

# I113 Ceres transcript

**No comments**

- n/a -

1/17/2012  
Delta Stewardship Meeting

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
DELTA STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL  
  
MEETING OF THE DELTA STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL  
  
Stanislaus County  
Ceres Community Center  
2701 4th Street  
Ceres, California 95307  
JANUARY 17, 2012  
6:00 P.M.  
  
Reported By: Skylar M. Hall, CSR No. 13615

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 APPEARANCES:  
2  
3 PHIL ISENBERG  
4 Chairman  
5 RANDY FIORINI  
6 Council Member  
7 DON NOTTOLI  
8 Council Member  
9 PATRICK JOHNSTON  
10 Council Member  
11 KEITH COOLIDGE  
12 Executive Manager  
13 JOE GRINDSTAFF  
14 Executive Officer  
15  
16 Public Speakers:  
17 Chris Tyler  
18 Tim Sanders  
19 Ron Jacobsen  
20 Earl Perez  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 BE IT REMEMBERED, that on January 17, 2012,  
2 commencing at the hour of 6:00 P.M., at Ceres Community  
3 Center, 2701 4th Street, Ceres, California, before me,  
4 SKYLAR M. HALL, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for  
5 the county of Sacramento, State of California, the  
6 following proceedings took place:

7  
8 (The following proceedings were held on the  
9 record.)

10  
11 MR. TYLER: Mr. Chairman, Councilmembers, and  
12 Staff, we really appreciate this. I'm Chris Tyler.  
13 I'll owe you a blue sheet. You can wrestle me on the  
14 way out.

15 I'm from the offices of Senator Anthony  
16 Cannella; and first of all, I'd like to welcome you to  
17 his hometown of Ceres. Thank you for all the work that  
18 you're doing. I mean, if this year doesn't improve it,  
19 I don't know what year will, because water is so  
20 critical to the operation of the valley. So I thank you  
21 for the work you're doing, for the time you're taking,  
22 listening, adapting, and coming up with a solution that  
23 will be beneficial and will achieve these two goals that  
24 you're talking about.

25 So thank you for letting us know about the EIR

I113-1

**Response to comment I113-1**  
Comment noted.

1 process. That's a process that's ongoing, and we'll  
2 look forward to reviewing that. I don't feel I have  
3 enough information right now to be able to comment, but  
4 again, thank you for being here. I113-1

5 MR. ISENEBERG: Thank you, Mr. Tyler.  
6 Yes, sir. Please adjust that microphone so  
7 it's suitable for you, please.

8 MR. SANDERS: I didn't fill out a blue form,  
9 either, but --

10 MR. ISENEBERG: Give your name.

11 MR. SANDERS: Tim Sanders. I'm just a local  
12 farmer here in Ceres. The delta is such a complicated  
13 and complex issue. I'm just wondering -- all the  
14 entities that are involved, how are they reacting to the  
15 work that you people are doing and how is it being I113-2  
16 accepted? California has always fought over water, and  
17 our worst water fights are probably yet to come; and  
18 we've got to fix the delta; and I'm just wondering how  
19 you were being accepted by all the varying interests  
20 that are involved.

21 MR. ISENEBERG: This -- I'll just speak for  
22 myself. Almost everyone's pretty polite, but as you  
23 correctly anticipated, within 30 seconds of the  
24 politeness, everyone has a clear, distinct and precise  
25 policy to recommend; policy to oppose; a declaration on

**Response to comment I113-2**  
Comment noted.

1 legal status or not; and -- you know, it runs the range  
2 of the historic water battles in California. There's no  
3 secret about that.

4         Keith said something that I'd like to  
5 emphasize. The three of us have been around water  
6 issues for a pretty long time, as I know many of you  
7 have. California only rouses itself to make a major  
8 decision on water every 30, 40, 50 years -- sometimes  
9 longer years than that. The legislative action on  
10 setting up this council, a companion agency, the Delta  
11 Conservancy, to handle restoration activities; and the  
12 change in authority of a longstanding entity, the Delta  
13 Protection Commission, now a locally-controlled  
14 commission and a state body with land use authority --  
15 all that was pretty unexpected to those of us who have  
16 been in the field, because it came with it some major  
17 policy declarations.

