To: Enos, Cassandra@DWR[Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov]
Cc: Vendlinski, Tim[vendlinski.tim@epa.gov]; Banonis, Michelle[mbanonis@usbr.gov]; Erin Foresman[Foresman.Erin@epa.gov]; Tom Hagler[Hagler.Tom@epa.gov]
From: Skophammer, Stephanie
Sent: Thur 3/19/2015 10:56:58 PM
Subject: RE: EPA Action Item discussion follow-up
EPA_DWR mtg Action Items summary Revised 031815 (3) SS.docx

Hi Cassandra-

Thanks for your note and for looking into that item. We would like to attach the following short clarifier which I know is clear to us who attended the meeting, but just in case this Action Item Summary is ever used by someone who did not attend the meetings. It was included on the individual meeting summaries previously, but didn't get carried over to this one.

EPA Note: Some of these notes refer to "agreements" or "conclusions." At this point, EPA is responding to tentative proposals for revisions suggested by the lead agencies or its consultants. Any agreements or conclusions referenced in this document are similarly tentative. EPA will base its Section 309 review on the actual released contents of the public revised DEIS and/or supplemental DEIS (whichever approach is taken).

Since things seem to be rapidly changing, I just want to make sure that this Action Item list accurately reflects what came out of the technical meetings, previous EPA letter, etc. but not necessarily the new direction, since we are not sure all that the new direction may entail.

Thank you for all your coordination,

Stephanie

Stephanie Skophammer

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Environmental Review Section (ENF-4-2)

75 Hawthorne St.

San Francisco, CA 94105

(415) 972-3098

From: Enos, Cassandra@DWR [mailto:Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 2:28 PM
To: Skophammer, Stephanie
Cc: Foresman, Erin L SPK; Vendlinski, Tim; Banonis, Michelle
Subject: EPA Action Item discussion follow-up

Stephanie – Thanks for taking the time to review and discuss the revised Action Item summary. Per our discussion, I revised the document and attached a clean version. I did follow-up on your question regarding deletion of the following action item:

- A discussion regarding the proposed project relationship to the abundance of LFS relative to existing conditions.

The item was deleted as it was specific to the benefits of the high outflow scenario to LFS in the context of Section 10. However, in the RDEIR/SDEIS we fully intend to include an evaluation of the impact of the proposed project operations on LFS abundance and, if necessary, identify appropriate mitigation measures under CEQA/NEPA.

Hope this is helpful. Please let me know if you have any additional questions/comments.

Thanks, Cassandra

Cassandra Enos-Nobriga

Environmental Management

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan

Department of Water Resources

901 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Office: (916) 651-0178

Mobile: (916) 835-6981