


# 1 **Appendix 6E Errata**

- 2 Please add the following pages after page 6E-396 of the Appendix 6E file.



1 **B.28. Sacramento River at Emmaton Compliance with D-1641**  
2 **Agricultural Salinity Standard**


Figure 6E.B.28. Sacramento River at Emmatton Compliance with D-1641 Agricultural Salinity Standard



1 **B.29. San Joaquin River at Jersey Point Compliance with D-1641**  
2 **Agricultural Salinity Standard**

3


Figure 6E.B.29. San Joaquin River at Jersey Point Compliance with D-1641 Agricultural Water Quality Standard



Notes: 1) Probability of compliance is defined as the probability the standard threshold will not be exceeded. 2) All alternatives are simulated with projected hydrology and sea level at Year 2030 conditions. 3) Model results for Alternatives 1, 4, and Second Basis of Comparison are the same, therefore Alternatives 1 and 4 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 4) Model results for Alternative 2 and No Action Alternative are the same, therefore Alternative 2 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 5) Values are the 14-day average from April through August.

1 **B.30. Contra Costa Canal at Pumping Plant #1 Compliance with**  
2 **D-1641 M&I Chloride Standard**


Figure 6E.B.30.1. Contra Costa Canal at Pumping Plant #1 Compliance with D-1641 M&amp;I Chloride Standard



Notes: 1) Probability of compliance is defined as the probability the standard threshold will not be exceeded. 2) All alternatives are simulated with projected hydrology and sea level at Year 2030 conditions. 3) Model results for Alternatives 1, 4, and Second Basis of Comparison are the same, therefore Alternatives 1 and 4 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 4) Model results for Alternative 2 and No Action Alternative are the same, therefore Alternative 2 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 5) Values are daily average.




Figure 6E.B.30.2. Contra Costa Canal at Pumping Plant #1 Compliance with D-1641 M&I Water Quality Standard



1 **B.31. San Joaquin River at Antioch Water Works Compliance with**  
2 **D-1641 M&I Chloride Standard**  
3

Figure 6E.B.31. San Joaquin River at Antioch Water Works Compliance with D-1641 M&amp;I Water Quality Standard




Notes: 1) Probability of compliance is defined as the probability the standard threshold will not be exceeded. 2) All alternatives are simulated with projected hydrology and sea level at Year 2030 conditions. 3) Model results for Alternatives 1, 4, and Second Basis of Comparison are the same, therefore Alternatives 1 and 4 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 4) Model results for Alternative 2 and No Action Alternative are the same, therefore Alternative 2 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 5) Values are daily average.

1 **B.32. West Canal at Mouth of Clifton Court Forebay Compliance**  
2 **with D-1641 M&I Chloride Standard**

3

Figure 6E.B.32. West Canal at mouth of Clifton Court Forebay Compliance with D-1641 M&amp;I Water Quality Standard




Notes: 1) Probability of compliance is defined as the probability the standard threshold will not be exceeded. 2) All alternatives are simulated with projected hydrology and sea level at Year 2030 conditions. 3) Model results for Alternatives 1, 4, and Second Basis of Comparison are the same, therefore Alternatives 1 and 4 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 4) Model results for Alternative 2 and No Action Alternative are the same, therefore Alternative 2 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 5) Values are daily average.

1 **B.33. Delta-Mendota Canal at Tracy Pumping Plant Compliance**  
2 **Compliance with D-1641 M&I Chloride Standard**

3

Figure 6E.B.33. Delta-Mendota Canal at Tracy Pumping Plant Compliance with D-1641 M&amp;I Water Quality Standard




Notes: 1) Probability of compliance is defined as the probability the standard threshold will not be exceeded. 2) All alternatives are simulated with projected hydrology and sea level at Year 2030 conditions. 3) Model results for Alternatives 1, 4, and Second Basis of Comparison are the same, therefore Alternatives 1 and 4 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 4) Model results for Alternative 2 and No Action Alternative are the same, therefore Alternative 2 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 5) Values are daily average.

1 **B.34. Barker Slough at North Bay Aqueduct Compliance**  
2 **Compliance with D-1641 M&I Chloride Standard**

3




Figure 6E.B.34. Barker Slough at North Bay Aqueduct Compliance with D-1641 M&amp;I Water Quality Standard



Notes: 1) Probability of compliance is defined as the probability the standard threshold will not be exceeded. 2) All alternatives are simulated with projected hydrology and sea level at Year 2030 conditions. 3) Model results for Alternatives 1, 4, and Second Basis of Comparison are the same, therefore Alternatives 1 and 4 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 4) Model results for Alternative 2 and No Action Alternative are the same, therefore Alternative 2 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 5) Values are daily average.

1 **B.35. Cache Slough at City of Vallejo Intake Compliance with D-**  
2 **1641 M&I Chloride Standard**

Figure 6E.B.35. Cache Slough at City of Vallejo Intake Compliance with D-1641 M&amp;I Water Quality Standard



Notes: 1) Probability of compliance is defined as the probability the standard threshold will not be exceeded. 2) All alternatives are simulated with projected hydrology and sea level at Year 2030 conditions. 3) Model results for Alternatives 1, 4, and Second Basis of Comparison are the same, therefore Alternatives 1 and 4 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 4) Model results for Alternative 2 and No Action Alternative are the same, therefore Alternative 2 results are not presented. Qualitative differences, if applicable, are discussed in the text. 5) Values are daily average.