



Restore the Delta

10100 Trinity Parkway Suite 120
Stockton, CA 95219
(209) 479-2053
Barbara@restorethedelta.org
www.RestoretheDelta.org

June 11, 2012

To: Joe Grindstaff, Executive Officer, Delta Stewardship Council

From: Restore the Delta

Subject: Sixth Draft of Delta Plan

Via Email to: deltaplancomment@deltacouncil.ca.gov

Restore the Delta will confine its comments to the following observations:

1. Changes to earlier drafts recommended by the Environmental Water Caucus, of which we are a part, have not been made in this final draft. Preeminently, these include a failure to consider water flows necessary for the health of the natural and human communities of the Delta. The Delta Plan pays lip service to the idea that “reliable” may not mean “more” but dodges the question of how much “reliable” might be. It ignores the fact that the BDCP will not be permitable given its current expectations about exports, proceeding as if BDCP will qualify for inclusion in the Delta Plan. This failure to address the dichotomy underlying the Stewardship Council’s mandate will, in effect, render the Delta Plan irrelevant.
2. The Economic Sustainability Plan has shown how risks of export interruptions can be reduced and the sustainability of the Delta improved by reinforcing all levees to a PL 84-99 standard or higher. This can be done for a quarter or less of the cost of building conveyance as proposed by the BDCP and for a small fraction of the total conveyance project costs including financing and operations. Rather than recognize that the Delta is an interconnected system, the Delta Plan commits to prioritizing levee investments and defers to the CVFPP and the BDCP to determine many of those priorities, even though both planning efforts ignore large portions of the Delta. In its unwillingness to evaluate the alternative for conveyance that is least damaging to the Delta itself, the Delta Stewardship Council abdicates its stewardship responsibility.

The Stewardship Council has sacrificed its opportunity to reform California water policies and has instead implicitly given its support to the failed strategies of the last century.

Restore the Delta has already commented on the DEIR and incorporates those comments by reference. Restore the Delta, as a member of the Environmental Water Caucus, has signed onto a second set of DEIR comments regarding the Delta Plan, and all other EWC responses to the Delta Plan, and incorporate those comments by reference. Please find these letters attached.



Restore the Delta

10100 Trinity Parkway Suite 120
Stockton, CA 95219
Barbara@restorethedelta.org
www.RestoretheDelta.org

February 2, 2012

Delta Stewardship Council
Attn: Terry Macaulay
980 Ninth Street, Suite 1500
Sacramento, California 95814

RESTORE THE DELTA COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DRAFT EIR) FOR THE FIFTH STAFF DRAFT DELTA PLAN

Restore the Delta appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the fifth Draft Delta Plan. This letter consists of Restore the Delta's observations of a few specific items within the DEIR. In addition to this individual letter, Restore the Delta in conjunction with the Environmental Water Caucus is submitting a separately transmitted joint comment letter which is incorporated by this reference. In addition to our comments below and the joint comment letter transmitted by the Environmental Water Caucus, we incorporate by reference the following comments:

- Environmental Advocates Supplemental Delta Plan DEIR Comments & Supporting Materials (Hand Delivered)
- Law Offices of Rossmann & Moore LLP
- Law Offices of Steven C. Volker
- Law Offices of Michael Jackson
- Law Offices of Lozeau/Drury LLP
- Law Offices of Lewis, Brisbois, Bisgarrd & Smith
- South Delta Water Agency
- Local Agencies Of The North Delta
- City of Stockton

Restore the Delta has been an active participant in the public process associated with development of the Delta Plan and the DEIR. Restore the Delta has submitted detailed comments on the Fifth Draft Plan in conjunction with the Environmental Water Caucus, this draft being the subject of this DEIR, as well as prior drafts of the Plan. Restore the Delta staff and supporters have made public comments at numerous public scoping meetings and

regularly scheduled Delta Stewardship Council meetings since the inception of the DSC. To date the most significant concerns over the Delta Plan, including the Fifth Draft and corresponding DEIR, have not been addressed. As the largest grassroots organization within the statutory Delta, with thousands of supporters from within the Delta and throughout the State of California, Restore the Delta is particularly concerned with the Plan and DEIR's failure to adequately address (1) performance measures; (2) BDCP impacts; (3) governance changes; (4) the Delta as place.

1. Legislatively mandated performance measures have not yet been identified in the Plan or the DEIR.

As cited in the City of Stockton letter:

The Delta Reform Act of 2009 provides that the Delta Plan include concrete measures to simultaneously improve water supply reliability and to restore the Delta ecosystem while protecting and enhancing the Delta as a place. Specifically, the Act requires that the Plan "include quantified or otherwise measurable targets associated with achieving the objectives of the Delta Plan. (Water Code § 85308 (b))

As of today, The Delta Plan still does not include measurable or otherwise quantifiable targets for flows into and through the Delta, for increased fish populations, or for improved Delta water quality. Thus, it is unclear to us how the Council can comply with CEQA in adopting targets. Groups like Restore the Delta, therefore, cannot then make a full and comprehensive assessment of what the impacts of the Delta Plan will be.

There is a lack of quantifiable data and, thus, the public and the Council have insufficient information with which to evaluate the differences in the proposed alternatives, especially in relation to the Public Trust Doctrine.

2. Incorporation of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan Will Affect the Scope and Impacts of the Delta Plan.

The Delta Reform Act directs that the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) be automatically incorporated into the Delta Plan if the BDCP meets certain statutory requirements. Presently, the BDCP is described in the Delta Plan as covering the operation of the State Water Project, the construction and operation of facilities for movement of water through the Delta, and the implementation of conservation actions. Thus, it will be the core component of the Delta Plan. The DEIR, however, does not clearly explain how the incorporation of the BDCP into the Delta Plan will change the scope and regulatory effect of the Delta Plan. Here again, the DEIR raises more questions than it answers for the public regarding the effect of the BDCP on the Delta Plan and the potential environmental effects.

Moreover, according to CEQA Guideline 15125: Environmental Setting:

(d) The EIR shall discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans. Such regional plans include, but are not limited to, the applicable air quality attainment or maintenance plan or State Implementation Plan, area-wide waste treatment and water quality control plans, regional transportation plans, regional housing allocation plans, regional blueprint plans, plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans and regional land use plans for the protection of the Coastal Zone, Lake Tahoe Basin, San Francisco Bay, and Santa Monica Mountains.

The DEIR has not evaluated inconsistencies between the Delta Plan and the HCCP that is tied to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, let alone inconsistencies between the Delta Plan and all Delta area general plans and county-wide habitat conservation plans.

3. There are inconsistencies and duplication of oversight and governance between the Delta Plan and the proposed BDCP.

The Delta Stewardship Council has used caution in interpreting its statutory mandate, and sees its role as coordinating actions of other government agencies, by simply creating a set of general policies for implementation of any actions in the Delta and evaluating consistency with these policies. The Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan describes this role:

Facilitation, Coordination, and Integration

The Council has an important role as a facilitator, coordinator, and integrator of activities among the local, State, and federal agencies and other entities that affect the Delta and statewide water supply reliability. In future updates to the Delta Plan, the Council may include recommendations for governance reform necessary to support the coequal goals.

The DEIR states that the Delta Plan primarily “functions as a strategic document because it provides guidance and recommendations to cities, counties, and State, federal, and local agencies to restore the Delta ecosystem and provide a more reliable water supply for California.” The DEIR also states that the Delta Stewardship Council “does not exercise direct review and approval authority over covered actions to determine their consistency with the regulatory policies in the Delta Plan.” (Section 1.2) Instead, the Council serves as an appellate body.”

Under section 82504 of the Delta Reform Act, the council has the authority to create a coordinating committee of agencies responsible for implementing the Delta Plan.

85204. The council shall establish and oversee a committee of agencies responsible for implementing the Delta Plan. Each agency shall coordinate its actions pursuant to the Delta Plan with the council and the other relevant agencies.

The Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan describes this coordinating committee:

In recognition that other government agencies have authorities and responsibilities that are critical to the achievement of the coequal goals, the Delta Reform Act requires the Council to establish and oversee a committee of agencies responsible for implementing the Delta Plan. The statute directs each agency to coordinate its actions pursuant to the Delta Plan with the Council and other relevant agencies. The Council will commence regular, public coordination meetings of the appropriate and interested federal, State, and local agencies and stakeholders after adoption of the Delta Plan. In addition, Council staff has met with federal agencies and is developing the Delta Plan in consultation with these agencies in order to pursue future consistency and compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act, as required by Water Code section 85300(d)(1)(A).

According to the Delta Plan, the Delta Stewardship Council's proposed role is that of facilitator and coordinator of actions which will be originated and overseen by individual agencies. However, there is a fundamental disconnect between the Delta Stewardship Council's proposed coordinating committee and the governance structure currently proposed in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Without incorporation of the BDCP into the Delta Plan, the public cannot review and comment on any potential discrepancies in governance and facilitation of project operations between the Delta Council's oversight committee and the BDCP's Implementation Office.

For example, who will be ultimately responsible for overseeing conservation measures? The proposed BDCP governance plan gives the "BDCP Implementation Office" oversight over implementation of "conservation measures, including those related to protection and restoration of habitat" and "management of conserved habitat." However, we believe that the Delta Reform Act gives fundamental authority or oversight of habitat-related land management decisions in the Delta to the Delta Protection Commission and the Delta Stewardship Council, as well as responsibility to ensure that the covered actions are consistent with the Delta Economic Sustainability Plan. We would argue that it is the responsibility of the Delta Stewardship Council to ensure that any governance structure is consistent with exercising these statutory responsibilities.

Another governance issue involves the hiring of a Science Manager by the proposed BDCP Implementation Office. The Science Manager will oversee the implementation of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. The current draft of the BDCP states:

The Program Manager, with the concurrence of the Implementation Board, will select a Science Manager to assist with the implementation of the BDCP and to ensure that such implementation decisions are guided by the best available scientific information. The Program Manager will consult with the Implementation Board and the fish and wildlife agencies and the Stakeholder Council in the selection of the Science Manager. The Science Manager will report to the Program Manager. Specifically, the responsibilities of the Science Manager include:

- Assist in the administration and implementation of the adaptive management program;
- Oversee the implementation of the BDCP monitoring and research program, with the assistance of the IEP and other science programs;
- Oversee the implementation of the BDCP adaptive management program;
- Engage in regular communication and coordination with the Delta Science Program and coordinate with the Independent Science Board, in a manner consistent with Water Code section 85820, as well as other outside scientists to gather independent scientific information and solicit input and review, as needed, and contract with the Independent Science Board or other scientists to provide such input and review, as needed;
- Support the Program Manager in the preparation of reports and other technical documents; and
- Assist in building sufficient scientific capacity and resources within the IO to advance the goals and objectives of the BDCP.

We are concerned that the specification of hiring of such a science officer in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, and the oversight by the “BDCP Program Manager” may undermine the authority given in The Delta Reform Act to the Independent Science Board appointed by the Delta Stewardship Council. The Delta Reform Act specified that the Delta Stewardship Council should appoint an Independent Science Board and a lead scientist, with oversight authority as specified in the following sections:

(3) The Delta Independent Science Board shall provide oversight of the scientific research, monitoring, and assessment programs that support adaptive management of the Delta through periodic reviews of each of those programs that shall be scheduled to ensure that all Delta scientific research, monitoring, and assessment programs are reviewed at least once every four years.

(4) The Delta Independent Science Board shall submit to the council a report on the results of each review, including recommendations for any changes in the programs reviewed by the board.

(b) After consultation with the Delta Independent Science Board, the council shall appoint a lead scientist for the Delta Science Program.

(2) The term of office for the lead scientist shall be no more than three years. The lead scientist may serve no more than two terms.

(3) The lead scientist shall oversee the implementation of the Delta Science Program. In carrying out that responsibility, the lead scientist shall regularly consult with the agencies participating in the program..

In addition, the qualifications required of the proposed Science Manager for the BDCP Implementation Office are substantially less than those required for the lead scientist for the Delta Science Program.