18         It's easy to say co-equal goals, but as I'm  
19 sure you recognize, really, for as long as we've been a  
20 state and certainly since World War II, the battle has  
21 not been to acknowledge their co-equal goals, but the  
22 battle has largely been our environmental interests to  
23 be treated with some level of comparability to human  
24 uses of water, and the legislature said yes. They  
25 adopted the co-equal goal. They had a host of other

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 policy decisions they made. That is not uniformly  
2 accepted, even though it is state law.

3 You also also pointed out other factors. It's  
4 easier to say than it is to accomplish, because as with  
5 most laws, society changes. Human beings change, and  
6 you engage in crop rotations and changing your crops  
7 based on a host of factors, and the water situation in  
8 California is increasingly difficult. As a matter of  
9 fact, one of the things that convinced me was listening  
10 to my friend Randy over here, who farms south of here,  
11 and one of the things we almost agreed to was -- we  
12 believe that the biggest problem we face is not a  
13 problem of who gets what water. It's that the water  
14 supply is increasingly volatile in the state.

15 Larger demands, population growing, economy  
16 growing, relatively static supply of precipitation --  
17 but water changes. This year to last year is kind of a  
18 classic illustration. So how as a society do we grow;  
19 develop; maintain our economy; honor and respect the  
20 environment; and deal with a volatile water supply in an  
21 era where everyone's in favor of something being done  
22 but deeply suspicious about having to pay for it?

23 So that's not any surprise to you. It's a  
24 national conundrum. It's a state problem. And Randy, I  
25 don't know if you want to take a crack at -- no?

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 MR. SANDERS: Well, I'm certainly hopeful that  
2 we can all work together and find an agreement that we  
3 can live with. I mean, that's how our system of  
4 government is designed -- come together with opposing  
5 opinions and find compromises where we come to an  
6 agreement we can all work with. Though we may not be  
7 completely happy with it, we can work with the  
8 situation, and that's what we're seeing. That's the  
9 problem we're seeing now with most state government and  
10 federal government. We're too polarized and we need to  
11 have the right signs and hopefully come up with a  
12 compromise somewhere

I113-3

13 MR. ISENBERG: We hope so. Thank you, sir. If  
14 you would fill out that form, please, Mr. Sanders?

15 Anyone else like to say anything or ask us a  
16 question on this first phase of activity?

17 MR. JACOBSEN: Good evening, members of the  
18 council. My name is Ron Jacobsen with the water  
19 authority. We'll have our own comments on EIR, so I  
20 guess we're like everybody else; but since it's kind of  
21 an open forum, here, I was wondering if you had any  
22 comments relative to the delta provisions of the water  
23 bond and the integrational water management of the water  
24 bond.

I113-4

25 There's a number of provisions in there -- it's

**Response to comment I113-3**

Comment noted.

**Response to comment I113-4**

Comment noted.

1 eleven billion dollars, but there's over two billion  
2 dollars for the delta, and over a billion dollars, I  
3 believe, for integrated regional water management plans;  
4 and part of your mission is for regional  
5 self-sufficiency. So if that bond is revised or  
6 deferred, how do you see that affecting the ability to  
7 advance the plan, if at all?

1113-4

8 MR. ISEBERG: You're correct that there is a  
9 significant amount of money in the 11.14 billion dollar  
10 bond that was part of this package directed towards  
11 regional sustainability and the water management plans.  
12 We've learned from Proposition 50 and Proposition 84  
13 that that money can be very effectively used by the  
14 locals.

15 The question is, will we have a bond? Will it  
16 be the one that is currently in play, or will it be  
17 something else? We don't know the answers to this, but  
18 I think the Stewardship Council will recommend bond  
19 funding, and we will be supportive of the regional  
20 approach to funding, similar to Prop 50 and Prop 84,  
21 which is what the current one is. You probably know  
22 more, Ron, about the politics in Sacramento and the  
23 likelihood of the current bond.

