To: CN=Bruce Herbold/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Cc: []
Bcc: []
From: CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Fri 5/20/2011 4:22:41 AM
Subject: Operations descriptions in word files
Proposed Operations for Dual Conv Alternatives 1 and 2 06_08_10 v3.docx
Proposed Operations for Alternative 3__06_22_10 v3.docx
Proposed Operations for Alternative 4__10_19_10 v7.docx
Proposed Operations for Alternative 5__06_08_10 v5.docx
http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html
mailto:Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov
http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html
http://bdcpweb.com/Files/Highlights_of_the_BDCP_FINAL_03-17-11.pdf
pidlof@usbr.gov
(embedded image)
(embedded image)
(embedded image)
(embedded image)

Last email on this. I have not looked at all of these files but the one I opened seemed to be another table with a little more information than the PDF table I sent you previously. It is hard for me to interpret these.

How are we to know what the effect is of any of the pumping ops? Like what is the effect of full time (w/o stop) pulling 5K CFS (no more than 300cfs from each intake at a time) from the north-delta intakes? All intakes at once? I recall a BECT meeting where they explained that they wanted 5 intakes but they would hardly ever operate two of them, those were for emergency or some other reason. So, then is it just 3 intakes operating all the time at 5K CFS, just one or two? Regardless of how many, how does 5K CFS translate into effect on aquatic resource designated uses (community ecology) CWA point of view and/or species by species ESA view of the world? Is it okay on smelt? Bad for salmon? Irrelevant for sturgeon? Do you get a sense of impacts from the info in these files?

****
Erin Foresman
Environmental Scientist & Policy Coordinator,
US EPA Region 9 C/O Army Corps of Engineers
650 Capitol Mall Suite 5-200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 557 5253, Fax: (916) 557 6877

http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html

----- Forwarded by Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US on 05/19/2011 09:00 PM -----

From: "Idlof, Patricia S" <PIdlof@usbr.gov>
To: Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Michael G SPK Nepstad <Michael.G.Nepstad@usace.army.mil>
Cc: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Carolyn Yale/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Laura Fujii/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, "michael.s.jewell@usace.army.mil" <michael.s.jewell@usace.army.mil>, "Barajas, Federico" <FBarajas@usbr.gov>
Date: 05/16/2011 11:01 AM
Subject: RE: BDCP

ED_000733_DD_NSF_00079762-00001

All,
Per your request, attached are the detailed descriptions of the operations modeling for the existing BDCP EIR/EIS Alternatives 1-5.

Patti Idlof
916-992-3566 (c)
pidlof@usbr.gov

From: Idlof, Patricia S
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2011 2:20 PM
To: 'Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov'
Cc: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov; Yale.Carolyn@epamail.epa.gov; Fujii.Laura@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: BDCP

That's odd that the attachments we're included because I distinctly remember doing it. Sorry! Anyway, here they are. I'll work on getting the operational descriptions for the existing alternatives to forward on.

Patti Idlof
916-992-3566 (c)
pidlof@usbr.gov

From: Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2011 2:09 PM
To: Idlof, Patricia S
Cc: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov; Yale.Carolyn@epamail.epa.gov; Fujii.Laura@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: BDCP

Hi Patti,
Thanks for the conf.call. I didn't notice at the time but when we mentioned this email exchange I went back and checked the messages and discovered the attachments you reference below weren't attached. If you could send those and the descriptions of operations for the five alternatives, it would be very helpful.

Thanks and have a good weekend,
Erin

****
Erin Foresman
Environmental Scientist & Policy Coordinator,
US EPA Region 9 C/O Army Corps of Engineers
650 Capitol Mall Suite 5-200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 557 5253, Fax: (916) 557 6877

http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html

ED_000733_DD_NSF_00079762-00002

From: "Idlof, Patricia S" <PIdlof@usbr.gov>
To: Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/27/2011 04:04 PM
Subject: RE: BDCP

Erin,
Attached is the description of the BDCP Proposed Project operational criteria (2/11/10 BDCP Handout) noted in the powerpoint. There are internal working draft descriptions of the alternatives that the consultants have developed, but they have not yet been reviewed and commented on by the lead agencies. Likely because no final decision has been made on the alternatives and due to the consultant work stoppage. The 2010 Proposed Project did not include a fall X2 action. As noted in the table, Alt 3 does include fall X2, but I don't recall if Alt 4 or Alt 5 included one or not.

