

From: Ann Spaulding [mailto:annspaulding@earthlink.net]

Sent: Friday, March 02, 2012 10:36 AM

To: Jerry.meral@resources.ca.gov; Grober, Les@Waterboards; Grindstaff, Joe@DeltaCouncil

Cc: Nemeth, Karla@RESOURCES; Howard, Tom@Waterboards; Egel, Rob@Waterboards

Subject: Clarification needed on BDCP Alternative 8 ((SWRCB increased Delta outflow)

Hi Jerry,

Hi Les,

Hi Joe,

Thanks for the joint presentation at the BDCP Public meeting on Wednesday.

A number of us are confused about which Delta outflow numbers/ranges are being modeled under what is now BDCP Alternative 8, and what the implications are. Hope you can help clarify and shed some light. This is such an important issue, and there seems to be discrepancy and perhaps a shift in approach, that was not discussed at the Public meeting.

According to attendees at the 2/21 BDCP meeting held at Contra Costa County offices, regarding the Western Alignment proposals, Jerry stated that the SWRCB wanted 1.5 MAF but that this would affect upstream reservoirs and water rights. He said they are considering the 800k to 1 MAF (I also heard a range of 700k to 1.2 MAF) and that it is included in Alternative 8. The BDCP brochure shows 1.5 MAF for Alternative 8.

My questions are these:

- What was behind the 1.5 MAF; how was that number developed?
- Has this been modeled in the Effects Analysis?
- What were the findings under that outflow scenario?
- What is the revised number or range for Alternative 8? (we have heard everything from 700k – 1.5MAF)
- How led to the new range, and how was it developed?
- Is it being modeled in the Effects Analysis, and if so, when will we see those results?
- What are the findings?

Thank you very much for clarification on this important aspect of the BDCP and Delta outflow.

Sincerely,

Ann B. Spaulding

-Government Relations

-Business Development

-Stakeholder Engagement

925-963-0613

annspaulding@earthlink.net