24 MR. JACOBSEN: No, but it is something that is  
25 moving forward. But if I can address the regional --

1113-5

## **Response to comment I113-5**

Comment noted.

1 the delta provisions -- I think it's two and a quarter.

2 MR. ISENBERG: I want to call on my colleague,  
3 Pat Johnston, who spent much of his time in the Senate  
4 Finance Committee, where ominous money-sounding issues  
5 always wound up. Pat, would you comment on what you  
6 hear -- I understand you're not involved in it  
7 directly -- and the calculations and considerations of  
8 whether the bond stays on the 2012 ballot or goes to a  
9 later date or disappears?

10 MR. JOHNSTON: For all that experience, I  
11 missed the mark often enough. When Governor Brown was  
12 running for election, he asked me at one point, when I  
13 saw him, what was my advice for him on water issues as  
14 he ran and as the work was underway of the Bay Delta  
15 Conservation Plan and the work of the Stewardship  
16 Council; and I said, well, you're running for office,  
17 after all. It's very controversial. You've supported  
18 the completion of your father's state water project work  
19 in the early 60s in signing the legislation to authorize  
20 the conveyance system at the canal when you were  
21 governor, and that -- in 1982, that was then rejected.

22 So I would suggest that the one thing you do is  
23 support the bond. The other parts -- you should be  
24 happy that Governor Schwarzenegger's administration has  
25 moved aggressively to address these water issues,

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 because all that is done before you become governor, if  
2 you're elected, will help you, because it's a big job --  
3 water decisions and policies.

4         And so my advice was be in favor of the bond.  
5 As it turned out, before -- at least to my knowledge, he  
6 made a decision on that. The bond was set aside, and  
7 so -- you know, it was not an issue in his election; but  
8 my thought then and my thought now is that at the point  
9 at which there is an adequate coalition to support the  
10 water bond, it would be wise to do so, and then have  
11 that available resource recognizing that the debt  
12 service for all that borrowing and bonds comes from the  
13 general fund, which is certainly depleted.

14         Nevertheless, that seed money can help the  
15 various regions of the state, be it the delta, but also  
16 the San Joaquin Valley and elsewhere. The principle of  
17 regional self-sufficiency is one that we, as the  
18 Council, feel ought to be stressed, and that makes the  
19 state a continuing partner with localities; but they  
20 have responsibilities, too, and they go to conservation  
21 and various strategies, which are outlined in the Delta  
22 Plan.

23         But the state's responsibility has to extend to  
24 more than telling people what they ought to do for  
25 themselves. The cost ought to be socialized over the

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 entirety of the state, to some degree, and a bond  
2 measure is a way to do that. I think the state leaders  
3 and voters have erred, on occasion, in using bond and  
4 bond money, including water bond money, for projects and  
5 expenditures that were not long-term investments. So  
6 we've sort of damaged that credibility, including  
7 funding a lot of our own work. It's off of bond money.  
8 It's off of borrowed money.

9         Now, it can be justified, perhaps, if our  
10 contribution merits the judgment that we helped improve  
11 water reliability, as well as the ecosystem, over time;  
12 but we would be wise, as a state, to return to the  
13 notion that bond money ought to be used for capital in  
14 long-term projects, and we ought to use that money with  
15 the leverage that the Delta Plan provides to reward  
16 regions that do their own best efforts to solve their  
17 water problems, and not reward areas that simply expect  
18 the state to pay that cost when they get the right  
19 alignment of elected leaders who will slip it into a  
20 bill, which -- I know you're shocked, but that's  
21 happened from time to time.