The lead scientist for the Delta Science Program working on behalf of the Delta Stewardship Council is to have the following qualifications:

- (1) The lead scientist shall meet all of the following qualifications:
 - (A) Hold an advanced degree in a field related to water or ecosystem management.
 - (B) Have a strong record of scientific research and publication in peer-reviewed scientific journals in a field related to water or ecosystem management.
 - (C) Have experience advising high-level managers in science-based decision making in the areas of water management and ecosystem restoration.
 - (D) Have the capability to guide the application of an adaptive management process to resource management policy decisions in the Delta.

The proposed qualifications for the Science Officer of the “BDCP Implementation Office” are substantially less:

Minimum requirements for the Science Manager will be:

- Educational and professional background in relevant scientific disciplines,
- At least 10 years of experience in the management of large programs,
- Substantial experience and involvement in the management of large-scale research or monitoring programs,
- Familiarity with water management and ecological issues related to the Delta
- Excellent communication skills.

In particular, the requirement for holding an advanced degree in a field related to water or ecosystems management, and a strong record of publication in peer-reviewed scientific journals is noticeably absent for the proposed BDCP Science Officer. The hiring of a BDCP Science Officer without these qualifications, and the proposed delegation of the lead scientist of the Independent Science Board to a “coordinating” role in overseeing the science used in the implementation of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan could greatly weaken the use of real, peer-reviewed science in the implementation of the BDCP, and seems contrary to the intent of the Delta Reform Act.

We believe that these specific duplications in governance and project operations between the BDCP and the Delta Plan render the Delta Plan premature and incomplete. Conflicts between the BDCP implementation committee and the DSC implementation committee will result in failed management of the Delta, thereby bringing continued environmental and economic harm to Delta communities. In addition, unresolved operational issues between these committees

will result in increased and unwarranted expenditures for Delta planning, which will be passed along to California taxpayers and water users.

4. The Delta Plan and the DEIR do not fully meet the legislative mandate of protecting and enhancing the Delta as Place.

According to Water Code § 85301 (a) the Delta Protection Commission shall:

Develop, for consideration and incorporation into the Delta Plan by the council, a proposal to protect, enhance, and sustain the unique cultural, historical, recreational, agricultural, and economic values of the Delta as an evolving place, in a manner consistent with the coequal goals. For the purpose of carrying out this subdivision, the commission may include in the proposal the relevant strategies described in the Strategic Plan. (b) (1) The commission shall include in the proposal a plan to establish state and federal designation of the Delta as a place of special significance, which may include application for a federal designation of the Delta as a National Heritage Area. (2) The commission shall include in the proposal a regional economic plan to support increased investment in agriculture, recreation, tourism, and other resilient land uses in the Delta. The regional economic plan shall include detailed recommendations for the administration of the Delta Investment Fund created by Section 29778.5 of the Public Resources Code.

Due to the fact that the Economic Sustainability Plan has not yet been reviewed and incorporated into the Delta Plan, the Plan and the DEIR do not fully answer the legislative mandate of protecting and enhancing the Delta as place in a manner consistent with the coequal goals. In fact, not one of the twelve enforceable actions that constitute the Delta Plan presently support increased investment in agriculture, recreation, tourism or any other resilient land uses in the Delta, but rather are in conflict with these goals.

Conclusion

First, the Delta Plan and the DEIR do not include measurable or otherwise quantifiable targets for flows into and through the Delta, for increased fish populations, or for improved Delta water quality. Second, the DEIR does not examine and elucidate how incorporation of the BDCP into the Delta Plan will impact the scope and the effects of the Delta Plan on the Delta ecosystem and Delta communities. Moreover, the DEIR fails the CEQA requirement for examination of inconsistencies between the Delta Plan and the BDCP.

Third, the Delta Plan and DEIR do not reconcile statutory duplications and conflicts between BDCP operations and implementation of the Delta Plan. Lastly, the Delta Plan and the DEIR are incomplete because the legislative mandate to evaluate and incorporate the Economic Sustainability Plan into the Delta Plan has not been completed.


The Plan, consequently, does not meet the needs of Delta communities, the Delta ecosystem, or California citizens, who are clamoring for government agencies to fulfill their missions efficiently and in a cost effective manner. Without analysis of the BDCP, and incorporation of the Economic Sustainability Plan, the Delta Plan and the DEIR are premature and incomplete, and fail to serve the public interest.

Restore the Delta calls on the Delta Council to authorize a rewrite of the Delta Plan to address these inadequacies, as well as the inadequacies identified by other parties incorporated into our comments at the beginning of this letter.

Sincerely yours,



Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla
Executive Director
Restore the Delta



Jane Wagner-Tyack
Policy Analyst
Restore the Delta

CC: Phil Isenberg, Chairman
Delta Stewardship Council

EWC COALITION LETTER REGARDING THE DELTA PLAN DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

February 2, 2012





SIERRA NEVADA ALLIANCE




Institute for Fisheries Resources

Unite. Protect. Restore.



THE MODOC NATION



Government of the Modoc People of Southern Oregon and Northern California




Tuolumne River Trust



CA Save Our Streams Council





Santa Clarita Organization
for Planning and the
Environment (SCOPE)



Vision. Passion. Community.




Because life is good.



THE ROSE FOUNDATION
For Communities & The Environment



Keeping Northwest California wild since 1977



ENVIRONMENTAL WATER CAUCUS

To: Joe Grindstaff, Executive Officer, Delta Stewardship Council

From: Environmental Water Caucus

Subject: Delta Plan DEIR Comments

Via Email to: eircomments@deltacouncil.ca.gov

February 2, 2012

The Environmental Water Caucus is pleased to provide you with our responses and comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report as you continue the development of this critically important Delta Plan. The Environmental Water Caucus has responded to the multiple releases of the Draft Delta Plan starting with the Scoping Comments in January 2011 and continuing with the release of the current Draft Environmental Impact Report.

In addition to our comments below, we incorporate by reference the following comments, as they are consistent with these EWC comments, by:

- Law Offices of Rossmann & Moore LLP
- Law Offices of Steven C. Volker
- Law Offices of Michael Jackson
- Law Offices of Lozeau/Drury LLP
- Law Offices of Lewis, Brisbois, Bisgard & Smith
- South Delta Water Agency
- C-WIN, CSPA, AquAlliance Comments on Delta Plan DEIR
- Environmental Advocates – Supplemental Delta Plan DEIR Comments & Supporting Materials (Hand Delivered)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“Reliable” Does Not Mean “Increased Exports”

Since the Legislature has required the Delta Stewardship Council to meet the co-equal goals of ecosystem restoration and water supply reliability, we have consistently urged the Council, without success so far, to define a level of “reliability” and to adopt measureable goals to ensure ecosystem restoration for the Delta Plan, and to allow the basis for a successful adaptive management plan.

The Draft EIR perpetuates the myth that existing water exports are sustainable. Worse, it suggests that “water supply reliability” is shorthand for a policy to increase Delta water exports. This interpretation is incorrect; the message is contrary to science and the many alternate methods of increasing the reliability of water supply and only leads to false hopes. In fact, even the current levels of water exports are not “reliable”; they are unsustainable and have led to the current ecosystem collapse. Increasing water exports from the Bay Delta beyond current levels will continue the collapse and harm to the Delta ecosystems, thereby defeating a primary goal of your legislative mandate to restore the Delta estuary ecosystem – one half of the legislative mandate.

Simply put, the Draft EIR and proposed Delta Plan are patently inconsistent with the increased Delta outflows recommended by the State Water Board in their adopted flow criteria. This required inflow and outflow, essential to the very ecological foundation of one of North America's most important estuaries, is also confirmed by the California Department of Fish and Game's assessment of flows needed to sustain other beneficial uses, including critical habitat for endangered species, such as Salmon, Steelhead, Sturgeon and other critical aquatic species needed to sustain these beneficial uses. As EPA stated, “*Significantly increasing exports out of a stressed Delta is the wrong policy... EPA questions the goal of increasing exports out of a severely distressed estuary.*”¹

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) echoed the need to increase Delta outflows into the bay when it evaluated flows needed to sustain the public trust resources of the Delta ecosystem, as well as beneficial and public trust values, and adopted flows to protect these values in August 2010: “*Recent Delta flows are insufficient to support native Delta fishes for today's habitats....In order to preserve the attributes of a natural variable system to which native fish species are adapted, many of the criteria developed by the State Water Board are crafted as percentages of natural or unimpaired flows. These criteria include:*

- *75% of unimpaired Delta outflow from January through June;*
- *75% of unimpaired Sacramento River inflow from November through June; and*
- *60% of unimpaired San Joaquin River inflow from February through June.”*²

¹ <http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/pdf/EpaR9CommentsBdcpPurpStmt6-10-2010.pdf>

² http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/deltaflow/

The SWRCB's public trust flow report was designed to guide and inform the Delta Plan, as it was required by the same enabling legislation. That the Delta Plan does not incorporate or ensure compliance with the SWRCB's recommendations is a clear sign of violation of the public trust obligations for the Delta, as detailed by its primary state trustee, the SWRCB.

These points are further reinforced by The Bay Institute's Report on Fresh Water Flows in the Central Valley,³ which stated, among numerous similar points, that:

- Fresh water flow is the dominant force controlling riverine and estuarine ecosystem processes and covered species populations – *flows define fish species' habitat.*
- Fresh water flows into, through, and out of the Delta are already severely impaired (in magnitude and timing) by Project operations.

Absent defined levels of water exports in relation to acceptable levels for the Delta, and measureable levels of ecosystem restoration health, one cannot determine if the legal requirements of the Delta Plan are met and what the environmental impacts of such a plan will be. As can be seen in Figure 1, the increase of water exports and resulting habitat degradation have led to the largest salmon collapse in U.S. history over the last decade.⁴ The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is the most important estuary on the West Coast. It is the nursery for many fish species of commercial importance. A study commissioned by Southwick Associates showed that the 2008-2009 salmon fishing closure has cost an estimated 23,000 jobs and \$1.4 billion annually to the California economy. California has over 2,000 businesses that derive most or all of their income from the recreational and commercial salmon industry.⁵ There is no information provided in the Draft EIR as to how the proposed Delta Plan will impact these jobs, the local regional economy, the statewide or west coast regions. These impacts need to be disclosed and evaluated.

³ The Bay Institute. January 10, 2012. Fresh Water Flows in the Central Valley.

⁴ <http://water4fish.org/>

⁵ http://www.asafishing.org/newsroom/documents/salmon_recovery_economics.pdf




Figure 1. *Pumping increased and salmon crashed*⁶

The DEIR fails to consider a full range of alternatives and has selected a Proposed Project that does not comply with state law.⁷ In each of the sections of the report discussing the Proposed Project, there is a lack of data to support the choice of the Proposed Project, leaving the reviewer with the impression that it is not a fact-based EIR. The lack of substance is insufficient to ensure the provision of a more reliable water supply for California and the protection, restoration, and enhancement of the Delta. The Plan ignores the Legislature’s direction that the Plan should “include quantified or otherwise measurable targets associated with achieving the Plan’s objectives” and “be based on the best available scientific information.” Use of the best available scientific information would enable the Plan to set meaningful, quantified targets that would place California on a path to a more reliable water supply and a healthy Delta ecosystem.

Given the general nature of the Proposed Project’s policies and recommendations and the uncertainty concerning the extent to which the Proposed Project will result in any particular action, it is unclear what types of projects will actually be implemented as a result of the Proposed Project’s policies and recommendations. Nevertheless, this EIR concludes that the Proposed Project will lead to an increase in local and regional water

⁶ <http://water4fish.org/>

⁷ Reform Act of 2009 (Delta Reform Act), Water Code section 85000 et seq.

Ibid. A Programmatic EIR does need to evaluate alternatives that achieve the fundamental objectives of a project.

reliability projects; it concludes that the Proposed Project’s recommendations regarding storage will lead to an increase in water storage projects, and; it assumes that the Proposed Project will lead to an increase in Delta ecosystem restoration projects.” Fact-based conclusions are totally absent.

