

1 submitted by CWF's proponents fails to demonstrate an absence of injury to legal users of
2 water, due to inappropriate assumptions regarding the operation of the CVP and SWP with
3 the addition of the CWF." [SVWU-100, §20.]

4 In my professional opinion based on my review of MBK's modeling, even with MBK's
5 measures to more aggressively export upstream storage using the new CWF facility, their
6 modeling does not show any significant impact on legal water users because the water
7 deliveries to Settlement Contractors, Exchange Contractors, Refuge Level 2 and Feather
8 River Service Area Contractors are provided at a substantially similar level as the no action
9 and as shown in this rebuttal testimony. This is consistent with testimony and modeling
10 provided by the Petitioners modeling. (Exhibit DWR-71 p. 20:9-19.)

11 Figures 1 through 5 (also, shown in DWR Exhibits 542, 543, 544, 545_errata, and 546)
12 demonstrate that the modeling of Mr. Bourez and Mr. Easton does not show injury to legal
13 users of water. At my direction, the following plots and tables were prepared from the MBK
14 modeling results. These plots and tables show that for the various classes of legal users
15 there is little to no change between the deliveries under the project compared to the no
16 action alternative.

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28