

From: [Jan McCleery](#)
To: [Delta Council Science](#)
Cc: [Janet McCleery](#)
Subject: Comments about Delta Flows and New Technologies
Date: Saturday, August 24, 2013 12:24:59 PM

Comments on the DSC Science Plan:

As we know, there are needs for water on both sides of the co-equal goals (the water contractors/exporters representing the Central Valley farmers on one side; the upstream water users, the Delta environment, Delta farmers, Delta communities, the users of the Delta from throughout the state for boating, fishing, and recreation and the downstream ecology of the San Francisco Bay on the other).

The competing needs for the same water is causing the problem in the Delta, the so-called "grand challenges".

The BDCP proposes a solution of exporting the same high levels of exports that have been causing the environmental issues and solving the issues with fish by other means than fresh water (habitat, taking the water out upstream, tunnel construction, etc.) This meets the needs of the exporters but seriously impacts stakeholders on the other side of the equation. Placer County just learned that the BDCP modeling for when the tunnels are installed seems to use different weights than the "No Action" alternative model because with the tunnels they show Folsom Reservoir going dry the 3rd year of a drought which it doesn't now and which would be horrible for communities relying on that water.

This raises two issues/lacking areas in the DSC Science Plan:

(1) Both the Delta Plan and BDCP fail to accept the science behind the SWRCB/Bay Institute recommended Delta Flows Report because it recommended significantly more water for in-Delta than is currently provided (I.e., the exports need to be reduced). Because there is no scientific starting point to allocate water shares rationally, although the Science Plan talks about monitoring flow, I don't see how it can do anything to keep more harm from occurring. The adaptive management process established in the BDCP where anyone can veto which requires escalation to the next agency and at each stage there is a water contractor included means changes to operations could take years. See <http://nodeltagates.com/2013/04/07/the-fox-are-guarding-the-henhouse/>. We recently observed how Westlands obtained early releases of water this year. When that caused salmon issues upstream, Westlands filed a suit (thankfully overturned) to try to block Klamath River releases; releases necessary to avoid the certain death of numerous salmon which would wreck commercial salmon fishing (again) and impact native communities' livelihood. Actions like these, repeated again and again over the past years demonstrate that having Westlands with veto power means problems since they will not cooperate to save the environment, Delta farmers, upstream users, or anyone else. Without an upfront agreement about water allocations and with the system already over-allocated and in crisis, how can science help?

(2) Because scientifically there may not be enough water in the Delta to meet the conflicting needs, it would be of great benefit if the Plan's scope could include analyzing better technologies and approaches. Dr. Jeff Michaels, UOP, posted about new technologies that improve desalination to where it will be both as economical as the tunnel water in 10-15 years plus could save the operational costs of pumping water over the Tehachapi's if LA were regionally self sufficient through desal, recycling and conservation. <http://valleyecon.blogspot.com/2013/04/what-should-we-assume-about-new.html> Shouldn't the Science Plan have a technology focus to evaluate the benefits, pros and cons, of proposed projects versus using newer, better technology. The contractors writing the BDCP have been looking at the same old approach of moving water from the Delta south since the '80s. There is less water in the watershed now plus there are newer technologies and newer ways of thinking.

The 2009 Delta Reform Act and Delta Plan advocate for reduced reliance on the Delta and increased regional self-sufficiency. The Science Plan needs to also make recommendations based on those objectives.

Respectfully submitted -

Jan McCleery
5672 Drakes Drive
Discovery Bay, CA 94505
925-978-6563

From: [Jan McCleery](#)
To: [Delta Council Science](#)
Cc: [Janet McCleery](#)
Subject: Recommendation to incorporate Social Science
Date: Saturday, August 24, 2013 10:53:14 AM

A recommendation was made at last Thursday's Delta Stewardship Council meeting that the Delta Science Program include a focus on Social Sciences in addition to Environmental Science. Supervisor Don Nottoli echoed that suggestion observing what has been lacking is the effect plans will have on communities in the Delta. The Delta Lead Scientist concurred and noted that integrating Social Science with Environmental Science is occurring in many projects throughout the country and to include it with the Delta Science Plan would be appropriate and in accordance with modern thinking.

The Delta Plan states "The Delta Reform Act includes an important caveat: while past Delta efforts focused almost exclusively on water supply reliability or ecosystem protection, the Delta Reform Act requires that the coequal goals be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place."

This important caveat is then ignored by Delta Plan regulations and is not reflected in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP). To-date, every reference to the "co-equal goals" is limited to water exports versus environmental concerns, ignoring the huge negative impacts on Delta communities, Delta farmers, scenic waterways, boating and recreation. You wouldn't put a massive construction project through the center of Yosemite Valley to protect and enhance it, would you? But the BDCP proposes doing that to scenic waterways, blocking boats from boating and recreation, ruining quaint legacy towns and impacting the economy of farmers and boating-related businesses and communities. Even with their new tunnel alignment in the North Delta, they continue to go straight through the South Delta removing most of the prime recreation waterways and blocking access to the one anchorage in the South Delta, Mildred Island. The resulting economic and cultural impacts to my community of Discovery Bay will be huge, yet are being totally ignored.

I would like to strongly encourage the scientists to incorporate Social Sciences into their planning to address the component currently missing from the BDCP plans and analyses - namely, the effect of the tunnel construction and resulting water quality impacts on the people in the Delta.

Thank you for your consideration
Jan McCleery
5672 Drakes Drive
Discovery Bay, CA 94505
926-978-6563