in a flood release condition.					
otected when released to Sac or Liberty.			Operating term sheets are under development, but they					
ne details of these agreements.	EH	5/14/21	cannot be finalized until the environmental document is finalized. [NOTE TO TEAM: can we share draft term sheet with CDFW this summer?]					
	EH	5/14/21	Noted. Analysis can be provided. Note to team: I think this comment and the next are					
' conditions may be limited by existing ITPs or Biological tations should be taken into consideration when modeling and	EH	5/14/21	reasonable and that we can address them, but I'm not sure where the appropriate place is to do so.					
ess but prior water rights are not being fulfilled due to other								
e CVP and SWP? Or that allocations are 100% south of delta or								
e if it is in place at the time of diversion?			Note to team: I assume yes but I am not familiar with the details of this plan.					
e of these losses?								
PP, Hamilton City, and Wilkins Slough. The minimum bypass not sufficient for the persistence of anadromous fishes. These navigational requirements, yet past and recent literature er than these operational minimums are necessary to be rsions once the river reaches these minimum flow metrics ay experience a realized benefit brought on by environmental ated.								

	R	EVIEWER
SED N	DATE MM/DD/YY	BACK CHECK COMMENT (Needed Only If NOT Closing Comment)
		(Needed Only II NOT Closing Comment)



SITES PROJECT AUTHORITY - RECLAMATION REVIEW

ADMIN USE ONLY				
ADIVIIN USE UNLI	Y REVIEWER			
			DATE OF	
			ORIGINAL	
	REVIEWER		REVIEW	
COMMENT ID	CONTACT INFO	LOCATION IN REPORT/DOC (Ch,	COMMENT	
(DO NOT Edit this Column	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Section, page, etc.)	MM/DD/YY	ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	Where and how will monitoring be conducted, so that fish pre
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	Please, provide the rationale for this minimum bypass flow, a
				a redd dewatering criteria for upstream of RBDD?
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	This seems to be actually controlled by flow up to the diversion the top end of diversion capacity maybe the last 300 cfs, or so
				Please, provide the rationale for this minimum bypass flow, a
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	does not appear to be a biologically based criteria.
				Please provide the rationale for the 8,000 cfs bypass flow, alo
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	rationale. If this is for fall run chinook emigrating at this time
				operationalized at Bend Bridge, it should be described clearly
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	Freemont weir is at river mile (RM) 82 while the diversion poi
			1/10/2021	stay within identified flow over weir thresholds? Will a tool b
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	Please provide justification for the Fremont Weir Protections. For a sort of threshold by which floodwaters in the Tule Canal/Toe Drain
				Please provide an analysis to show how protective these mea
				to quantify changes to the total amount of water entering the
				basis, this may not provide enough detail to sufficiently assess
				For the Fremont Weir Big Notch Project, changes to the amou
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	important than monthly changes to inundated acres because
			1, 20, 2022	factor for floodplain rearing rather than total inundated acres
				Relevant questions that will need assessed: • What is the reduction in the number of days with water flow
				• How does this reduction translate into the amount of fish th
				• How many adult fish passage days are being lost by this redu
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	Rearing will need to be addressed for all salmon, steelhead, st
				What about DPS Green Sturgeon? Juvenile out-migration is h
	CDFW	Chapter 2, Page 2-80	4/13/2021	early winter.

Cooperating Agency Review Administrative Draft REIR/SDEIS

April-22	1
----------	---

· · · · · · = =								
Comment Log								
			RESPONDENT					
	RESPONDENT CONTACT INFO (Name)	DATE OF RESPONSE MM/DD/YY	RESPONSE	CONCUR	NON-CONCUR	FOR INFO ONLY	CARRY FORWARD	CLOS Y/
resence can be detected?								
along with supporting documentation for that rationale. Is this								
on capacity, rather than fish screen design (i.e. 1:1 except at o).								
along with supporting documentation for that rationale. This								
ong with the supporting documentation that supports that of the year, with the 10,000 cfs pulse flow science to be y in this document.								
bints are at RM 205 and 243. How will real time operations be developed?								
example, how was the 600 cfs threshold chosen? Is this tied to any n begin spilling onto the floodplain?								
asures actually are. While the CalSim-2 modelling can be used e Yolo Bypass over/through the Fremont Weir on a monthly ss potential impacts.								
unt of flow diverted on a daily time scale may be more e it is assumed that fish access to the Bypass is the limiting s.								
wing through the notch? nat will be entrained in the Yolo Bypass? uction?								
sturgeon, species of special concern.								
highly correlated to pulse events (freshets) in the fall and								