22         MR. ISEBERG: I should point out -- we've just  
23 been joined by the fourth member of the Council here  
24 tonight, Don Nottoli, supervisor from Sacramento County  
25 for 18 years -- 18 years, now -- and the chair of the

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 board and automatically a member of the Council. The  
2 only automatic membership of the Council is because he  
3 is Chair of the Delta Protection Commission, both the  
4 delta region's land use and planning body, particularly  
5 in the primary zone of the delta. So, Don, if you would  
6 come up here and join us, please, we'd appreciate it.

7         Just a last point on the previous question on  
8 money -- for those of you who tend to fall asleep when  
9 budget discussions occur, the general fund of the state  
10 of California is the fund that pays overwhelmingly for  
11 education; for health and social services; for  
12 corrections and law enforcement; which is about --  
13 that's about 90 percent, I think, of the spending of the  
14 general fund -- and then miscellaneous state government  
15 is on top of that.

16         Accordingly, the difficulty that's happened in  
17 recent years -- and it's a growing concern -- as the  
18 debt burden increases, the money that pays back that  
19 borrowing comes from money that pays -- otherwise would  
20 pay for schools; for health and social services; for  
21 corrections and law enforcement. That includes higher  
22 education, by the way. Those are the two biggest  
23 expenditure items in the state.

24         So, just speaking for myself, I think if you  
25 look at the long term, you're probably not going to see

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 as generous a state expenditure on general obligation  
2 bonds for school instruction, for transportation  
3 construction, or water construction, although schools  
4 and transportation are the largest users, by far, of  
5 general bonds of the state. So the recession has kind  
6 of dampened the enthusiasm and dampened voters' pleasure  
7 about authorizing spending, but those calculations are  
8 undergoing by all the politicians in Sacramento -- the  
9 folks that make decisions.

10           One last thing -- to change the date of an  
11 election that's already been enacted by statute requires  
12 a two-thirds vote of the legislature. So to change the  
13 terms and conditions of the bond measures that are  
14 already on the ballot also requires a two-thirds vote of  
15 each house of the legislature, and it's hard enough  
16 getting a majority. Supermajorities tend to be even  
17 more difficult than that.

18           Anyway, that was a very long answer to a very  
19 precise question, but it's what everybody is struggling  
20 with in Sacramento. By the way, at the governor's  
21 address tomorrow, we're told there will be some mention  
22 of how extensive it is about the water issue, so we  
23 would encourage you to read the news reports or plug in  
24 on computer or television if you have access to those  
25 channels.

**No comments**

- n/a -

1           Is there anyone else who would like to talk to  
2 us in this stage of the discussion? Yes, sir? And  
3 remember, we're going to nail you for a blue form after  
4 you get through with your statements.

5           MR. PEREZ: My name is Earl Perez. I'm part of  
6 a farming operation on the west side. We're highly  
7 dependent on federal water and state water. Ninety  
8 percent of our water comes from these two projects, so  
9 we're very interested in what's happening with the Delta  
10 Plan. I appreciate the fact that you're here and  
11 wanting to hear from the people, low-income people  
12 who -- I'm surprised there's not more people from the  
13 west side here, because they are more directly affected,  
14 I think -- but I appreciate the fact that the Council is  
15 doing some tremendous work, which is trying to figure  
16 out what the balance will be between the ecosystem and  
17 the economy of the state.

18           I think those two things are very important,  
19 and we have to consider the economy. I know there are  
20 various stressors to consider, here, and I hope you  
21 would take some advice from the Academy of Sciences,  
22 which -- I think you've considered their study, without  
23 a doubt. I think it mentions some very important  
24 things, which I -- which will affect the outcome of this  
25 study; but I'm interested in the land that is going to

I113-6

### **Response to comment I113-6**

This is a comment on the project, not on the EIR. Environmental stressors are discussed in the EIR. Please refer to the existing conditions in Sections 3 through 21 of the DEIR, such as deteriorating water quality and other stressors in Section 4.3.2.1, Factors Affecting the Delta Ecosystem.

I113-6

1 be purchased for habitat restoration. Is that going to  
2 be purchased or is it going to be leased, or how are you  
3 going to handle that?