A program EIR cannot rationalize vague or evasive analysis. The CEQA guidelines’ list of “advantages” to preparing a program EIR include a “more exhaustive” examination of effects and alternatives, “full consideration” of cumulative impacts, and allowance for analysis of “broad policy alternatives and program wide mitigation measures” at a time when the lead agency has the best opportunity to address them properly. This Draft EIR does not come close to meeting these standards. At this stage, and with such a vague project to evaluate, the Draft EIR does not meet the requirements of a Programmatic EIR, nor can any future EIR’s be logically tiered from this Proposed Project. *This Draft EIR should be significantly revised into a CEQA-qualified and legally enforceable Delta Plan that demonstrably meets the legislatively mandated co-equal goals,⁸ with permanent protection of the Delta’s natural and scenic resources.⁹*

Omission of Significant Impacts

Further, the analytical route that is used to arrive at findings of “significant impact” or “less-than-significant impact” is not explained. As a result, the document fails the test of “full disclosure” required by CEQA. Unfortunately, we see no *measurable* differences between the DEIR’s Proposed Project and the present status quo – where fish and wildlife are facing extinction and exports of water exceed sustainable quantities available. By allowing and/or encouraging increased Delta exports – exports which the Delta Plan has the power to constrain but apparently is choosing not to – the EIR must, but did not, evaluate the consequences of increased impacts as a result of those increased exports.

Under a legislative mandate to produce a timely Delta Plan, it is understandable that efforts have been made to meet specified deadlines even though critical documents such as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, which are essential elements of the proposal, are not completed or available for public review and comment. Absent these documents and any clear measurements, mechanisms, or criteria with which to judge whether these major state and federal actions meet state law, the public and decision makers are left without necessary information regarding the environmental impact of the Delta Plan.

Public Trust and Appropriate Baseline

We understand that members of the Council have expressed a preference not to address the public trust in the plan under review, but instead to defer to subsequent determinations of the State Board. We question that premature deference and ask the Council in its final plan and EIR to seize the unprecedented opportunity that the Legislature has created to restore the public trust in the Delta to the stature of its venerable roots. Public trust analysis of the Delta Plan is a mandatory duty of the DSC

⁸ See California Water Code Section 85300. Particularly note 85300 (d) (1) The council shall develop the Delta Plan consistent with all of the following: (A) The federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. Sec. 1451 et seq.), or an equivalent compliance mechanism. (B) Section 8 of the federal Reclamation Act of 1902. (C) The federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. Sec. 1251 et seq.).

⁹ California Water Code Section 85022 (C)(2)

Plan and the DEIR. The action-forcing sentence in *National Audubon Society v. Superior Court* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 419, 446, reads, with emphasis added, "*The state* has an affirmative duty to take the public trust into account in *the planning* and allocation of water resources, and to protect public trust uses wherever feasible." This Council, as an agent of *the state*, must embrace the public trust doctrine in its *planning* for the future of the Delta.

Further, the document abrogates the Delta Stewardship Council's duty to carefully weigh and protect public trust values and beneficial uses that will be impacted by this fifty year planning document. Public trust resources including the beneficial uses of the Delta and estuary, such as recreation, fishing, agriculture, navigation, and domestic water supply, have not been balanced against the continued damage to them caused by the present level of water exports or increased exports. There is a lack of quantifiable data and, thus, the public and the Council have insufficient information with which to evaluate alternatives in relation to the Public Trust Doctrine. As required by the same enabling legislation as the Delta Plan, the State Water Resources Control Board made a public trust determination with reference to the Delta which recommended significantly reduced exports.

Yet the harm to public trust resources caused by current exports is not analyzed in the EIR, under either the public trust or CEQA, because the export baseline for the project is set at a high level, which already assumes, and therefore does not evaluate, the destructive impacts to public trust resources caused by that pumping. The "existing baseline" is presumed to be well above the level of existing exports – *if* the "existing conditions" include environmental constraints and low precipitation conditions. The baseline here should not be the maximum amount that has been exported, as that does not represent a complete picture of "existing conditions." The present project baseline, set in the DEIR at a level similar to that for exports envisioned for the Proposed Project, is the same level that resulted in the closing of the 2008-2009 salmon fishing season, costing an estimated 23,000 jobs and \$1.4 billion annually to the California economy, as previously mentioned above.¹⁰ No cost figures are provided for the existing Proposed Project, so one must conclude that these impacts and job losses are underestimated and will likely go higher.

We also call to your attention numerous incorrect interpretations of the Environmental Water Caucus' Alternative 2, related to but not limited to the following specific subjects: ocean desalination; restoring flood plains, water transfers; levee maintenance; environmental restoration actions; and your incorrect implication that the EWC is proposing a 6,000 cfs conveyance option (Table 23-1). Corrections to these subjects are described in the comments below and are required prior to a final EIR.

¹⁰ The 2008-2009 salmon fishing closure has cost an estimated 23,000 jobs and \$1.4 billion annually to the California economy. California has over 2,000 businesses that derive most or all of their income from the recreational and commercial salmon industry. http://www.asafishing.org/newsroom/documents/salmon_recovery_economics.pdf

The revised EIR should be withdrawn, rewritten, and re-circulated for public review and comment. At a minimum the new Draft should include an analysis of the following information:

- Citing the authority given to the Delta Stewardship Council by the 2009 Delta Reform Act, the Delta Stewardship Council should undertake to accomplish an economic and sociological determination of public trust resources in order to provide the State of California with a thorough and legally enforceable Delta Plan. That authority is provided in numerous parts of the legislation, such as the requirement to reduce reliance on the Delta and the requirement to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and the Delta estuary restoration. Absent quantifiable measurements to determine an acceptable Bay Delta Conservation Plan that meets water quality, flow, and public trust objectives and achieves the co-equal goals of Delta estuary restoration and water supply reliability, the public is left in the dark as to the ecological, sociological, and economic impacts of the Delta Plan.
- The Delta Plan is de facto a statewide plan with a fifty year horizon, thus, by law, it must reflect a statewide vision and assure the citizens of California that you have discharged your duty to “protect the people’s common heritage in streams, lakes, marshlands, and tidelands” as called for in the Public Trust Doctrine.
- Critical to the adoption of any Delta Plan that meets the legislatively mandated goals is one that also meets existing water quality laws including those regulating salt, selenium, temperature, flow, and other contaminants harmful to public health and ecosystem health. In EWC’s five submissions and comments to previous drafts, all adopted here by reference, comments and evidence were provided regarding the importance of meeting water quality standards, flow requirements, and temperature standards to the health of the ecosystem and its viability. The Draft EIR and proposed Delta Plan fails to enforce existing water quality laws or ensure that any future covered actions will be required to meet these flow requirements, water quality constraints, and protect public trust values, to ensure these beneficial uses are protected.
- In scoping comments, and a series of comments on the five drafts, the EWC has presented a clear alternative for achieving water supply reliability and the Delta ecosystem restoration. Our proposed alternative has relied on strict enforcement of water quality laws, adoption of the State Water Resources Control Board and Fish and Game flow recommendations, shoring up of existing levees, ceasing the unreasonable use of water to irrigate toxic soils that return pollution to the estuary ecosystem, while also providing for exports and water supply along with water conservation measures to ensure existing supplies are extended to meet demand. This reasonable alternative has not been fully considered under the Draft EIR.
- The Draft EIR fails to accurately characterize the EWC’s proposed Alternative 2 and instead piles on “poison pills” that render the alternative expensive, risky, and

likely to increase pollution and harm to the Delta estuary. Thus, the Draft EIR fails to present this alternative for consideration. The Environmental Water Caucus' superior alternative of ecosystem protection and water supply reliability should be more accurately reflected in Alternative 2 and then selected as the Proposed Project (Preferred Alternative) for this EIR. Such an alternative is environmentally superior and meets the legislatively defined objectives and definition of the project, as required by CEQA. This is based on the superior weight of the "less-than-significant" impacts and superior ratings of Alternative 2 in all areas, including but not limited to, Delta restoration, water supply reliability, flood risks, water quality, biological resources, hazardous materials, greenhouse gas emissions, and climate change impacts. Additionally, when economics are considered, these ecological and economic balancing requirements which are met by Alternative 2 would meet the legal requirements of a preferred Proposed Project.

- The Monterey Amendments to the State Water Project long-term contracts are a "covered action" as defined by Section 2.1.2 of the Delta Plan, and therefore must be analyzed. These Amendments have already been successfully challenged in court before, and were not finalized again until DWR issued a Notice of Decision in 2010, at which point another legal challenge began. These Amendments cause increased export activities to occur in the Delta; they directly impact Delta water users, and the manner, amounts, and timing of exports; and are not part of "routine operations" of the State Water Project, as evidenced by their requiring their own EIR for approval.
- In particular, as a part of water supply reliability, especially for Southern California urban areas, analysis of Delta impacts should include the use of Kern Water Bank as a public reservoir under state control. The Kern Water Bank transfer was authorized by DWR in 2010 as part of that agency's approval of the Monterey Amendments, severely constraining its future ability to improve water supply reliability. The transfer of the Kern Water Bank should be evaluated in terms of whether this action increased supply reliability, whether returning it to state control would improve such reliability, and how such a public resource could be incorporated into future Delta planning models. Conversely, the water bank's current displacement via the Monterey Amendments to private industry, depriving the state of a public resource to improve water supply reliability should be included as well.
- Analysis is also required for additional changes caused by implementation of the Monterey Amendment to the long-term contracts for the State Water Project. These changes do not fall under "routine operation" and were not authorized by DWR prior to the creation of the Article 18 urban preference, which must be restored, and the misuse of Article 21 surplus water, which must be eliminated. These items were inappropriately modified in State Water Project contracts as a part of the privately negotiated Monterey Amendments.

- Demonstrate compliance with Water Code Section 85021, by documenting the Delta Plan’s action to reduce reliance on the Delta to meet California’s water supply needs, promote conservation, and take into account scientific findings that affirm the reuse of municipal wastewater that has significant potential to augment future water supplies and protect water quality.¹¹
- In order to be a thorough Environmental Impact Report, a cost/benefit analysis of the various alternatives needs to be performed. It is inconceivable that such a major undertaking as the Delta Plan has so far had no information or comparisons on the costs of these alternatives, yet a (preferred) Proposed Project has been selected with no references to costs or quantified benefits. The state of California and its citizens deserve costs and benefits information for a fifty year plan. Additionally, if the BDCP is examined in future for its certification as a component of the Delta Plan, the state will need information on the various Delta Plan alternatives that were examined and compared to the BDCP. The responsibilities given to the Delta Stewardship Council by the Delta Reform Act would require that you be prepared for that kind of complete cost/benefit analysis.
- In order to be considered a legally acceptable analysis, each alternative must include pertinent information on the phasing of proposed actions, especially in the identification of short and medium range actions. We did not see any information on phasing of actions or projects within the more than 2,000 pages of information.

In order to contribute to a legally enforceable plan, and to ensure the Delta ecosystem beneficial uses are adequately restored and protected along with ensuring long term water supply reliability, we have highlighted other inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the attached comments pertaining to applicable sections of the proposed Draft EIR.

In summary, we repeat: *This draft EIR should be withdrawn, rewritten, and re-circulated for public review and comment.*



Co-Facilitator
Environmental Water Caucus



Co-Facilitator
Environmental Water Caucus

¹¹ http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13303 —“ With recent advances in technology and design, treating municipal wastewater and reusing it for drinking water, irrigation, industry, and other applications could significantly increase the nation’s total available water resources, particularly in coastal areas facing water shortages, says a new report from the National Research Council.”

COMMENTS ON THE DELTA PLAN DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Section ES – EXEC SUMMARY

Description of the Proposed Project. Page ES-2

The Proposed Project description is inadequate as a CEQA project description. A “project” under CEQA is considered to be an activity directly undertaken by a public agency. Although the CEQA definition of a “project” is very broad, the series of Policies and non-binding Recommendations, which are defined in this EIR as the Proposed Project, fails the tests of an adequate CEQA project definition, even though the policies might lead to an activity, as stated in the Draft EIR. There is little or no attempt at quantifying the significance of policy statements, despite the attempts to attach significance ratings in the DEIR. Without an adequate project description, there is no way to apply the CEQA “rule of reason” regarding the range of alternatives that must be evaluated, as attempted in this DEIR; there is no way to complete a cumulative impacts analysis, which is also attempted; there are no described thresholds of significance for any of the described activities; and there is no way to describe specific mitigations to be undertaken since there is no project being described. (CEQA Guidelines 15151, Standards of Adequacy for an EIR, 15146, Degree of Specificity).