	R	EVIEWER
SED N	DATE MM/DD/YY	BACK CHECK COMMENT (Needed Only If NOT Closing Comment)

COMMENT ID (DO NOT Edit this Column)	REVIEWER CONTACT INFO (Name, Agency)	LOCATION IN REPORT/DOC (Ch, Section, page, etc.)	DATE OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT MM/DD/YY	ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONDENT CONTACT INFO (Name)	DATE OF RESPONSE MM/DD/YY	RESPONSE	CONCUR	NON-CONCUR FOR INFO ONLY	59	DATE (I	BACK CHECK COMMENT (Needed Only If NOT Closing Comment)
	amparo del rosario romero	Chapter 1, Page 1-7	3/24/2021	Sites Project functions include AG, M&I, and environment. Don't see anything about industrial water use. Should there be at least a passing reference to it?								
	amparo del rosario romero	Chapter 2, Page 2-1	3/24/2021	In Chapter 1.2.1 CALFED Record of Decision: a statement is made that over 50 storage sites were considered. Here we list 52 specifically. Perhaps want to keep the refernce to over 50, or explicitly state 52 whenever talking about water storage sites studied.	LWH		will clarify in text					
	amparo del rosario romero	Chapter 2, Page 2-1	3/24/2021	In Chpater 1.2.1. CALFED ROD section: reference is made to 5 storage sites selected for further study. It makes reference to 12 here. Perhaps time refernce indicates the reason why the difference? Maybe the 12 were identified prior to the CALFED ROD being finalized?	LWH		will clarify in text					
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-5	3/26/2021	Interconnection to transmission lines is missing. Map only shows partial transmission lines. WAPA can provide a GIS clip if needed.	LWH		ICF has been provided direction to revise figures to more clearly indicate powerline location vs. interconnection					
	amparo del rosario romero	Chapter 2, Page 2-27	3/24/2021	Under 1.2.5 Value Planning Process, a statement is made that, All three options included reservoir sizes from 1.3 to 1.5 million AF," eliminated the pump-back hydroelectrical facilities". Is that for the main reservoir only? I see that there is a proposed TRR Pumping Generating Plant, which implies pump-back storage for at lease the forebay reservoir from GCID facilitaties to Sites. If so, may want to clarify that no pump-back regernation for the main off-stream reservoir	LWH		will clarify in text					
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-28	3/26/2021	Transmission lines are missing on figure. Unless I am not reading this correctly. It's sort of faint.	LWH		See above					
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-30	3/26/2021	These proposed transmission lines and connections should be illustrated on some of the maps. The figures later are schematics and not readily understood where the lines and connections would be placed on the landscape.								
	amparo del rosario romero	Chapter 2, Page 2-37	3/24/2021	Similar comment for Funks Reservoir as mention is made for Funks Reservoir P-Gen Plant.								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-37	3/26/2021	Show locations for transmission lines in the project figures.								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-41	3/26/2021	Where is this shown in the construction schedule later in this chapter? Do you need to discuss the interconnection application and studies that still will be needed?								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-41	3/26/2021	Need to review Appendix C. Where are the lines on the main project figures?								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA		3/26/2021	Who is building the towers and lines? I realize this question is outside the scope of the EIS/EIR – just wondered who's responsibility it would be.								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-41	3/26/2021	Need to show these features on the project figures.							 /	
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-42	3/26/2021	Who is responsible for building and operating this substation? If WAPA then we will need a Federal NEPA document to cover this action. Footprints for ROW and substation would need to be studies for bio and cultural and land ownership impacts if not already part of project footprints studies.								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-42	3/26/2021	1.Add this task to any of the schedules. Transmission line access (lines and substations) seem to be covered adequately, including the interconnection requests. However, the time frames for the project do not address the interconnection timeline. Starting Construction in 2024 without any interconnection requests completed is a dream that is not likely to occur.								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-42	3/26/2021	Show on project figures.								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-70	3/26/2021	Location for access to power lines?								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-73	3/26/2021	2. For the New and Existing Roadways – should new access roads be included for the powerlines?								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-73	3/26/2021	WAPA uses access roads for maintenance and inspection of transmission lines and ROW easements (Vegetation management).								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-78	3/26/2021	 Construction Access Roads do not address this use along new powerlines 3. Construction Access Roads do not address this use along new powerlines. I think it should. 4. Clearing and Grubbing is not addressed along the powerline routes. I think it should. 								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-78	3/26/2021	And for ROW and transmission line inspection and maintenance.								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-78	3/26/2021	Keep in mind that transmission line ROW widths are standard for WAPA and easements obtained for vegetation maintenance under lines.								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-78	3/26/2021	1.图II Alternatives – Operation and Management Plans – should this include O&M of power facilities?								
	Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-88	3/25/2021	From Howard Hirahara: ; the report makes reference to potential storage exchanges with Shasta, Oroville, and Folsom Reservoirs if these storage exchange do occur, more potential administrative headaches keeping track of the energy ins/outs. If CVP in particular makes exchanges with Sites (independent of whether Reclamation becomes a participating partner, there are going to be energy transactions which will need to be kept track of in order to assure that SPA and CVP as well as SWP storage exchanges which have an energy use component are properly recorded and balanced on the "energy books".								

Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-91	3/25/2021	From Howard Hirahara: I noticed on Tables 2.6 and Tables 2.7, MW's were put into the table. Since MWs reflect capacity and not necessarily actual energy used (MW-hours). Difficult to ascertain actual energy usage. If you assume that the pumps are running constantly. You may want to ask projected actual energy usage. I'm assuming that the pumps are not working 24/7, if they are, then using the figures 142.5 MW x 24 hours x 365 days = 1,2248,300 MW-hours energy used; 75.5 MW x 24 hours x 365 days = 661,388 MW-hours energy re-generated. Right now I'm not sure if they calculated the actual energy use and then levelized that to a MW capacity assuming 24/7, or they are using a capacity value and not sure how it relates to actual projected energy to be used Assuming 24/7 operations: total cost to CVP would be 586,912 MW-hours or 586 Gigawatts of Energy. Depending on whether there is no participation (Option 2) or partial (up to 7% under Option 1 and up to 25% under Option 3), could be a lot of energy to keep track of by the energy settlements people and Reclamation's energy analyst (replacement for Paul Landry). So the actual drain on CVP resources could be as low as zero, or up to 41 GW-hours (7% option) or 146 GW-hours under (25% option)			
Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-99	3/26/2021	WAPA has conducted biological and cultural surveys along the ROWs and has ROW Maintenance EA for activities			
Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-99	3/26/2021	including vegetation management along the ROWs and towers. WAPA has conducted cultural surveys along their ROW and has programmatic agreements with SHPO.		+	
Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-99 Chapter 2, Page 2-101	3/26/2021	1.Transmission line access (lines and substations) seem to be covered adequately, including the interconnection requests. However, the time frames for the project do not address the interconnection timeline. Starting Construction in 2024 without any interconnection requests completed is not likely to occur. Image: Conducted cuttural surveys along their NOW and has programmatic agreements with SIFO.			
Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-101	3/26/2021	5.Construction Timing table should address electrical facilities as taking place during the project window.			
Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-101	3/26/2021	WAPA has access roads for transmission lines and ROWs.			
Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-105	3/26/2021	1.©onstruction Power Requirements: do these assume the new electrical facilities (lines and substations) would be Installed and operational to support this? If not then the document does not address temporary construction power Installed and operational to support this? If not then the document does not address temporary construction power Installed and operational to support this? If not then the document does not address temporary construction power Installed and operational to support this? If not then the document does not address temporary construction power Installed and operational to support this? Installed address temporary construction power Installed			
Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-107	3/26/2021	All Alternatives – Operation and Management Plans – should this include O&M of power facilities WAPA has EAs for ROW Maintenance that covers inspections, maintenance, and vegetation management.			
Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 2, Page 2-117	3/26/2021	1. Por the New and Existing Roadways – should new access roads be included for the powerlines?		4	
Kelly, Elizabeth/WAPA	Chapter 3, Page 3-6	3/26/2021	Sounds like the analysis part of the environmental analysis is somewhere in here, right?		++	
					<u> </u>	
					<u> </u>	