Also attached is a draft non-federal cooperating MOU that was ultimately signed by the Federal lead agencies and Contra Costa County that you requested.

Patti Idlof
916-992-3566 (c)
pidlof@usbr.gov

From: Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2011 1:39 PM
To: Idlof, Patricia S
Cc: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: BDCP

Hi Patti,

Thanks for sending this to us! Is this the only description of range of alternatives that you know of? In the table near the end of the power point, in the operations column, there is mention of a document handed out at the 2-11-10 meeting that discusses the proposed bdcp project with respect to operations. I'm sorry to ask for another thing, but do you have a copy of that or could get a copy of that description?

Was there any development of "fall X2" as an operational criteria?

****
Erin Foresman
Environmental Scientist & Policy Coordinator,
US EPA Region 9 C/O Army Corps of Engineers
650 Capitol Mall Suite 5-200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 557 5253, Fax: (916) 557 6877

http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html

-----"Idlof, Patricia S" <PIdlof@usbr.gov> wrote: -----
To: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

From: "Idlof, Patricia S" <PIdlof@usbr.gov>
Date: 04/27/2011 12:00PM
cc: Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: RE: BDCP
Karen and Erin,

Attached is the powerpoint presentation from the June 15, 2010 BECT meeting regarding the screening process and range of alternatives. I checked the BECT meeting list and several people from EPA and the Corps were included in the invitation. The EIR/EIS consultant seemed to recall that someone from EPA joined the meeting by phone and was emailed the presentation. In any case, this is it.

Looking forward to our continuing discussions.

Patti Idlof
916-992-3566 (c)
pidlof@usbr.gov

From: Idlof, Patricia S
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2011 1:11 PM
To: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: BDCP

Hi Karen,
I agree that our meeting last Friday was very productive and I'm looking forward to having more of them. I too had trouble finding the presentation given at our last BECT meeting (June 15, 2010) regarding the screening process, criteria, and resultant preliminary array of alternatives, so I've asked the consultant to track it down for me. I looked through some of my meeting notes and recalled that a presentation on this was also given at a Steering Committee meeting. A brief description and table of the preliminary array of alternatives is included in the state's BDCP Highlights document on pages 74-76 (see link).

http://bdcpweb.com/Files/Highlights_of_the_BDCP_FINAL_03-17-11.pdf

Yes, I believe that's what I said at last Thursday's meeting. What I was addressing was that the alternatives need to at least partially satisfy the P&N, or they wouldn't be included for analysis. A "reduced export alternative" would be difficult to define (how much reduced? reduced from what?) and wouldn't meet the co-equal goals of the project. That doesn't mean that one or more alternatives would not result in reduced exports (which some actually do).

The results of the screening process will be described in the alternatives development report, an appendix to the EIR/EIS which has not been completed. So I don't have a detailed writeup to forward you at this point.

Hope this helps!

Patti Idlof
Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region, MP-152
916-992-3566 (c)
pidlof@usbr.gov

ED_000733_DD_NSF_00079762-00004

From: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov [Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2011 3:31 PM
To: Idlof, Patricia S
Cc: Nawi, David
Subject: BDCP
Hi Patti -

I heard that Friday's meeting on 404 integration was productive - thanks for organizing it.

I wanted to get clarification on what I think I heard on last Thursday's federal agency call. It was in the context of discussing the State Board's recent letter about the need for a "reduced export" alternative. I think I heard you say that this could be a problem for the federal DEIS as the Screening Criteria had screened out (or would screen out) such an alternative. Did I get that right? You were going to send me the Screening Criteria because somehow I had missed that this document had been completed. Is there also a report documenting the results of applying this criteria? Or was that what you said was done by powerpoint at a BECT meeting?

Thanks Patti! - Karen

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

KAREN SCHWINN
Associate Director
Water Division
U.S. EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street (Wtr-1)
San Francisco, CA 94105
415/972-3472
415/297-5509 (mobile)
415/947-3537 (fax)
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

[attachment "Presentation for Range of Alternatives for June 15 2010 BECT v5.pptx" removed by Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US]

ED_000733_DD_NSF_00079762-00005