4 MR. ISENERG: First of all, let me make a  
5 comment on something that's been consistent all the way  
6 through this process. We are not the only process  
7 around. There is another process called the Bay Delta  
8 Conservation Plan. Mr. Coolidge talked about it. It's  
9 the long-running discussion, debate, argument process to  
10 see whether there could or should be an improvement to  
11 the existing delta water conveyance facility and all the  
12 issues that arise from that.

13 So in 2006, after the association of California  
14 Water Agencies -- and I think Randy was vice chair or  
15 chair at that time -- chair at that time -- had  
16 recommended that the process be started formally. A  
17 process called the Bay Delta Conservation Plan was  
18 created. That is a joint federal/state environmental  
19 process designed to identify an alternative on  
20 conveyance and all the bells and whistles that go with  
21 it, and seek approval of that from federal and state  
22 officials. That process has been going on, as I said,  
23 since 2006 -- three years before we started.

24 The Council has a role to play in that, but it  
25 is only a potential appellate role to a piece of that

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 process. So the question about who gets how much water  
2 and all that is not directly answered in the plan.

3 But back to the first -- Mr. Tyler's first  
4 question -- I think it was Mr. Tyler, or maybe it was  
5 Mr. Sanders -- I think it was Mr. Sanders -- are people  
6 changing their views and starting to reach agreement?  
7 On the basic issues, I haven't seen a lot of agreement.  
8 Some people say they want the highest level of water  
9 export, regardless of how much is available; other  
10 people say there should be none available. That's the  
11 old battle. The law, however, directs the Bay Delta  
12 Conservation Plan to proceed ahead, and we have been  
13 clear that we'd like to see the process completed, but  
14 we're not trying to prejudge that issue because we have  
15 a potential appellate role to a piece of that plan.

16 That's the place where a lot of the questions  
17 will be raised, but as -- well, you know. You farm, so  
18 you understand. A renegotiation of a water contract is  
19 something akin to trying to get Southern Pacific  
20 Railroad to dispose of a hundred thousand acres of its  
21 land. It takes a very painful process and a long time.  
22 All those things are going on, and behind the scenes,  
23 there are all kinds of conversations. Our conversations  
24 are in public, and hopefully we can help resolve some of  
25 them.

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 MR. FIORINI: The scientists tell us there is a  
2 need to convert some of the land in the delta to shallow  
3 water habitat to help the endangered species, and  
4 clearly, that's going to require the conversion of some  
5 ag land. It's a concern of the delta counties, in terms  
6 of revenue, because that takes protective agricultural  
7 ground out of the tax roll and puts it into something  
8 else. Whether that land is purchased, whether it's  
9 leased -- that's up for debate at this point; but the  
10 underlying problem is the funding for the delta  
11 counties, and they don't want to lose revenue.

12 There are going to be attempts to try and  
13 convert state- and federally-owned lands first, but they  
14 may not be located in the places where the scientists  
15 tell us are the best places; but the process that Phil  
16 outlined is designed to get at -- to answer some of  
17 those questions. It's been targeted that there would be  
18 up to 100 acres of land converted to shallow water  
19 habitat.

20 It's not going to happen overnight. Currently,  
21 there are projects underway -- five acres here, ten  
22 there. No one knows for sure if that's going to help.  
23 Suspicions are -- and scientists believe that converting  
24 to shallow water habitat will be helpful, but it's  
25 unlikely that a hundred thousand acres will be converted

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 rapidly. The adapted management portion of the Delta  
2 Plan calls for -- try a little bit, see how it goes; if  
3 that's good, do a little bit more; if it's bad, don't do  
4 anymore.

5 MR. PEREZ: I have haven't heard too much about  
6 conveyance. } 1113-7

7 MR. ISENBERG: We think there are about 53,000  
8 acres of land in the delta that are currently held in  
9 public ownership of one kind or another. So, for  
10 example, that includes the Yolo bypass -- the flood  
11 bypass you're all familiar with near Sacramento. It  
12 includes the lands that have been developed, some of  
13 which are still being farmed by some arrangement, but  
14 others are not.