		_	_		
			\rightarrow		

			DATE OF		DECOONDENIT			UR	NLY		
COMMENT ID (DO NOT Edit this Column)		LOCATION IN REPORT/DOC (Ch, Section, page, etc.)	ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT MM/DD/YY	ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONDENT CONTACT INFO (Name)	DATE OF RESPONSE MM/DD/YY	RESPONSE	CONCUR NON-CONCUR	or info c Arry	DATE	BACK CHECK COMMENT (Needed Only If NOT Closing Comment)
			4/20/2021	Include summary sentence of what has changed?				0 2			
		Chapter 1, Page 1-3	4/20/2021	Since the need for the project is to provide water storage north of the delta, I think it would be important to include information here on why CALFED found that storage is needed in the NORTH specifically (declining health of delta fisheries).							
	Gordon, Stephanie/USEPA	Chapter 1, Page 1-5	4/20/2021	Overall the background about the funding and development is very clear and thorough.							
	Gordon, Stephanie/USEPA	Chapter 1, Page 1-6	4/21/2021	I would recommend including more information about the need for the project. I don't recommend altering the purpose and need statement and I think it is much clearer than it was in the 2017 document. However, supporting information for why fish need improved water temperature and why CVP needs additional operation flexibility to address restraints would support this section. It is important to explain not just what the project proponent/agency hopes to achieve, but why here, why now, and what problems will be solved/addressed.							
	Gordon, Stephanie/USEPA	Chapter 1, Page 1-7	4/20/2021	Food for who?							
					-						
					-						