We would use the California Supreme Court’s CALFED decision (*In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings*) to conclude that alternatives that do not meet the Project Description’s co-equal goals should not be considered in the DEIR. Therefore, the Proposed Project, with its anticipated increase in Delta exports which contribute to continued harm to the Bay-Delta, would defeat one of the co-equal goals and should not be considered as a legitimate alternative.

"An accurate, stable, and finite project description is the *sine qua non* of an informative and legally sufficient EIR." (County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles (3d Dist. 1977) 71 Cal.App.3d 185, 193, Discussion following CEQA Guidelines §15124).

Although we recognize that the evaluation of economic effects is optional under CEQA Guidelines (15131), as we pointed out in our cover letter, the economic and social effects of the differing alternatives is so significantly different and the economic weighing of public trust values so important, that economic effects should not be optional in the case of this DEIR. The elimination of a \$12 to \$15 billion expenditure, by not investing in a canal or tunnel around the Delta, and the economic tradeoffs of reduced Delta diversions, as indicated in Alternative 2, is so significant to the state budget, and to reduced environmental impacts to the Bay-Delta, that it must be considered. At a minimum, the environmental impacts of the increased economic development caused by increased delta exports should be quantified and analyzed as reasonably foreseeable impacts under CEQA. If not analyzed as direct impacts, the increased exports foreseen under the Delta Plan should be analyzed for indirect impacts on increased development.

Under Alternatives to the Proposed Project, and per CEQA guidelines, it is stated that: “This EIR describes and evaluates five Alternatives to the Proposed Project, which are analyzed at the *same level of detail* as the Delta Plan.” However, in Section 2A, Proposed Project and Alternatives, the Proposed Project is described in 54 pages, while the combination of the other four alternatives plus the No Project Description covers 21 pages. The same disproportionate analysis is carried through in the other sections of the DEIR where comparisons are described.

In this section, we also note incorrect interpretations of the Environmental Water Caucus’ Alternative 2, related to but not limited to the following specific subjects: ocean desalination; restoring flood plains, water transfers, Tulare Basin farmlands, and; levee maintenance. Corrections to these subjects are described in the Section 2A comments below.

Section 1 – INTRODUCTION

Water Supply Reliability. Section 1.3.1.1

This section fails to recognize the predicted reduction in total precipitation for California as a result of climate change. CEQA requires that reasonably foreseeable futures must be considered in an EIR. Instead this EIR recognizes only “reduced annual water availability” because of “water storage” in reservoirs and recognizes changes in supply volatility or changes in precipitation patterns (Page 1-6, lines 41-46). The importance of recognizing that Sacramento River inflows may be reduced by 20% by the 2050’s¹² is the effect that this predicted change will have on CVP and SWP contracted amounts and the clear possibility that a Peripheral Canal or Tunnel, as being planned by BDCP and anticipated by this DEIR, may become a stranded asset by the time it could be built.

There should also be a discussion of underground storage and recharge as provided by the Kern Water Bank, estimated to be the state’s third-largest reservoir. The development of additional capacity for south-of-Delta reliability should be discussed, in connection with the recommendation for the facility to be returned to state control. This is linked to Groundwater Monitoring, below (2.2.1.3).

Project Area. Section 1.4.2

In the controversy surrounding the definition of the Delta area, we have supported the Delta Stewardship Council’s definition of the Project Area as shown in Fig 1.4 and have so stated in our previous comments to the Council.

Section 2A – PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

PROPOSED PROJECT.

¹² Margaret A. Palmer, et al. 2008. *Climate Change and the World’s River Basins*. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment. Vol. 6, No 2, pp. 81-89. <http://www.esajournals.org/doi/full/10.1890/060148>

Policies and Recommendations. Section 2.1.1

Page 2A-2, Paragraph beginning at Line 8: This paragraph makes reference to policies and recommendations that could directly or indirectly lead to construction of new or modified facilities. The paragraph continues: “At this time, it is not known which agency would implement any such projects, where the facilities would be located, or how the facilities would be operated. Therefore, for the purposes of this Environmental Impact Report (EIR), general types of projects and facilities are considered possible outcomes of implementation of the policies and recommendations.” For purposes of a CEQA EIR, and although this is considered a Programmatic EIR, this statement and many more like it throughout the document are too vague and lacking the precision that would allow decision makers to proceed with evaluation, approval, public trust balancing of alternatives, or tiering of future EIR’s (CEQA Guideline 15151, Standards of Adequacy for an EIR).

Administrative Exemptions of a Covered Action Section 2.1.2.2

“Temporary Water Transfer” (line 21) does not meet the exemption under CEQA; such a transfer is only exempted if it does not have a significant impact on the environment. The language should be changed to reflect this.

Along these lines, temporary transfers are occurring in recent increments of up to 100,000 AF, involving transferring water rights between the State Water Project and the Central Valley Project. Such transfers function to evade environmental constraints on exports imposed on one or the other export project at any given time, causing the very harm such restraints on their sister projects’ were intended to avoid.

As a result, significant temporary transfers which impact Delta exports should be evaluated under the Delta Plan as covered actions. Moreover, these transfers are occurring for multiple consecutive years; the Plan should evaluate the impacts on the Delta in the instances where such “temporary” transfers are repeated multiple times.

Reliable Water Supply. Section 2.2.1

Page 2A-5, Lines 16-20: It is not clear how the “Proposed Project” can include ongoing projects whose outcomes cannot yet be evaluated and whose environmental significance cannot yet be determined. The projects cited are still in process and include: North of Delta Offstream Storage Investigation, Los Vaqueros Reservoir Project - Phase 2, the Upper San Joaquin River Basin Storage Investigation Plan, and the next update of the Department of Water Resources (DWR) Bulletin 118 *California’s Groundwater* (DWR 2003). (CEQA Guidelines 15151, Standards of Adequacy for an EIR, Guideline 15146, Degree of Specificity). There is no way to judge the environmental significance of any of these projects at this time.

Surface Water Projects. Section 2.2.1.2

Beginning with Paragraph 2.2.1.2.1 Surface Water Intakes and Diversions from Streams and Rivers and continuing through Page 2A-11, Line 10, are descriptions of construction steps or techniques for building a variety of facilities. Although interesting descriptions, the requirement is that an EIR will inform agencies and the public of **significant**

environmental effects; it is not clear what applicability these descriptions have in the document. (Guideline 15121(a), Informational Document).

Surface Water Reservoir Projects. Section 2.2.1.2.4

As a matter of environmental policy, many of our organizations will oppose further surface storage projects that are included in the Proposed Project due to the significant negative environmental impacts that they have on California riverine habitat and due to the lack of any consideration of public trust values that should be associated with the questionable cost evaluations that accompany those projects. This includes but is not limited to: expansion of Shasta Dam, Sites Reservoir, and Temperance Flat Reservoir. The Proposed Project supports these projects without any quantitative justification on costs, yield, impacts on the environment, or evaluation of the public trust values involved. (CEQA Guideline 15126.5, Discussion of Alternatives, Guideline 15146, Degree of Specificity).

Groundwater Monitoring. Section 2.2.1.3

Environmental organizations are generally disappointed with the groundwater monitoring features that were built into the Delta Reform Act of 2009. Earlier drafts of the 2009 legislation required groundwater monitoring and reporting throughout the state, while the final legislation was weakened to make groundwater reporting a voluntary effort. As pointed out in the DEIR, groundwater represents 30% of California's water supply in most years. The Proposed Project for the Delta Plan must face this politically difficult situation with a recommendation, similar to Alternative 2, for mandatory groundwater reporting throughout the state since the use of groundwater can have significant environmental impact (CEQA Guideline 15151, Standards for Adequacy of an EIR, and (Guideline 15126.5, Discussion of Alternatives).

Wells and Other Groundwater Storage Facilities 2.2.1.3

This or the previous section on groundwater needs to include a discussion of the Water Code's requirement for additional South-of-Delta underground storage, and the ability to meet that requirement through public control and expansion of the Kern Water Bank. The impacts of the additional capacity for Delta exports as provided by a public Kern Water Bank should be considered here. Given its location, size, and relative cost of development to surface storage (see estimates in DWR 132-87 and 88), the Kern Water Bank is a facility which could greatly assist balanced export controls for the Delta and could be the single greatest improvement to overall state-wide water supply reliability, the DSC should strongly advocate for the return of the Kern Water Bank to state control, and include its return among the recommended additions.

In the alternative, the absence of the Kern Water Bank from South-of-Delta storage should be analyzed.

Ocean Desalination Projects. Section 2.2.1.4

In the discussion of Ocean Desalination, little coverage of the significant adverse environmental impacts of ocean intakes, outflows, and construction is provided. There is only a minimal discussion of the large energy demands of desalination plants and the high costs of produced water when compared with other available water supply alternatives.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Environmental Water Caucus Alternative 2.

Ocean Desalination. Page 2A-69

This section improperly characterizes the EWC Alternative 2 as advocating more Ocean Desalination. In all of our comments to the Delta Plan, beginning with the Scoping Documents, we have made no mention of Ocean Desalination. To be clear: our view of Ocean Desalination is one of skepticism of this as an alternative for water supply because of the significant environmental and wildlife impacts caused by construction, by ocean intakes, by brine outflows, by the high energy usage, and by the high costs of the produced water. We also remain concerned about the significant impact on land use planning where desalinated water is used to induce growth. Lacking a comprehensive statewide policy on Ocean Desalination, it is premature to promote the most costly, energy intensive, and least reliable source of water supply. Before we reach the point of needing Ocean Desalination, we must exhaust the options of serious water conservation, by maximizing water reclamation, and capturing stormwater and urban runoff for water supply. By adding rainwater capture, graywater systems, and desalination for groundwater cleanup, it is possible to reduce per capita water demand to a level obtained by other countries before they even looked at Ocean Desalination. Spain, Israel, and Australia have each reduced per capita demand to 30 to 60 gallons per day per person, while California's statewide average is 174, with some areas of California using more than 300.

Alternative 2, Storage. Table 2-4, Page 2A-71

The EWC Alternative 2 did not recommend expansion of Friant/Millerton reservoir; we made no comment related to Friant/Millerton. This reference needs to be corrected.

Alternative 2, Conveyance. Table 2-4, Page 2A-72

The reference to the EWC agreement with the recommendation to complete BDCP was in the described context of consistency with the provisions of the Delta Reform Act; we also stated that it is unlikely to lead to BDCP meeting either the flow requirements or the water quality standards envisioned in the Delta Plan, and as such, would likely not meet the recovery objectives. Our qualification is important to include since it expresses our doubts that BDCP can actually achieve the reliability, ecosystem goals, and water quality goals of the Delta Plan. (CEQA Guideline 15146, Degree of Specificity) Also see below under Section 23, BDCP.

Additionally, with the exception of reinforcing core levees above the PL 84-99 standards and the installation of upgraded fish screens, Alternative 2 relies mainly on maximizing

the use and improvement of existing facilities south of Delta. Therefore, Alternative 2 can be shown to have far less significant impact on the Delta environment than any of the conveyance-oriented construction alternatives described or anticipated in the DEIR. Adding further to the beneficial effects of maximizing the use of existing conveyance is the probability that there will be little or no financing available for significant conveyance construction and that there is in all probability will be no further water available from the Sacramento River as a result of a changing climate, as pointed out elsewhere in these comments.

Alternative 2, Conveyance. Table 2-4, Page 2A-72

The EWC Alternative 2 made no recommendation regarding abandonment of South Delta intakes. This error should be corrected.