15 Before you go to the facilities, would you  
16 mind, Don? You want to add anything?

17 MR. NOTTOLI: Not a whole lot. I would just  
18 say that -- I think as Randy and Phil outlined --  
19 obviously, it's a process that's parallel to this one,  
20 but certainly has connection via what the legislation  
21 called for BCP to reconsider under the terms of how that  
22 would be accomplished.

23 I would just say -- and as Randy alluded to  
24 it -- that one of the primary concerns -- not just for  
25 communities or community members, whether they be a

## **Response to comment I113-7**

Please refer to Master Response 1.

1 farmer or businessperson or a resident, is how much --  
2 and certainly under what terms land would be acquired  
3 under the BCP; and I think the magnitude -- there's a  
4 little more than 750,000 acres, several of which is  
5 already held in a public ownership.

6 We certainly get the economy and the fragility  
7 of some of the pursuits, and that's part of what the  
8 protection commission, on which I serve as chair, has  
9 put forward in a report to be finalized later this  
10 month, and that's the Economic Sustainability Plan that  
11 will hopefully inform the Delta Plan and be put forth  
12 for consideration, and someday later in the spring --  
13 but basically, to talk about agriculture, its  
14 contributions to the economy we talked about a moment  
15 ago -- but certainly to a way of life.

16 It's very important, not only to the local  
17 region, but certainly to California, so that will get  
18 considered. I trust -- and hopefully some of the  
19 recommendations of that report will be put forth for  
20 some consideration by the Council, as I said, later this  
21 spring.

22 MR. PEREZ: I haven't heard as much about  
23 conveyance. Is that not your concentration? ] 1113-8

24 MR. ISENBURG: Well, that's the Bay Delta  
25 Conservation Plan. The statute tells us -- the statute

## **Response to comment I113-8**

Please refer to Master Response 1.

1 that created us said that if and when the Bay Delta Plan  
2 is completed and complies with law, we should  
3 incorporate it in the Delta Plan. It's mandatory, not  
4 discretionary. The laws that they have to comply with,  
5 however, are pretty significant.

6 So this enabling act, a copy of which you can  
7 get at the table, says, for example, the Bay Delta  
8 Conservation Plan has to satisfy the California  
9 Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA. It has to satisfy  
10 the natural community's conservation plan act itself, a  
11 state requirement. It has to satisfy, ultimately, the  
12 endangered species. The only way you can build a  
13 facility is if the federal government allows you what's  
14 called a "take permit" to do some temporary damage to  
15 protect its species for a long-term gain.

16 All of that's involved, and at the end of the  
17 state process, if the Department of Fish and Game says  
18 they've met the requirements of law, anybody can appeal  
19 the Fish and Game's determination to us; but we don't  
20 have the authority to build or design.

21 On the other hand, we kind of rumbled in the  
22 Delta Plan, saying if the Bay Delta Conservation Plan is  
23 not completed -- it's been going on since 2006, and this  
24 issue's been discussed by Californians for 60, 70  
25 years -- it's nothing new -- we may have to consider

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 actions on our own; but we do not pretend that we can  
2 authorize and construct, let alone do it ourselves.  
3 That's somebody else's job.

4           There's a lot of discussion about the Bay Delta  
5 Conservation Plan. They are considering alternatives.  
6 They have a website that makes ours look puny by  
7 comparison. Our document on that one CD is long enough.  
8 It's 2,000 pages. I bet their document -- later this  
9 year, it'll be exceeding 10,000 or more pages. They are  
10 designing a project -- a tunnel, as Mr. Coolidge said --  
11 a tunnel or a ditch of this size -- that size. Our  
12 activity is much closer to a general plan for the state  
13 of California, comparable to what you see in general  
14 plans in communities around California.