COMMENT ID (DO NOT Edit this Column)	REVIEWER CONTACT INFO (Name, Agency)	LOCATION IN REPORT/DOC (Ch, Section, page, etc.)	DATE OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT MM/DD/YY	ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONDENT CONTACT INFO (Name)	DATE OF RESPONSE MM/DD/YY	RESPONSE	NCUF	NON-CONCUR FOR INFO ONLY		CLOSED Y/N	BACK CHECK COMMENT (Needed Only If NOT Closing Comment)
	NMFS	Chapter 1, Section 1.1	4/30/2021	Is there a lead federal agency for Project Operations?						<u> </u>		
	NMFS	Chapter 1, Section 1.1	4/30/2021	Is the December 2020, Final Feasibility Report for the North-of-Delta Offstream Storage Investigation available? Is that report the same as the August 2017 Feasibility Report?								
	NMFS	Chapter 1, Section 1.2.5	4/30/2021	Are results available for the additional analysis of "environmental effects of the new alternatives in the [Value Planning] Report"?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1	4/30/2021	What Project alternatives were considered and rejected?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Figure 2-4	4/30/2021	Boxes in figure 2-4 should refer to figure 2-2 (not 2- 1).								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.4	4/30/2021	Appendix 1A and Chapter 5 not yet received.								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1.1	4/30/2021	Why is the RBPP increasing capacity to 2,500cfs?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1.1	4/30/2021	Why do all alternatives require a TC Canal gate structure modification to 3,000 cfs?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1.2	4/30/2021	Has the TRR already been permitted?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1.2	4/30/2021	Confirm that the GCID Main Canal capacity is 1,800cfs.								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1.2	4/30/2021	What is WSE?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1.2	4/30/2021	Confirm the Funks pump station (for TC) flow rate: 2,100 cfs or 2,000?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1.4	4/30/2021	Confirm that the maximum reservoir inflow is 3,900cfs (2,100 + 1,800)								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1.4	4/30/2021	Where is construction material coming from? How much is needed? How is it getting there?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.1.5	4/30/2021	Confirm that the dunnigan pipeline capacity is 1,000 cfs								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2.1	4/30/2021	Confirm that Sites reservoir deliveries can be made 'upstream' through the GCID or TC Canals								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2.1	4/30/2021	Confirm that Project diversions would be made Sept 1 -June 15.								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2.1	4/30/2021	Define 'excess conditions'								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2.1	4/30/2021	How would an 'expanded' Los Vaqueros Reservoir be considered?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Table 2-5	4/30/2021	Regarding "precipitation-generated pulse events" Would a managed spring pulse be protected?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Table 2-5	4/30/2021	What constitutes "fish presence and migration"?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Table 2-5	4/30/2021	Does "at all times" apply to the period of operation (i.e. Sept 1 - June 15) or year round?								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2.1	4/30/2021	Confusing description of a "qualified pulse event," is it a flow pulse or a pulse of fish?								
	NMFS NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2.1 Chapter 2, Figure 2-37	4/30/2021 4/30/2021	Clarify the cessation of pulse protection after 7 days. What if fish are still present in high numbers? Confusing figure. GCID Main Canal capacity 1,800cfs why is it depicted up to 3,000cfs? Combined capacity (GCID+TC) is								
	NMFS	Chapter 2, Section 2.5.3.8	4/30/2021	3,900 why is it depicted at 3,000?What is the estimated volume and tonnage of off-site material? What methods would be used to transport said								
	NMFS	Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1	4/30/2021	 material to the construction site? NMFS would recommend the use of a future baseline, considering the Project would not be operational until at least 2030. 								
	NMFS	Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1	4/30/2021	Is Delta Conveyance included in the baseline? Where and how is it considered in the EIS?								
				Is the CALSIM period of record a reasonable baseline for current and future conditions (e.g. with regard to drought								
	NMFS	Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1	4/30/2021	frequency and duration)?								
	NMFS	Chapter 4, Section 4.1	4/30/2021	Has FWS produced a FWCA 2(b) report?								

-	
-	
_	
-	
_	
-	
_	
_	
_	
_	
_	
_	
_	
_	

COMMENT ID (DO NOT Edit this Column)		LOCATION IN REPORT/DOC (Ch,	DATE OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT MM/DD/YY	ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONDENT CONTACT INFO (Name)	DATE OF RESPONSE MM/DD/YY	RESPONSE	CONCUR NON-CONCUR	FOR INFO ONLY CARRY	CLOSED Y/N	DATE MM/DD/YY	BACK CHECK COMMENT (Needed Only If NOT Closing Comment)
	Roberts, Matthew J CIV USARMY CESPK (USA)	Chapter 1, Page 1-8	4/27/2021	Add agencies								
	Roberts, Matthew J CIV USARMY CESPK (USA)	Chapter 1, Page 1-8	4/27/2021	A brief table of all needed permit or approvals would be helpful								
	Roberts, Matthew J CIV USARMY CESPK (USA)	Chapter 2, Page 2-1	4/27/2021	Are these criteria referenced anywhere?								
	Roberts, Matthew J CIV	Chapter 2, Page 2-4	4/27/2021	40 CFR 1502.14 Does not state this								
	USARMY CESPK (USA) Roberts, Matthew J CIV	Chapter 2, Page 2-5	4/27/2021	How can this be an alternative when it only about costs and who pays?								
	USARMY CESPK (USA) Roberts, Matthew J CIV		4/27/2021	Would recommend to show which is the preferred alternative								
	USARMY CESPK (USA) Roberts, Matthew J CIV		4/27/2021	Would recommend to show which is the preferred alternative								
	USARMY CESPK (USA)		4/2//2021									
	Roberts, Matthew J CIV USARMY CESPK (USA)	Chapter 2, Page 2-107	4/27/2021	I do not believe this is a reasonable alternative, where funding comes from is not a screening mechanism as it cannot be compared to the human or environmental factor and another alternative with feasible criteria should be added.								
								$\left \right $				