Alternative 2, Ecosystem Restoration. Table 2-4, Page 2A-74

The EWC Alternative 2 is incorrectly characterized as “Less emphasis than Proposed Project on ecosystem restoration throughout the Delta...” In our comments to the Fifth Draft of the Delta Plan, we indicated the following: “We agree with the Council’s reliance on the *Conservation Strategy for Restoration of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecological Management Zone and the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley Regions* (DFG 2011). We also support most of the Ecosystem Restoration Program features of the CALFED program. We would recommend that the Council require DFG to fully integrate restoration with inputs from the NMFS and FWS, both for riverine as well as terrestrial habitats. (ER P2).” The finding in the Table that Alternative 2 places less emphasis than the Proposed Project on ecosystem restoration throughout the Delta is in error and our recommendation on this subject should indicate that our emphasis on Ecosystem Restoration is the same as or similar to the Proposed Project.

Alternative 2, Flood Risk Reduction. Table 2-4, Pages 2A-79 & 80

The characterization of the EWC Alternative 2 as “Less emphasis than Proposed Project on reducing flood risk for all lands in the Delta areas...” does not consider the EWC recommendation to immediately initiate planning to upgrade core levees above the PL84-99 standard, in accordance with the recommendations of the Delta Protection Commission. This action is superior to the Proposed Project. If supported by the Delta Stewardship Council, this action would significantly reduce Delta earthquake and sea level rise vulnerabilities, putting Alternative 2 on a par with the Proposed Project (CEQA Guideline 15126.5, Discussion of Alternatives). Our current support of Policies RR P1 and RR P2 (Reduce Risk of Floods in the Delta) also contradicts your finding of “Less emphasis than the Proposed Project on reducing flood risks for all lands in the Delta areas...” and would elevate Alternative 2 to a superior rating compared with the Proposed Project.

Alternative 2, Reliable Water Supplies. Page 2A-98

While we agree with your interpretation that Alternative 2 would eliminate the use of Delta water on drainage-impaired farmlands, we support dealing with drainage problems in the least environmentally damaging manner and the most long-range, cost-effective manner by retiring the drainage-impaired farmland and converting to less

environmentally significant uses. Those uses would include, but not be limited to, dry farming or energy production which would also be more cost-effective through the elimination of plants and infrastructure to recycle the drainage water. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), in Open File Report No. 2008-1210 states that “*Land retirement is a key strategy to reduce drainage because it can effectively reduce drainage to zero if all drainage-impaired lands are retired.*” (CEQA Guideline 15126.5, Discussion of Alternatives).

Additionally, agricultural drainage treatment plants will not be part of Alternative 2 because the retirement of 380,000 acres of drainage impaired lands will eliminate the need for that type of facility and also the impacts those facilities will have, such as storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous waste.

The main reason Alternative 2 is not rated as a better alternative than the Proposed Project is due to the large amount of land retirement, including 380,000 acres in the San Luis Unit and 320,000 acres in the Tulare Basin for Tulare Lake Basin Reservoir, as well as potential land fallowing due to the limitation in Delta exports at 3 million acre feet. However, it is clear that no solution is in place for the 380,000 acres of San Luis Unit drainage impaired lands either financially, technically or otherwise authorized by Congress at necessary funding levels. Ultimately, like the 100,000 acres already retired due to soil salinization, the full 380,000 acres (including the 100,000 acres already fallowed) will go out of production unless they are allowed to reopen the San Luis Drain and dump all of the San Luis Unit’s pollution into the San Joaquin River. Efforts to maintain arability in the root zone of those lands through drainage treatment will require substantial increased public subsidies. According to Reclamation’s 2008 Feasibility Report for San Luis Drainage Feature Re-evaluation:¹³

“To provide drainage service to the San Luis Unit, neither of the action alternatives is economically justified by the Federal government. For the Federal government to provide drainage service to the San Luis Unit, neither of the action alternatives is financially feasible, within existing authorities.”

The Feasibility Report also found that substantial increased subsidies and Congressional funding authorization would be necessary to implement the Preferred Alternative:¹⁴

- Increase the funding authorization for the San Luis Act by \$2.69 Billion (2006 indexing)
- Waive the required collection of full Operation and Maintenance funding (and interest), including payments to the CVPIA Restoration Fund per Section 5 of the Reclamation Act for providing drainage service to Panoche, Pacheco and San Luis Water Districts.
- Authorize indefinitely waiving repayment of San Luis Unit contractors’ contractual obligation for repayment of reimbursable capital and/or reimbursable

¹³See page 97 http://www.usbr.gov/mp/sccaosld/docs/sldfr_report/index.html

¹⁴ Ibid. p xxvi

Operation and Maintenance costs incurred to implement the Preferred Alternative AND the remaining reimbursable capital costs incurred to construct pre-existing CVP facilities until the contractors can “afford to pay” their bills.

It also found that if the Preferred Alternative were implemented, the CVPIA Restoration Fund would be adversely affected because there is a pre-existing prohibition on reassigning drainage costs to CVP power customers because the San Luis Unit contractors will be unable to pay into the CVPIA Restoration Fund.

The proposed Panoche Demonstration Selenium Treatment Facility will cost an estimated \$37 million just to remove selenium from drainage, not salt or boron. At a treatment rate of 200 gallons per minute 24/7 for 18 months (470 AF), the cost of treating agricultural drainage only for selenium is \$78,723/AF, not counting transportation and disposal of the processed solid waste to a hazardous waste facility. Even at that cost, the potential for success is low. Previous attempts to use reverse osmosis have failed. A 2010 Report by CH2MHill for the North American Metals Council¹⁵ determined the following:

“While these physical, chemical, and biological treatment technologies have the potential to remove selenium, there are very few technologies that have successfully and/or consistently removed selenium in water to less than 5µg/L at any scale. There are still fewer technologies that have been demonstrated at full-scale to remove selenium to less than 5 µg/L, or have been in full-scale operation for sufficient time to determine the long-term feasibility of the selenium removal technology. There are no technologies that have been demonstrated at full-scale to cost-effectively remove selenium to less than 5µg/L for waters associated with every one of the industry sectors.”

Continued irrigation of the 380,000 acres (really 280,000 acres) of drainage impaired lands in the San Luis Unit will result in continued decline of soil productivity and will ultimately cause retirement of the land because it cannot support agriculture. Irrigation of these lands can only continue with huge subsidies and/or discharge of the toxins to the San Joaquin River and Delta. Therefore, continued irrigation of these lands does not meet the Delta Plan Financing Framework’s key tenets (2A-55) for cost effectiveness and stressors as follows:

- Beneficiaries (those who benefit from the water resources of the Delta and its watershed) should pay for the benefits they receive
- Stressors (those whose actions adversely affect the Delta ecosystem) should pay for the harm they cause the ecosystem.

Taking into account the fact that Alternative 2’s ultimate impact on agriculture by retirement of those 380,000 acres is really no different than Existing Conditions, No

¹⁵Review of Available Technologies for the Removal of Selenium from Water, CH2MHill, June 2010. See <http://www.namc.org/docs/00062756.PDF>, page 8-2.

Action, or the Proposed Project, it removes one reason that Alternative 2 cannot be environmentally preferred to the Proposed Action.

Your finding related to the negative impact of the loss of farmlands in the Tulare Basin needs to be corrected. We did not recommend eliminating those lands from production; the recommendation in the Fifth Draft is to study the feasibility of converting the land to a basin reservoir. Therefore, your negative impact finding is premature and will have to wait until such a feasibility analysis is completed.

Significantly favorable impacts to water supply reliability, especially for Southern California urban areas, would result with the return of the Kern Water Bank to state control, the return of the Article 18 urban preference, and the elimination of Article 21 surplus water.

Summary of Alternative 2.

With the above corrections or modifications applied to Alternative 2 in Section 2A, there will be no basis for selecting the Proposed Project as superior to Alternative 2, especially in view of the fact that even without the modifications, Section 25 – Comparison of Alternatives – indicates that “Alternative 2 is *slightly* (emphasis added) environmentally inferior to the Proposed Project” (Page 25-11, Line 16). With the cumulative impact of the corrections noted above, we recommend that Alternative 2 be designated as the Proposed Project.

No Project Alternative. Page 2A-85

As stated in this section: “The baseline for assessing the significance of impacts of the Proposed Project is the existing environmental setting...” (Lines 18-19). According to CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) (2), the Proposed Project is to be compared to Existing Conditions. Since this Existing Conditions section does not provide quantification of important existing conditions such as water supplies, water quality performance, percentage of fish or wildlife restoration goals met to date, or other resource areas normally evaluated in a Draft EIR, there is no ability to actually compare the other alternatives to Existing Conditions or to the Proposed Project (CEQA Guideline 15126.5, Discussion of Alternatives, Guideline 15146, Degree of Specificity).

Given the ongoing poor state of wildlife such as endangered salmon and smelt in the Delta, and given the tangential decline of these species, the “existing conditions” should include as the baseline the condition where exports are severely constrained, as they were when USFWS required substantial export reductions due to impacts to Delta Smelt.

Along the same lines, “existing conditions” for the No Project Alternative should be amended to include a discussion of the present constraints on Delta exports set forth in the relevant SWRCB Decisions and the Delta Flow Criteria, and whether these constraints are currently being implemented in part or in their entirety, and/or whether existing exports exceed recommended levels set forth by SWRCB.

Likewise, the No Project Alternative should also discuss the impacts which strict compliance with current SWRCB decisions, orders, and flow criteria impact would have on the Delta.

Section 3 – WATER RESOURCES

Alternative 2, Impact on Water Quality Standards. Impact 3-1

According to the EIR discussion, all of the actions of Alternative 2 would result in beneficial impacts on water quality. We agree. This includes beneficial impacts when compared with the Proposed Project as well as existing conditions, because of the mandatory requirements, the monitoring, and the enforcement actions called for in Alternative 2.

Rather than definitely improving water quality along a projected and supportable time frame with clear requirements that include specific enforcement mechanisms, the DEIR actually cements into place a weak and ineffective series of water quality actions that would be in place for many years under the Proposed Project. This potentially results in a water quality regime under the Proposed Project that prevents the state from moving forward effectively in response to growing information about the degraded state of our waterways. For example, the Fifth Draft states that “No policies with regulatory effect are included in this section,” when regulatory requirements are absolutely essential to address the health of the Delta. Additionally, there is no indication of how the Proposed Project is going to meet water quality standards. The extraordinarily long time frame for Delta Plan implementation prevents the necessary evolutionary path of the regulatory regime in light of the Delta’s immediate and expected needs. Therefore, the Plan actually creates a situation with significantly more potential negative consequences than the status quo, which accordingly need to be evaluated.

The recommendations we made in the Fifth Draft are enumerated here to reinforce the above points:

- The Central Valley Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program must include mandatory waste discharge requirements for all growers as need to ensure that water quality standards are met, and fees must be charged that are sufficient to ensure the that program is successfully implemented, monitored and enforced. Among other things, this mandatory program must include the following elements:
 - Individual growers must apply for coverage. No third-party applications would be authorized.
 - Growers must develop and implement individual Farm Water Quality Management Plans in order to minimize discharge of waste to groundwater and surface water from irrigated agricultural lands. Ambient surface and groundwater monitoring must be required as needed to demonstrate progress toward meeting water quality standards.
 - All growers must conduct nutrient tracking, pesticide tracking, and implemented tracking of management practices.

- Water bodies must be identified under Clean Water Act Section 303(d) as “impaired” due to low flows, in addition to chemical or biological pollution, and flows must be carefully considered in all Total Maximum Daily Loads later developed to restore the water bodies to health. This has yet to be accomplished in the Central Valley Region. As described in the extensive comments that were submitted by our coalition in the Fifth Draft, the state must identify and restore water bodies impaired by altered flows, as required by the Clean Water Act.

Without these above recommendations and additional recommendations we made in the Fifth Draft, the Proposed Project actually *discourages* their implementation by presenting a state-approved alternative that creates the misperception that water quality is being addressed. For instance, the DEIR mentions the selenium TMDLs for the San Joaquin River, but fails to mention that actual enforcement of basin plan selenium objectives upstream of the Merced River has been delayed until 2020.

