

**Bay Delta Conservation Plan
Review Document Comment Form**

Document: **WORKING DRAFT CONSERVATION STRATEGY, CHAPTER 3.2, JUNE 25, 2009**

Name: Osha Meserve/Rob Burness **Affiliation:** Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge Association (SLNWRA)

Date: 7/14/09

Please use this form to document your comments to the above document. Please number your comments in the first column and indicate the page, section, and line number (if provided) that reference the comment's location in the review document in the next three columns. **Return completed comment forms to Rick Wilder (wilderrm@saic.com).**

To be of the greatest value to the document development process, please make your comments as specific as possible (e.g., rather than stating that more current information is available regarding a topic, provide the additional information [or indicate where it may be acquired]; rather than indicating that you disagree with a statement, indicate why you disagree with the statement and recommend alternative text for the statement). Do not enter information in the **Disposition** column. This column will be used by SAIC to record how each comment was addressed during the document revision process.

No	Page #	Section #	Line #	Comment	Disposition
1	3.2-1 to 3.2-5	3.2.1; 3.2.2	Passim; see, e.g. p. 3.2.3, lines 30-33	Construction of the peripheral canal is characterized as the keystone of the BDCP conservation strategy, and the draft chapter indicates that the canal is considered a "conservation measure." From the perspective of SLNWRA, the canal should instead be characterized as a "covered activity." The primary purpose of the canal is to provide more reliable, better quality water to the PREs. A potential and unproven side benefit of adding upstream diversion points for the Projects is that less pumping may be necessary in the South Delta and take of certain species may be reduced. The direct impacts -- including impacts on special status aquatic and terrestrial species generally as well as species that rely on habitat within the Refuge specifically -- from construction and operation of the canal will be very negative and significant. In addition to the canal itself, the removal of water from the river and Delta farther upstream would likely reduce freshwater availability within the Delta, leading to still more impacts on special status and other species. The new intakes will also likely lead to some entrainment of special status and other species. Last, construction and operation will have multiple significant and unavoidable environmental impacts under CEQA. (Please see SLNWRA's May 2009 NOP comment letter for further details on impacts to the Refuge.) Thus, to the extent any benefits to special status species could accrue from eventual operation of the canal, they pale in comparison to the negative direct and indirect impacts on special status species. As a result of the impacts of the canal on species from an ESA/CESA perspective (in addition to impacts that must be analyzed and	

