

From: thomas@firstlookdesign.net on behalf of [Delta Stewardship Council](#)
To: comments_EIR@DeltaCouncil
Subject: Form submission from: Comment on Draft EIR
Date: Thursday, February 02, 2012 10:25:16 PM

Submitted on Thursday, February 2, 2012 - 22:25

Submitted values are:

First Name: Hirshel
Last Name: Mattingly
Phone Number: 916-2-739-8121
Comment:

As a Sacramento area resident, I am concerned about three items around which my comments are centered:

1. The proposed action will divert "less water" from the Delta than the status quo. I did not see that this EIR fully addressed all of the future water diversion projects from north of the Delta that have a cumulative effect on the ecosystem of the Delta. These project include but are not be limited to: Ultimate build-out of the Stockton Delta Diversion project, Proposed Woodland Davis Diversion, Solano County future diversions, Sacramento Valley IRWPM future needs, Mokelumne River Integrated Plan future diversions, and many other pending Area of Origin Right diversions off water ways serving both the CVP and SWP north of the Delta. To not include a discussion of the cumulative impacts of these projects and their impact on the co-equal goals appears to be a shortcoming in the policy making and the environmental analysis of the Plan. Yes, the diversions may be less, but they may also be those diversions that north of Delta water users have been counting on under their Area of Origin Rights to support their future growth. Or, the ecosystem will continue to decline as both north and south of Delta diverters battle for their rightful share of the available supplies irrespective of a SWRCB Delta flow standard that neither north nor south will accept without judicial ruling. Please perform a thorough analysis of the cumulative effects of Area of Origin Rights. The Federal Government is conspicuously absent from the Plan. How can this be? The CVP is a major diverter of Delta water at essentially the same withdrawal location at Clifton Court. To not have an adequate discussion of the CVP water needs that are thoroughly entangled with the water need of the Delta environment and the SWP appears to be a serious shortcoming of the Plan. Financing plans state that users will pay- where is the allocation of Federal contractor willingness to pay? For example: the Friant Exchange Contractors have no obligation, desire, or need to pay for alternative diversion facilities – they have a guaranteed future contract through DMC deliveries. To not adequately factor or disaggregate the Federal CVP diversions of water as part of the Plan appears to be serious shortcoming. A truly sustainable plan cannot be

accomplished by simply looking at the SWP diversions and casually looking at the CVP diversions. Please include a thorough analysis of the CVP and SWP effects to the Delta in the Plan. Because future Federal funds are almost certain to be used to implement this plan, full NEPA compliance should be undertaken with an identified Federal Lead Agency.

The finance plan states that a cost benefit analysis will be performed at some time in the future. Although not required by CEQA, how can such an important decision on a Delta Plan in difficult economic times be made without such information? California taxpayers and citizens need to understand the returns on the investment along with the decision- not after-the-fact! Please commence with the CBA as part of the Plan so that the Commission has adequate information to fulfill its fiduciary responsibility to the people of California about the choices made in the Delta regarding the spending of taxpayer funds. As a Sacramento area resident, I am concerned about three items around which my comments are centered:

1. The proposed action will divert "less water" from the Delta than the status quo. I did not see that this EIR fully addressed all of the future water diversion projects from north of the Delta that have a cumulative effect on the ecosystem of the Delta. These project include but are not be limited to: Ultimate build-out of the Stockton Delta Diversion project, Proposed Woodland Davis Diversion, Solano County future diversions, Sacramento Valley IRWPM future needs, Mokelumne River Integrated Plan future diversions, and many other pending Area of Origin Right diversions off water ways serving both the CVP and SWP north of the Delta. These projects are all cataloged as part of DWRs ongoing planning efforts. To not include a discussion of the cumulative impacts of these projects and their impact on the co-equal goals appears to be a shortcoming in the policy making and the environmental analysis of the Plan. Yes, the diversions may be less, but they may also be those same diversions that north of Delta water users have been counting on under their Area of Origin Rights to support their future growth and those of the Delta ecosystem. Or, the ecosystem will continue to decline as both north and south of Delta diverters battle for their rightful share of the available supplies irrespective of a SWRCB Delta flow standard that neither north nor south will accept without judicial ruling. Please perform a thorough analysis of the cumulative effects of Area of Origin Rights to the North of the Delta and the effect this has on available water supply for the co equal goals.

2. The Federal Government is conspicuously absent from the Plan. How can this be? The CVP is a major diverter of Delta water at essentially the same withdrawal location at Clifton Court. To not have an adequate discussion of the CVP water needs that are thoroughly entangled with the water need of the Delta environment and the SWP appears to be a serious shortcoming of the Plan

(surely, it's not a plan for only the SWP but covers all withdrawals?). The financing plans state that users will pay- where is the allocation of Federal contractor willingness to pay? For example: the Friant Exchange Contractors have no obligation, desire, or need to pay for alternative diversion facilities

– they have a guaranteed future contract through DMC deliveries. To not adequately factor or disaggregate the Federal CVP diversions of water as part of

the financial plan appears to be serious shortcoming at the core of California's

public's willingness to support the DBCP and Delta Plan and the this EIR. A truly sustainable plan cannot be accomplished by simply looking at the SWP diversions and casually looking at the CVP diversions. Please include a thorough analysis of the SWP AND CVP affects to the Delta in the Plan.

Because

future Federal funds are almost certain to be used to implement aspects of this

Plan, full NEPA compliance should be undertaken with an identified Federal Lead

Agency.

3. The finance plan states that a cost benefit analysis will be performed at some time in the future... Although not required by CEQA, how can such an important decision on a Delta Plan in difficult economic times be made without

such information? California taxpayers and citizens need to understand the return on the investment that go along with the decision- not after-the-fact! Please commence with the CBA as part of the Plan so that the Commission has adequate information to fulfill its fiduciary responsibility to the people of California about the choices made in the Delta regarding the spending of taxpayer funds to support the coequal goals. To not do so will only invite the

public's outrage at a decision that is potentially not supported by future economic analysis.