

**Items pulled by Council Members from Consent List  
Delta Plan – List of Changes 7/12/12**

Item Number	Page #/ Line #	Issue or Requested Change	Original Source of Comment	Initial Staff Recommendation	Council Member Who Pulled Item
<b>Chapter 1</b>					
43	15/26-34	Clarify that the uncertainty occurs in dry years (and below normal) when the conflicts are the greatest.  Line 32 after “water supply uncertainty for agencies that use water conveyed through the Delta” add “(comma) particularly in drier years when ecosystem conflicts are greatest.”  Also revise line 34 to say...becoming increasingly reliant on Delta exports that, by contract, were intended to be supplemental supplies.	DSC Staff	Revise as indicated.	Gray
<b>Chapter 2</b>					
80	47/1-29	Clarify that local agencies will be part of implementation committee , this was intended but not clear.	Ag Urban/ Tuolumne/Yolo	Add “local” to line 14, after “federal”	Nottoli
81	48/41-45	Add language about DP being updated sooner than 5 years	Council: Marcus	Revise text to clarify Delta Plan may be updated sooner than 5 year minimum requirement	Marcus
85	52/28-36	Technical clarification to definition of significant impact.	DSC Staff	For this purpose, significant impact means a change in <del>existing</del> <u>baseline</u> conditions that is directly, or indirectly <del>and/or cumulatively</del> caused by a project, and that <u>on its own or when considered “cumulatively” in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects,</u> will have a substantial impact on the achievement of one or both of the coequal goals or the implementation of government-sponsored flood control programs to reduce risks to people, property, and State interests in the Delta.	Gray
<b>Chapter 3</b>					
107	75/8-10	Consider whether worth explaining that all available	Council:	Look for reference, if appropriate, add reference	Marcus

**Items pulled by Council Members from Consent List  
Delta Plan – List of Changes 7/12/12**

Item Number	Page #/ Line #	Issue or Requested Change	Original Source of Comment	Initial Staff Recommendation	Council Member Who Pulled Item
		storage sites are already taken	Isenberg		
145	85/32-34	Conflicts over water use are compounded by SWP and CVP contracts that, <u>while intended to be a supplemental water supply to augment local water sources</u> , now create an expectation that more water should be exported than can be consistently <del>delivered</del> pumped. <u>Overall, exports from the Delta have been rising over the past four decades. However, SWP contract amounts were originally based on assumptions that additional <u>dams and conveyance</u> facilities were to be constructed at a later date.</u>	DSC Staff	Revise and tie to export chart which will be in next draft per comments above	Gray
179	96/26-28	The first sentence of the paragraph should be deleted. The statement that groundwater use in California “is largely unregulated” is patently false. There is significant regulation and management at the local level throughout the state. That there isn’t centralized state regulation is not an indication of abdication of responsibility or management. Correlating an asserted lack of “oversight” with “incomplete information” is mixing apples and oranges. As noted, there is not a lack of oversight. Also, the issue of transparency and information is being addressed as a consequence of SBX X7. The third sentence in this paragraph should be revised by deleting the beginning of it; “ <del>The lack of State oversight means that</del> Limited and often incomplete information is available....”	SFWCA	Review and clarify problem statement. Disagree with assertion but will revisit language to ensure accuracy.	Gray
181	99/15-16	<del>In 2007, the California Legislature passed a law requiring</del> Since 2008, DWR, SWRCB and the Department of Public Health <del>to study the development of a coordinated</del> have been working to develop a <u>coordinated</u> database <u>to track the...</u>	DSC Staff	Revise accordingly	Marcus