Alternative 2, Impact on Groundwater Supplies. Impact 3-2

The suggestion that “water transfers might increase compared to the Proposed Project” is incorrect. Alternative 2 would **decrease** water transfers through the Delta due to the export limits of Alternative 2. (Line 31, Page 4-93). We also expressed our reservations and limitations of “North-to-South through the Delta” type of water transfers in our referenced report *California Water Solutions Now*, Figure 4, Water Transfer Matrix, Page 24. While incorrectly stating that Alternative 2 recommends more emphasis on water transfers than the Proposed Project, this section points out that significant adverse impacts on groundwater supplies and recharge under Alternative 2 would be **less than** the Proposed Project, partially the result of the favorable linkages between reduce exports, reduced water transfers, and the resultant groundwater supply protections for Northern California and our emphasis on regional transfers south of the Delta among willing sellers and buyers.

The State has long looked to the Sacramento River watershed as a solution for escalating demand south of the Delta. An early attempt at conjunctive use in 1994 revealed the folly of moving forward with large ground water extractions when so little was (and still is) known about the hydrologic region. Attempting to establish conjunctive use and ground water banking in the Sacramento Valley, and expanding efforts south of the Delta, exposes serious unanswered questions regarding the risks associated with such ambitious plans that have already devastated the Owens and San Joaquin rivers and valleys. It is helpful that the Fifth Draft of the Delta Plan highlighted some of the significant damage from current and past excess ground water pumping and manipulation of hydrologic systems, yet the DEIR seeks to use the same practices that created the problems that the DEIR seeks to ameliorate. Knowing this, we continue to encourage the Council to consider a new paradigm that was provided in our comments on the Plan’s first draft. However, with ground water storage and conjunctive use an integral part of the DEIR, we believe that it must disclose and analyze the risks associated with these strategies and expound upon the numerous uncertainties.

In our response to the First Draft Delta Plan we stated: “It is imperative that a comprehensive process for evaluating permanent and serial short-term transfers be established within the Delta Plan, including its impact on groundwater and up-stream impacts. We do not see that “comprehensive process” being included in the Proposed Project.

Alternative 2, Water Supply Availability. Impact 3-3

While we agree that Alternative 2 would have significant impacts on water supply availability for south of Delta agricultural and urban water users and that the impacts would be more significant than the Proposed Project, we believe that enough data has been recorded on both agricultural and urban water efficiencies to demonstrate that the impacts can be mitigated to a **less-than-significant** level. Additionally, the development of a Tulare Lake storage basin, the return of the Kern Water Bank to public ownership, the return of the urban preference, and the elimination of Article 21 surplus water would substantially increase water supply availability, especially for urban Southern California, as previously mentioned.

In view of the combination of the continuing growth of California’s population, the growing limitations of statewide water supply, the future effects of climate change on water supplies, and the pricing of energy supplies, the state needs to examine the societal value and the pricing of water on low value crops that are currently grown throughout the state. Although this is a sensitive subject in our market-based economy, the newly constituted Delta Stewardship Council might be an appropriate venue for dealing with this subject.

Alternative 2, Mitigation Measures

The statement needs to be corrected; mitigation would not be required for Impacts 3-1 (Water Quality) and 3-2 (Groundwater), as described in the DEIR. Mitigation would be required only for Impact 3-3 (Water Supply), and can be reduced to a less-than-significant level, as shown in numerous recent analyses, including the latest reports from the Pacific Institute.^{16 17} Alternative 2 would also have less unavoidable impacts than the Proposed Project. Those corrections, plus others pointed out in these comments, would put Alternative 2 as preferable to the Proposed Project, using your judgmental criteria.

Section 4 – BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Study Area. Section 4-1

The Study Area includes the Trinity River, but there is no discussion whatsoever regarding Trinity River basin water obligations in Existing Conditions or the other alternatives. Since the Trinity is one of the sources of water for the Delta, it is inappropriate to leave out impacts, especially since some of the alternatives would retain existing Delta pumping or even increase Delta pumping with resultant impacts to the

¹⁶ Pacific Institute. 2005. California Water 2030: An Efficient Future. ES-2.
http://www.pacinst.org/reports/california_water_2030/ca_water_2030.pdf

¹⁷ Pacific Institute. 2009. Sustaining California Agriculture in an Uncertain Future.
http://www.pacinst.org/reports/california_agriculture/

areas of origin such as the Trinity. Trinity River Coho salmon are listed as a threatened species under federal and state law, but they are not mentioned in the document. This is a significant omission that should be corrected. Evaluation of impacts to Trinity River salmon and steelhead from the alternatives with high Delta exports such as Alternatives 1A and 1B could have been performed through evaluation of the frequency of violation of Trinity River Temperature Objectives contained in the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region.

The Trinity Record of Decision fishery flows and the 50,000 AF Humboldt County additional entitlement are components of the 1955 Trinity River Division (TRD) federal legislative authorization (PL 84-386) as amended by the 1992 Central Valley Project Improvement Act (PL 102-575).

Trinity River temperature objectives to protect salmon and steelhead have been adopted by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and the State Water Resources Control Board but have not been put into water permit requirements for the Bureau of Reclamation. In 1958, the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to section 8 of the 1902 Reclamation Act applied to the state for water rights to operate the TRD, but those water rights contain minimum fishery flows of only 120,500 AF. Trinity ROD flows and Humboldt County's 50,000 AF amount to a weighted annual average of 644,000 AF. Therefore, in order for the Trinity River to be protected, the Delta Plan should include a recommendation that the SWRCB convene a Trinity specific water right hearing, as directed in SWRCB Water Quality Order 89-18.¹⁸ The water right hearing shall license Reclamation's eight Trinity River water permits as follows:

1. Conformance with the instream fishery flows contained in the Trinity River Record of Decision.
2. Provision for release of Humboldt County's 50,000 AF in addition to fishery flows per the 1955 Trinity River Act under Water Code Section 1707.
3. Inclusion of permit terms and conditions to require Reclamation to comply with the Trinity River temperature objectives contained in the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region (NCRWQCB).
4. A requirement to maintain an adequate supply of cold water in Trinity Reservoir adequate to preserve and propagate all runs of salmon and steelhead in the Trinity River below Lewiston Dam during multi-year drought.
5. Eliminate paper water in Reclamation's Trinity River water rights.

Alternative 2, Effects on Sensitive Natural Communities. Impact 4-1

We concur with your important conclusion that "Alternative 2 would likely contribute more to improving the Delta ecosystem than the Proposed Project because of the greater emphasis on developing and implementing flow objectives that provide ecosystem benefits, including improvements to sensitive natural communities. Therefore, significant impacts on sensitive natural communities under Alternative 2 would be **less than** under the Proposed Project." The importance of this overall conclusion cannot be underestimated; ecosystems improvements are one of the overriding goals of Alternative 2, as well as the Delta Plan, and in keeping with one of the co-equal goals.

¹⁸ http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/1989/wq1989_18.pdf, page 18.

The DEIR incorrectly states that there will be significant impacts to sensitive natural communities (lines 21-21) compared to existing conditions because of the impacts of increased agricultural treatment facilities. As stated above, Alternative 2 does not contain agricultural treatment facilities because they would not be necessary if 380,000 acres of drainage problem lands in the San Luis Unit are retired. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not have significant impacts to sensitive natural communities as compared to Existing Conditions or the Proposed Project.

Alternative 2, Effects on Special-status Species. Impact 4-2

Once again, we concur with the DEIR finding that significant impacts on special-status species under Alternative 2 would be **less than** under the Proposed Project.

We also would like to point out two needed corrections:

1. Temporary construction-related impacts under Alternative 2 would be **less** than the Proposed Project because fewer projects would be constructed, not **greater than**, as indicated. Lines 1-2 on Page 4-94.
2. The suggestion that “water transfers might increase compared to the Proposed Project” is incorrect. As pointed out above (Section 3-2), Alternative 2 would **decrease** water transfers through the Delta due to the export limits of Alternative 2.

Alternative 2, Reduction of Fish or Wildlife Species Habitat. Impact 4-3

We concur that the overall significant impacts on fish and wildlife habitat under Alternative 2 would be **less than** under the Proposed Project because Alternative 2 would contribute more to improving habitat for fish and wildlife.

To go further, we fail to see how the Proposed Project with its BDCP emphasis on increasing water exports through the Delta can at the same time contribute to improved flows through the Delta and its connected rivers. In view of that obvious anomaly, we would judge the Proposed Project to have a more adversely significant impact on the Delta habitat and fisheries.

One of our major disappointments with the Delta Plan is the absence of a discussion of reduced flows through the Delta. Two key reports accomplished by the State Water Board over the last two decades have pointed out the importance of increasing outflow through the Delta and reducing exports to the level that is recommended in Alternative 2. The Delta Stewardship Council does not need further legal authority to support these past recommendations of the State Water Board, which have proven over time to be required for the recovery of fish and habitat in the Delta.

A full chapter in the report, *California Water Solutions Now*, upon which Alternative 2 is partially based, as well as our comments to the Fifth Draft Delta Plan, recommends studying the feasibility of fish passage above major Central Valley dams and the removal of dams that have outlived their usefulness as a significant favorable contribution to the recovery of listed salmonid species and the improvement of habitat for fish and wildlife.

We expect the DEIR to reinforce this need to allow migrating anadromous listed species to be able to reach more favorable habitat above dams in order to assure their survival.

Alternative 2 Interfere Substantially with the Movement of Any Native Resident or Migratory Fish. Impact 4-4

We concur with the finding that: “Overall, significant impacts on fish and wildlife movement under Alternative 2 would be **less than** under the Proposed Project because of the greater emphasis on flow objectives to achieve environmental benefits and a reduction in construction impacts associated with levees and dredging.” The overall objective of our fisheries recommendations is to provide benefits to ecosystems, fish, and wildlife through the Delta Plan.

Alternative 2, Conflict with Any Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources. Impact 4-5

As stated: significant impacts under Alternative 2 would be **less than** under the Proposed Project. We concur with your finding, and point out the need for the DEIR to support the enforcement of Fish and Game Code 5937, which mandates that dam operators keep fish in good condition below dams.

Alternative 2, Mitigation Measures:

With Alternative 2 having less impact than the Proposed Project in **all** of the five above impacts, it is not clear what analytical route you have used to decide that potential impacts are “significant and unavoidable.” Your analysis needs to be fully disclosed in accordance with CEQA practices.

Section 5 – DELTA FLOOD RISK

Overall, it is impossible in this section to make a reasoned analysis of benefits or impacts to flood risk from the various alternatives. For instance, there is no quantitative list of the number, size, and cost of levee improvements included under the various alternatives. Alternative 2 should have clearly included a list of all levee work necessary to bring all Delta levees up to the PL 84-99 standard as stated in EWC correspondence on the fifth draft of the Delta Plan. Instead, the DEIR incorrectly portrays Alternative 2, as “Actions to reduce flood risk under Alternative 2 would emphasize floodplain expansion and reservoir reoperation rather than levee construction and modification.” Specific impact analysis is put off until subsequent environmental documents. There is no discernible difference between No Action and the Proposed Action in terms of flood risk. No reasoned analysis can be made from the alternative descriptions, analysis, and discussion in this chapter.

Background. 5.3.2

The DEIR acknowledges that the failure rate of Delta levees has declined during the latter half of the twentieth century, although the section is organized to focus on the period of greater failures. Not mentioned are the reasons for failure reductions, which include: 1) many remaining levees in the Delta are in fact quite stable, the weaker ones having

already failed; and 2) local reclamation districts financed by Delta landowners have taken responsibility for levee maintenance, even in times when subventions funds were not available. The role of local agencies is better acknowledged under 5.4.5.1.2, which notes that “The USACE and State and *local agencies* have regularly rehabilitated bank erosion along project levees under the authority of the Sacramento River Bank Protection Project.” (Emphasis added.)

In the Overview, it is important to note that while a variety of upstream facilities affect flood management in the Delta, the reverse is not true: flood plains (flooded islands) in the Delta will not provide any benefit to Sacramento, Stockton, or other cities in the watershed. In fact, flooded islands would contribute to more pressure being placed on local levees.