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

COMMENT ID (DO NOT Edit this Column)	REVIEWER CONTACT INFO (Name, Agency)	LOCATION IN REPORT/DOC (Ch, Section, page, etc.)	DATE OF ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT MM/DD/YY	ORIGINAL REVIEW COMMENT	RESPONDENT CONTACT INFO (Name)	DATE OF RESPONSE MM/DD/YY	RESPONSE	JON-CONCUR	OR INFO ONLY ARRY	CLOSED Y/N	BACK CHECK COMMENT (Needed Only If NOT Closing Comment)
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 1, Page 1-3	4/8/2021	Sites has been considered since at least the 70s, and probably earlierit wasn't a new idea/location in 2000I added a minimal edit; you can decide how much more, if at all, you should include.						•	
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 1, Page 1-5	4/8/2021	AF of reservoir size? That's not the same as having water in it, or AF of yieldsomewhere in the document there needs to be a disclosure of how much it costs per unity of usable water. Be mindful I am coming into this recently, and these comments reflect that.							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 1, Page 1-7	4/8/2021	Notedwill keep these in mind to see if all of these are expected to be met, or not, in other sections of the document.							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 1, Page 1-10	4/8/2021	Is the whole chapter on terminology? Or is it the analysis itselfor is it elsewhere as in ch 5-27? Edit chapter title if							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 1, Page 1-10	4/8/2021	needed. Sounds like the analysis part of the environmental analysis is somewhere in here, right?							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-3	4/8/2021	This talks about 2 alternatives at 1.3 MAF and one at 1.5 MAF and says the alternatives in the report are based on them but the alternatives in the report have 2 alternatives at 1.5 MAF and one at 1.3 MAFso immediately confusing, at least to me. It takes a couple pages before this is explained on page 2-5until then, it's confusing. Consider revision.							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-5	4/8/2021	A few pages ago, it said this was 1.3 MAFas in VP5 please check/explain.							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-18	4/8/2021	I don't understand from this language or the figure what is being built or why, as in why would high river levels decrease water elevation. It may all be correct, but it isn't clear to an unfamiliar reader.							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-26	4/8/2021	What are these improvements? I can't tell from this description or the figure I don't see any road specified on that figureI am presuming there is one on the"left", if you say soand if that left is							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-26	4/8/2021	facing downstream (south), would that be to the east?. And what about figure 2-9 (not referenced yet)and what do all those letters in the figures mean? (not yet explained). Just trying to understand all this.							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-26	4/8/2021	What is being done here with the fill? RU creating a levee of sorts on the sides in places to create 2.5 ft? It isn't clear to me.							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-27	4/8/2021 4/8/2021	I cannot find this on a figure (none is cited) or decipher where it might be from this language alone. Where are these existing lines/how far away?							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-30 Chapter 2, Page 2-35	4/8/2021	That figure shows various "stockpile" areas; so is it that the excavated material is going to be placed there? I am more used to the term "spoil" or "disposal" areas for places that material is going to be left. This narrative says it is assumed the material will remain "near"; does this mean it might be moved around again later?							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-37 Chapter 2, Page 2-41	4/8/2021 4/8/2021	Fig 2-16 doesn't show these. How far north, or west and north?							└─── ┘
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-41 Chapter 2, Page 2-62		No locations on that figure, which is a section only, maybe you mean figure 2-1?							
	Schoenberg, Steve/USFWS	Chapter 2, Page 2-86	4/12/2021	I will keep this in mind when reviewing the effects sectionto see what the "no restriction" means in terms of flow, area, depth of inundation, etc., in the yolo bypass.							