15           But we're very concerned about it, and it's  
16 fair to say this statute and the Delta Plan believes  
17 that if you want to look to the year 2100, our planning  
18 framework -- it's hard to imagine you will not have  
19 improved delta conveyance systems during that time.  
20 They're getting older. They're functioning poorly, as  
21 Randy indicated. It's causing harm to the environment,  
22 and we've got to address those problems for a host of  
23 reasons.

24           MR. PEREZ: My final question is, why aren't  
25 you working more closely with the Ag Commission Group?

— I113-9

## **Response to comment I113-9**

This is a comment on the project, not on the EIR.

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 MR. ISEBERG: Well, let's see. I actually  
2 brought a list of all the 473 folks who have testified  
3 for us in the past 18 months of the Ag-Urban Coalition  
4 of the Federal State Water Contractors, and ACQA  
5 probably constituted 125 or 130 of all the 400-plus  
6 comments that we've received. We work with them all the  
7 time. There are disagreements. There are sections of  
8 the act they do not like. There are sections of the  
9 Delta Plan they do not like, but we're working with them  
10 as closely as we can. Randy?

11 MR. FIORINI: I agree.

12 MR. PEREZ: Thank you.

13 MR. ISEBERG: Thank you.

14 Anyone else on this part? Then we're going to  
15 move on to the Environmental Impact Report process.

16 Ladies and gentlemen, again, on -- the request  
17 is if you do have something to say, we're of course  
18 taking the transcript down of any comments here, and I  
19 know from some of the comments that were made by several  
20 speakers in advance, they plan on formal written  
21 comments during this comment period on or before  
22 February 2.

23 We would urge all of you who are going to make  
24 formal comments to try to make them as early as you  
25 could, because that gives us a little more time to read

1 them and understand them; and we have to get out the  
2 sixth staff draft plan, so the earlier your ideas and  
3 comments and questions are submitted on the EIR,  
4 hopefully the better informed our staff is on the  
5 recommendations.

6           Just a last procedural point -- I think Keith  
7 may have mentioned this, but to date, the draft delta  
8 plans are staff draft delta plans. They are not  
9 Council-adopted plans. The Council's developed the  
10 staff draft of the plan. At the EIR evaluation, as  
11 staff and consultants prepared evaluations, we'll  
12 reserve our judgments to the end with what we consider  
13 the final Delta Plan.

14           So, ladies and gentlemen, is there anyone who  
15 would like to talk to us on the Environmental Impact  
16 Report itself? The Environmental Impact Report  
17 itself -- well, I know that you're going to be spitting  
18 written comments, so I'd be disappointed if you didn't.  
19 Some of these groups -- they've indicated their desire  
20 to do so.

21           I think -- Mr. Coolidge, not seeing anyone in  
22 the audience who expresses a desire to make comments on  
23 the Environmental Impact Report, just see if there are  
24 any comments by members of Council and then adjourn.

25           Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much. If

**No comments**

- n/a -

1 there's information you need and materials you need  
2 supplemental to this, you could talk to any of us after  
3 the council meeting. Look at our website and call the  
4 staff if you don't find what you're looking for. We can  
5 point you in the right direction for the Bay Delta  
6 Conservation Plan. They have a host of information  
7 publicly available that I think will help answer some of  
8 your earlier questions.

9 Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for  
10 having us down to Ceres. We appreciate it very much.  
11 The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much for  
12 coming.

13 (Whereupon, at 7:05 p.m., the Council meeting was  
14 concluded.)  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**No comments**

- n/a -

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE

OF

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

The undersigned certified shorthand reporter  
of the State of California does hereby certify:

That the foregoing Council meeting was taken  
before me at the time and place therein set forth;

That the testimony of the public and all  
objections made at the time of the hearing were recorded  
stenographically by me and thereafter transcribed, said  
transcript being a true copy of my shorthand notes  
thereof.

In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name  
this date

\_\_\_\_\_ .

\_\_\_\_\_  
Skylar M. Hall, CSR  
Certified Shorthand Reporter #13615

**No comments**

- n/a -