Earthquake Risks. 5.3.5.2

There is no data or evidence to support the following two conclusions:

- “The risk of earthquakes causing levee breaches and island inundations in the Delta have long been recognized.”
- “It is assumed that an earthquake in the area would pose a significant threat to the Delta water supply because of the potential for liquefaction of levee embankments and foundations.”

There have been one or two minor earthquakes in the Delta and no levee breaches or island inundations caused by earthquakes. Ideas about liquefaction are poorly supported, with some engineers suggesting that peat soils in the Delta would in fact be less vulnerable to liquefaction than other soils. A test in August of 2011 by UCLA researchers of an artificial levee constructed of peat and other materials found that the peat settled but did not liquefy, even though the test machine generated ground motions equivalent to a local quake in the "high 6" range on the Richter scale. Although this research was limited and preliminary, it could be cited in the list of Sources of Information.

Increased Risks to Levees Due to Climate Change and Sea Level Rise. 5.3.5.1 (Page 5-23)

It is worth noting in the second paragraph that a robust levee maintenance program would allow levee height to keep up with any sea level rise on the same gradual basis as the rise itself is expected to occur. Dealing with any kind of increased risks to levees should be viewed not as a potential unavoidable catastrophe but as an ongoing design and maintenance challenge worthy of commitment from all levels of government.

Emergency Management Preparation 5.3.7

Note that preparation includes maintaining rock and sheet piles for levee repairs. These repair resources already exists but need to be expanded and to be accessible (as noted under Flood Risk Reduction for the Proposed Project).

Emergency Response Authorities and Responsibilities. 5.3.7.2

A critical missing piece here is an immediately accessible fund for emergency response. A flood fight can't wait while responding agencies try to decide which authority is going

to pay. Emergency funding should be in local control, not in State control. Such funding might be administered by the Delta Protection Commission or by a joint powers authority.

Assessment Methods. 5.4.1

The first paragraph indicates that: “The Proposed Project and alternatives would not directly result in construction or operation of projects or facilities” although they “could ultimately result in or encourage implementation of actions or development of projects.” Such implementation “could result in changes to flood management conditions *of the places in which they would be located.*” (Emphasis added). But taking just two examples given of typical projects – conveyance facilities and flood control levees – it seems clear that flood management conditions might be affected *outside* the immediate location, and that, in fact, affecting outside flood conditions might be the purpose of a particular project as a quantifiable objective of the Delta Plan. The italicized phrase should be deleted in order to provide a better description.

“The potential increases in flood flows, elevations, and velocities that *could* be caused by the implementation of projects encouraged by the Proposed Project and the alternatives were assessed qualitatively by applying general principles of hydrology and hydraulics to a range of representative conditions in California during the period of analysis.” (Emphasis added.) How can meaningful representative conditions be identified for the wide range of actions or projects that might be encouraged? This is an example of the lack of quantitative data to support the findings in this DEIR, as pointed out in our cover letter. This same comment is applicable to the Thresholds of Significance and Water Supply Reliability paragraphs contained in this section.

Impact 5-1

We disagree that Alternative 2 would have greater impacts on drainage pattern alteration than the Proposed Project because Alternative 2 does not contain ocean desalination projects or agricultural drainage treatment facilities, but it does include significant levee improvements by bringing all levees at least up to the PL 84-99 standards. Therefore, Alternative 2 would have the least impacts and certainly less impacts than the Proposed Project.

Impact 5-2

We agree that Alternative 2 would have less impacts than the Proposed Project for alteration of drainage patterns and polluted surface runoff.

Impact 5-5

We agree that “Overall, significant impacts associated with placement of structures within a 100-year flood hazard area under Alternative 2 would be **less than** under the Proposed Project.”

Based on changes to accurately reflect the EWC’s Alternative 2, Alternative 2 would have fewer impacts and more benefits than the Proposed Action in relation to flood risk.

Section 6 – LAND USE AND PLANNING

Study Area. 6.1

The last paragraph in this section reads: “As described in Section 2A, Proposed Project and Alternatives, facilities could be constructed, modified, or reoperated in the Delta, Delta watershed, or areas located outside the Delta that use Delta water, and other actions could be taken. It is unclear where any such facilities would be located or actions taken. The Delta is the focus of the Delta Reform Act, so the study area for this resource is focused in the Delta.”

Although we recognize the DSC’s wish to pare this subject down to manageable proportions, the statement in the last sentence could be applied equally to any section of the Delta Plan or DEIR. Land use and planning in the Delta watershed and areas outside the Delta that use Delta water may certainly have an environmental impact on the Delta, and the fact that it is unclear where any such facilities would be located or actions taken should not keep those matters from being addressed for regions outside as well as within the Delta for purposes of evaluating programmatic success.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK. 6.2

Local Land Use Plans. 6.2.1

Missing from this section is any mention of local habitat conservation plans such as the Yolo Natural Heritage Program, a county-wide NCCP/HCP, and the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan. This omission gives the impression that local government has been negligent in dealing with habitat conservation issues and that plans put forward by outside interests should therefore take precedence. In fact, it is essential that local planning efforts of this kind be respected and taken into account in any project planning going forward for the Delta region.

Also missing is any mention of Delta reclamation districts. This document needs to recognize these local authorities and incorporate their five-year plans on an island-by-island basis.

Section 11 – GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The evaluation of impacts in Chapter 11 is inconsequential. If a project were to be built, the geology is not going to change. Major impacts would be on the ecosystem, water supply, and disease vectors while impact rates of erosion could possibly be mitigated.

Regional and Local Seismicity. 11.3.2.2

Mentioned in this section are three earthquakes of magnitude 6.5 or greater. Despite the devastation caused by these earthquakes in the Bay Area and along the coast, there is no record of any levee failure in the Delta associated with these or other seismic events. This fact should be stated clearly. “A moderate, or moment magnitude 6.5 or greater earthquake on the major seismic sources in the San Francisco Bay region would affect the Delta with moderate to strong ground shaking and could potentially induce damage in

these areas.” There is no historic evidence to suggest that this ground shaking and damage would have more than local consequences.

By contrast, Figure 11-3 shows hundreds of seismic events occurring along faults extending south from the San Francisco Bay Region. The California Aqueduct runs down the coast range parallel to the San Andreas Fault, and geologists predict the existence of many blind thrust faults along the east side of the coast range. This document considers blind thrust faults underlying the Delta with the idea that a seismic event could disrupt water deliveries. The analysis should be extended to the potential vulnerability of the California Aqueduct, where damage could be equally disruptive of water supply.

Section 14 – HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Overall, this chapter overestimates the hazmat impacts from Alternative 2 under the incorrect assumption that the EWC alternative includes increased construction and use of ocean desalinization and agricultural drainage treatment facilities and therefore greater exposure to hazardous materials (greater impacts) compared to the Proposed Project. Alternative 2’s reduction in selenium, salt, and boron production and elimination of the need for agricultural pollution treatment facilities more than offsets hazmat impacts from increased recycling and sewage treatment facilities compared to the Proposed Project. Using information from the Broadview Contract Assignment Draft Environmental Assessment (Reclamation, 2004)¹⁹, and extrapolating the savings from retirement of 380,000 acres of drainage impaired lands in the San Luis Unit would result in the reduction of 98,800 AF/year of contaminated agricultural drainage to surface water and groundwater, including a reduction of 646,000 tons of salt, 57,000 pounds of selenium and 1.976 million pounds of boron. Clearly, Alternative 2 cleans up significant sources of surface and groundwater pollution for the Delta and San Joaquin/Tulare basins and is by far superior to any other alternative in this regard. The DEIR does not disclose the magnitude of this improvement in hazardous material production, storage, transport, and disposal, as a result of Alternative 2 because it lacks any quantitative analysis. Alternative 2 is environmentally superior for Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Section 21 – CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

We appreciate the effort of the Delta Stewardship Council to comprehensively review the environmental implications of the Delta Plan with respect to climate change and GHG emissions. However, the Plan suffers from the fundamental limitations in that some aspects of climate change, such as sea level rise and changes in precipitation patterns, have been exhaustively studied and evaluated, while some GHG impacts, including the embedded energy use in conveying water for long distances, and the growth patterns

¹⁹ See http://www.c-win.org/webfm_send/195, page 4-2

induced by conveying hundreds of thousands of acre feet of water to certain parts of the state, have barely been considered.

Since water conveyance, distribution, and treatment is a large component of energy consumption in the state, the Delta Plan needs to be integrated with the California Climate Adaptation Strategy²⁰, and the efforts of the Water Energy Task Force of the California Climate Action Team. The Council has the Authority to Recommend Options (Water Code section 85304) and to provide comments as a Responsible Agency, we recommend that the Delta Stewardship Council work with WET-CAT to develop specific guidelines for addressing greenhouse gas emissions that would be required for any project that is or will be incorporated into the Delta Plan. CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064)

GHG Assessment Methods. 21.5.1.1

Section 21.5.1.1 states “Because project-level details of project construction and operation needed to determine quantities and timing of GHG emissions are unknown, impacts for the alternatives were qualitatively evaluated for significance based on the estimated magnitude and types of emissions that might result.” We question the assumption that GHG impacts can be evaluated piecemeal for individual projects. For this reason, we question the criteria used for arriving at findings that some impacts are “less than significant.” We believe that more specific analysis of cumulative impacts and policy impacts are required under CEQA guidelines 15064.4 and are also required to adequately analyze the Proposed Project and alternatives under this document. Below are comments on specific impacts.

Construction and Operations of Projects Could Result in an Increase in GHG Emissions That May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment. Impact 21-1a:

We agree that these impacts are significant; however, we disagree with the assertion that “Project-level impacts would be addressed in future site-specific environmental analysis conducted at the time such projects are proposed by lead agencies.”

An overall, system-level analysis will need to be conducted of the cumulative GHG emissions of the proposed changes to operations of the State Water Project, as well as evaluation of alternatives. This will need to be done when the proposed projects are more fully specified. For this reason, these impacts cannot be subject to tiering from this document, because the impacts cannot be evaluated.

Construction and Operations of Projects Could Conflict with an applicable Plan, Policy, or Regulation Adopted for the Purpose of Reducing Emissions. Impact 21-2a

The EIR concludes that impact 21-2a is less than significant. We disagree with this conclusion. There are potentially significant statewide, cumulative impacts to the

²⁰ 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy, California Natural Resources Agency Available at http://resources.ca.gov/climate_adaptation/docs/Statewide_Adaptation_Strategy.pdf

Proposed Project, which could increase exports of water from the Sacramento Valley watershed through the Delta to Southern California. Because water supply ultimately drives growth, one of the biggest impacts would be a shift in growth from the Sacramento Valley watershed, which includes the western Sierras as well as the Sacramento Valley, to the San Joaquin Valley, the Inland Empire, and coastal southern California. Temperature projections from the state's Climate Adaptation strategy show that inland Southern California regions will be some of the hottest areas in the state, with mean peak daily temperatures in July as high as 110 degrees by 2070.

No analysis has been done of the increased greenhouse gas emissions from shifting development to these regions, or of the increased GHG emissions from an increase in demand for air conditioning. For this and other reasons, we disagree with the conclusion that projects implemented under the Delta plan would not conflict with other plans adopted by the state for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, as long as the individual projects were evaluated for conformance to statewide and regional policies.

We also note that the 20% reduction in per-capita urban water use required under the Delta Plan will only provide reduction in GHG emissions if it is used to reduce consumption of energy-intensive sources of water, including water conveyed for long distances and, water that is actively infiltrated and extracted.

We assert that the cumulative impacts are significant and will require analysis under CEQA guidelines 15126.2(d) and 15064, and are required to be evaluated in planning stages, rather than solely prior to implementation of specific projects.