**Chapter 4**

**Items pulled by Council Members from Consent List  
Delta Plan – List of Changes 7/12/12**

Item Number	Page #/ Line #	Issue or Requested Change	Original Source of Comment	Initial Staff Recommendation	Council Member Who Pulled Item
196	120/1-2	All ecosystems will absorb and adapt to multiple stressors, but humans may not like the end result of this adaptation (e.g. loss of native species, reduced productivity). Hence, this statement is not adequate. Isn't the goal that a resilient ecosystem will absorb and adapt to multiple stressors without a significant reduction in the goods and services it provides?	ISB	Add concluding phrase " <u>without significant declines in ecosystem services.</u> "	Marcus
<b>Chapter 5</b>					
240	175/29-41	Expand discussion of climate change in this chapter and throughout Delta Plan.	Council: Marcus	Staff to review/revise policy chapter climate change section as directed.	Marcus
<b>Chapter 6</b>					
275	230/ 4	Change due date for nutrients work plan to 1/1/2014. Agency says cannot meet 2013 deadline on this issue.	SWRCB/ RWQCB	Revise accordingly	Gray
278	233/4-10	Add more depth on disadvantages communities	Council: Marcus	Revise language to:  <b>Small and disadvantaged communities:</b> Ensuring a safe drinking water supply can have a disproportionate cost for small and disadvantaged communities. <u>Delta communities that are small and disadvantaged include Bethel Island, Courtland, Hood, Isleton, Locke, and Walnut Grove. Options available to small, disadvantaged communities to correct unsafe drinking water conditions include consolidation with a larger water system, consolidation of several small systems into a single, larger system, centralized treatment, interim point-of-use treatment or use of bottled water, replacement of a contaminated source with an uncontaminated source and, in the case of chemical contamination, blending of contaminated sources with uncontaminated sources.</u> Availability and prioritization of funding, restructuring of regulatory requirements, and provision of technical assistance	Nottoli

**Items pulled by Council Members from Consent List**  
**Delta Plan – List of Changes 7/12/12**

Item Number	Page #/ Line #	Issue or Requested Change	Original Source of Comment	Initial Staff Recommendation	Council Member Who Pulled Item
<p>may all be part of the solution, but involve the authority of various agencies including the Department of Public Health, the SWRCB, and DWR. An integrated effort including the input and involvement of the regulatory and affected agencies will be needed to properly address these issues and to refine effective recommendations.</p>					
<p><b>Chapter 7</b></p>					
288	250/40-43, 251/1	<p>We suggest the following language to help distinguish the three types of levees in the Delta and Suisun Marsh: " ... the Delta includes more than 1,000<del>335</del> miles of levees, <u>There are roughly 1,000 miles of project and non-project levees in the Delta and Suisun Marsh. These levees include some that are unmaintained along the perimeter of permanently flooded islands and therefore may not technically function as levees in the traditional sense. Non-project levees are defined in California Water Code, Section 12980(e). Some levees that are not project levees are also not "non-project levees" and are sometimes called "unattributed levees". There are hundreds of miles of these other levees in the Delta and in the Suisun Marsh. Depending upon which types of levees are being counted, different values may be derived for levee mileage in the Delta.</u> Approximately 65 percent of the levees in the Delta and all levees in the Suisun Marsh are owned or maintained by local agencies or private owners and are not part of the State and federal government's Sacramento River Control Project or San Joaquin River Flood Control System Project. Most of these non-project and unattributed "non-project" levees are maintained by local reclamation districts created and funded by landowners, initially for the purpose of draining ("reclaiming") the Delta's islands and tracts."</p>	DWR	Revise narrative to reflect three characterizations of levees	Nottoli

**Items pulled by Council Members from Consent List  
Delta Plan – List of Changes 7/12/12**

Item Number	Page #/ Line #	Issue or Requested Change	Original Source of Comment	Initial Staff Recommendation	Council Member Who Pulled Item
304	261/15	<p>The first bullet regarding State funding priorities should be changed to clarify that this funding priority for 200-year protection would apply to <u>existing</u> urban areas and <u>adjacent</u> urbanizing areas. Otherwise, this could be read to indicate that the State is prioritizing funding for providing 200-year protection for existing small communities that want to become urban areas. Consistent with the errata sheet for the CVFPP (e.g., errata numbers 33, 43, and 65), this bullet should say "Provide a 200-year level of flood protection for existing urban and adjacent urbanizing areas (Water Code section 9600 et seq.)." This same comment applies to the table on page 272, as previously noted.</p>	DWR	Correct narrative	Marcus

**Chapter 8**