

July 2, 2010

Chairman Phil Isenberg
Delta Stewardship Council
650 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairman Isenberg,

Re: Comments on First Draft Interim Delta Plan,

The Planning and Conservation League offers these comments on the First Draft Interim Delta Plan.

1. The Bay Delta Conservation Plan effort intends to have its preferred project identified during the Interim Plan period. Therefore the Interim Plan should state that the Delta Stewardship Council will provide guidance on the definition of “reliable water supplies” in the context of the two co-equal objectives. The DSC needs to do this because it has the statutory authority to review and include or not include the BDCP in the final Delta Plan.

The DSC needs to provide up front guidance so that the BDCP’s work during this Interim period will lead to a product that can be included in the final Delta Plan.

2. The Interim Plan needs to state its expectation that the BDCP and the EIR/EIS will fully analyze a full range of conveyance alternatives. That needs to specifically include a 3,000 c.f.s. North Delta intake and tunnel as part of a dual conveyance option for the reasons set forth in Jonas Minton’s public testimony to the DSC.

The potential for that alternative was just reaffirmed by the presentation given yesterday, July 1, 2010, to the BDCP by Ron Milligan, Executive Manager of the Federal Team. He presented the results of their comparison of conveyance alternatives. It confirmed that a 3,000 c.f.s. tunnel as part of dual conveyance was comparable and even superior in most respects to larger tunnel sizes.

3. The Interim Plan needs to state its expectation that efforts including BDCP need to look at sequencing of conveyance alternatives. For instance a 3,000 c.f.s. tunnel as part of dual conveyance could be constructed in the relatively near term. At some point in the future if the South Delta was unusable as a point of diversion for exports, an additional tunnel could be bored.
4. The Interim Plan needs to state its expectation that political feasibility is a criterion that needs to be factored into the decision on conveyance. Again, a 3,000 c.f.s. tunnel as part of dual conveyance might be politically much more acceptable than a larger North Delta intake and tunnel. In this case the art of the

possible is a major factor in whether the two co-equal objectives will actually be achieved or whether protracted contention will defeat both purposes.

5. The Interim Plan needs to discuss the need for assured funding to meet the co-equal goal of protecting, restoring and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. This includes identifying alternative sources of funding if the Water Bond currently scheduled for the November, 2010 ballot is postponed or defeated.

The Planning and Conservation League has already identified the outline of what could be in a more focused and affordable water bond (See "*8 Affordable Water Solutions for California*" provided to the DSC as part of Jonas Minton's public testimony). This specifically includes funding to start the Delta ecosystem restoration program. It also includes funding to cost share innovate water supply projects.

If you have any questions on these recommendations please contact me at jminton@pcl.org, mobile (916) 719-4049.

/s/

Jonas Minton
Water Policy Advisor
Planning and Conservation League