Section 21.5.3.2 Delta Ecosystem Restoration

This section states that "Project-specific GHG emissions impacts would be addressed in project-specific environmental studies conducted by the lead agency at the time projects are proposed for implementation, and required mitigation and operating conditions would be reflected in needed permits and approvals for the projects." This analysis fails to take into account the cumulative impact of ending agricultural production in an area with moderate rainfall and proximity to a water supply needed for irrigation. Production could be shifted to regions within California that are heavily dependent on imported water supplies, and that will be subject to large temperature shifts, or there could be an increase in imports from out of state. We believe a cumulative analysis of GHG emission impacts is required.

On the subject of impacts, we disagree with your assessment of Alternative 2 on the Mitigation Measures; with two of the three impacts rated as less-than-significant and the other rated the same as the Proposed Project, it is difficult to understand how you arrived at the overall rating of "significant and may be unavoidable." Again, we question the criteria you have used for arriving at these findings in the absence of quantifiable data or measures, as required by CEQA (Guideline 15146, Degree of Specificity).

Section 22 – CUMULATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

CEQA Requirements

Although the evaluation of economic effects is optional under CEQA Guidelines (15131), the economics and social effects of the differing alternatives is so significantly different, and the economic balancing of public trust values so important, that they should not be optional for this DEIR. The possible elimination of a \$12 to \$15 billion expenditure, by not investing in a canal or tunnel around the Delta as anticipated with BDCP, is so significant to the state budget, as well as significant to the environment of the Bay-Delta and the balancing of the public trust, that it must be considered. The longstanding constitutional principle of reasonable use and the **public trust doctrine** shall be the foundation of state water management policy and are particularly important and applicable to the Delta (Water Code Section 85023).

Section 23 – BAY DELTA CONSERVATION PLAN

Alternative 2. Page 23-27, Line 36

In the section on Relationship of BDCP Alternatives to Delta Plan EIR Alternatives, there is an indication that EWC recommends completing the BDCP (Page 23-24, Line 3-4).

Our recommendations have been qualified but clearly stated, as follows:

- In our report, *California Water Solutions Now*, we have recommended “Measures that provide adequate water for all Californians and preclude the need for major new surface storage projects or the currently proposed Peripheral Canal.”
- For the Fifth Draft Plan, we commented that the water use reductions and savings shown in the EWC alternatives make major structural alternatives such as a canal or tunnel around or under the Delta and further surface storage unnecessary for water supply reliability.
- Also in the Fifth Draft, we commented that: “We agree with the recommendation that they complete the BDCP consistent with the provisions of the Delta Reform Act. However, this is unlikely to lead to BDCP meeting either the flow requirements or the water quality standards envisioned in the Delta Plan, and as such, likely would not meet the recovery objectives. Since BDCP is a 50 year plan, it must meet the Delta Reform Act mandates, and from a practical sense, the Council must work closely with BDCP on issues like developing alternatives.”
 - We also stated that: “The purpose of the evaluation of any Delta facility is to decrease the physical vulnerability and increase the predictability of Delta supplies, not to increase Delta diversions.”

We would like to make it clear that we do not support the current BDCP plan to implement a 15,000 cfs canal or tunnel, but are in favor of BDCP analyzing a full range of alternatives, including an alternative similar to our Delta Plan Alternative 2, along with an economics-based balancing of the public trust, as required by state policy. The context of the Fifth Draft comments was that the Delta Stewardship Council should “work with the BDCP to help them establish a list of alternatives for evaluation that would likely provide information based on the Council’s understanding about **“less reliance on the Delta.”**”

- As noted in each section of the DEIR, the Delta Stewardship Council has the Authority to Recommend Options (Water Code section 85304) and the Authority to Comment During the BDCP Process (Water Code section 85320 (c)) as a Responsible Agency. We would go further and expect the Delta Stewardship Council to have a required obligation to recommend and comment. **We recommend that the Delta Stewardship Council exercise those authorities and obligations.**

As a part of the BDCP Section 23, Table 23-1 on Page 23, **Potential Array of Alternatives being Considered for the BDCP Effects Analysis Process**, reviewers could be misled into concluding that the EWC Alternative 2 recommends a 6,000 cfs diversion. We want to clarify: we are not recommending a 6,000 cfs diversion. We repeat our recommendation, stated above, that BDCP analyze a full range of alternatives, including an alternative similar to our Delta Plan Alternative 2, along with an economics-based balancing of the public trust.

Although there are indications that BDCP may do a cost analysis of their preferred 15,000 cfs conveyance alternative, it is unlikely that this exports-driven project will complete a thorough cost/benefits analysis of the various alternatives to a 15,000 cfs conveyance. It is, therefore, incumbent on the Delta Stewardship Council, as a part of its statewide planning and public trust responsibilities, to assure that the BDCP's costs and benefits be compared to the various Delta Plan DEIR alternatives prior to certification of BDCP as a part of the Delta Plan.

APPENDIX C – POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

Table C-7 Alternative 2 Recommendations on Finance Plan Framework

Alternative 2 Recommendations 1 through 13 are described as the same or similar to the Proposed Project recommendations except for the addition of a 14th recommendation in Alternative 2. This recommendation calls for the exploration of a water diversion fee and a Delta export water fee to be used in support of ecosystem restoration efforts. Depending on the results of that exploration, it may contribute to strengthening the findings of superior ecosystem restoration actions for Alternative 2.

Beneficiaries should include not just those who benefit from the water resources of the Delta but those whose access to those water resources is facilitated by levee and other maintenance activities of entities within the Delta. A number of water agencies receiving water from the Delta have expressed support for this principle and a willingness to help pay for levee maintenance.

Regarding funds set aside for flood protection and disaster prevention, an accessible emergency response fund should be established and should be readily accessible to local agencies in the event of an emergency, so that time is not lost deciding what agency will pay for emergency response. Such a fund could be administered by the Delta Protection Commission or by a joint powers authority.

EWC ALTERNATIVE 2 SUMMARY

By following the outline and sequence of subjects of the DEIR, as we have done in these comments, and because of the numerous Draft Delta Plan comments from our caucus over the year, it may be difficult for reviewers to determine concisely which actions the EWC Alternative 2 supports or opposes. The following is a brief outline of those actions:

Supported Actions:

1. Reduce exports to 3MAF, and in keeping with SWRCB flows criteria
2. Public trust protection and thorough economic analysis of reasonable alternatives
3. Keep water transfers within revised Delta export limits
4. Maximize use of existing Delta facilities
5. Installation of improved fish screens at existing Delta pumps
6. Expand statewide water efficiency and demand reduction programs
7. Maximize regional self sufficiency
8. Eliminate irrigation water on drainage-impaired farmlands below Bay Delta
9. Return Kern Water Bank to state control, restore Article 18 urban preference, and restore the original intent of Article 21 surplus water in SWP contracts
10. Restore water quality in the Bay Delta and in impaired rivers
11. Reinforce core levees above PL84-99 standards
12. Monitoring and reporting of groundwater, statewide
13. Restore approximately 18,000 acres of Delta ecosystems
14. Feasibility study for Tulare Basin water storage
15. Provide fish passage above Central Valley rim dams for species of concern
16. Retain cold water for fish in reservoirs
17. Integrate floodplains with rivers
18. Fund agencies with user fees
19. Provide phasing of all above actions

Actions Not Supported:

1. Ocean desalination
2. Increased water transfers
3. BDCP 15,000 cubic foot per second new conveyance capacity
4. Major new or expanded surface storage
5. Expansion of Friant/Millerton reservoir
6. Increased construction and use of agricultural drainage treatment plants

The following Environmental Water Caucus affiliated organizations support the findings and recommendations shown in the attached DEIR comment letter dated February 2, 2012.

Their logos are shown at the front of this document.

*Gary Adams
California Striped Bass Association*

*Deirdre des Jardins
California Water Research Associates*

*Dan Bacher
Editor
Fish Sniffer*

*Siobahn Dolan
Director
Desal Response Group*

*Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla
Executive Director
Restore the Delta*

*Marty Dunlap
Citizens Water Watch*

*Shawn Bothwell
Policy Analyst
California Coastkeeper*

*Conner Everts
Executive Director
Southern California Watershed Alliance*

*Lloyd Carter
President
California Save Our Streams Council*

*Larry Glass
President
Safe Alternatives for Our Forest
Environment
Northcoast Environmental Center
South Fork Mountain Defense
Committee*

*Jennifer Clary
Water Policy Analyst
Clean Water Action*

*Victor Gonella
President
Golden Gate Salmon Association*

*Joan Clayburg
Executive Director
Sierra Nevada Alliance*

*Zeke Grader
President
Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's
Associations*

*Larry Collins
President
San Francisco Crab Boat Owners
Association*

*President
Institute for Fisheries Resources*

*Caleb Dardick
Executive Director
South Yuba Citizens League*

*Kelli Grant
President
Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance*

*Greywolf, Jeff Kelley
Chief of the Modoc Nation*

*Leda Huta
Executive Director
Endangered Species Coalition*

*Bill Jennings
Executive Director
California Sportfishing Protection
Alliance*

*Carolee Krieger
Executive Director
California Water Impact Network*

*Mondy Lariz
Director
Santa Clara County Creeks Coalition*

*Adam Lazar
Staff Attorney
Center for Biological Diversity*

*David Lewis
Executive Director
Save the Bay*

*Tim Little
Co-Director
Rose Foundation for Communities and
the Environment*

*Roger Mammon
President
Lower Sherman Island Duck Club*

*John Merz
President
Sacramento River Preservation Trust*

*Jim Metropulos
Senior Advocate
Sierra Club California*

*Jonas Minton
Senior Water Policy Advisor
Planning and Conservation League*

*Nanananda
Executive Director
Friends of the Eel River*

*Andrew J. Orahoske
Conservation Director
Environmental Protection Information
Center*

*Carol Perkins
Butte Environmental Council*

*Lynne Plambeck
Executive Director
Santa Clarita Organization for Planning
and the Environment*

*Mark Rockwell
Co-Conservation Director
Northern California Council Federation
of Fly Fishers*

*Michael Schweit
President
Southwest Council Federation of Fly
Fishers*

*Adam Scow
California Campaign Director
Food and Water Watch*

*Deb Self
Executive Director
San Francisco Baykeeper*

*Linda Sheehan
Executive Director
Earth Law Center*

*Caleen Sisk-Franco
Spiritual Leader & Traditional Chief
Winnemen Wintu Tribe*

*Esmeralda Soria
Legislative Advocate
California Rural Legal Assistance
Foundation*

*Ron Stork
Senior Policy Advocate
Friends of the River*

*Bruce Tokars
Salmon Water Now*

*Craig Tucker
Karuk Tribe*

*Barbara Vlamis
Executive Director
AquAlliance*

*Bill Wells
Executive Director
California Delta Chambers & Visitors
Bureau*

*Eric Wesselman
Executive Director
Tuolumne River Trust*

*Chris Wright
Executive Director
Foothill Conservancy*


**COALITION OF ENVIRONMENTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, TRIBAL
AND FISHING ORGANIZATIONS' COMMENTS
ON THE FIFTH STAFF DRAFT OF THE DELTA PLAN
September 30, 2011**



NORTHERN CALIFORNIA COUNCIL



FEDERATION OF FLY FISHERS





THE ROSE FOUNDATION
For Communities & The Environment





**Merced River
Conservation Committee**





Sierra Foothills Audubon





Central Coast Forest Watch



Battle Creek Alliance

P.O. Box 228, Montgomery Creek, CA 95861
(530) 474-1400
wccall@battlecreekalliance.org



NORTH
COAST
RIVERS
ALLIANCE



Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge

CA Save Our Streams Council



Santa Clara Organization
of Planning and the
Environment (SCOPE)




Tuolumne River Conservancy, Inc.





Tuolumne River Trust



An affiliate of the Redwood Coast Watersheds Alliance




Sierra Forest Legacy



Protecting Sierra Nevada Forests and Communities



Ventura CoastKeeper




Foothills Anglers Coalition



HUMBOLDT AREA SALTWATER ANGLERS



CALIFORNIA OUTDOORS
Dedicated to preserving, promoting, and experiencing California's unique rivers.



**COALITION OF ENVIRONMENTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
AND FISHING ORGANIZATIONS**

To: Joe Grindstaff, Executive Officer
Delta Stewardship Council

From: Coalition of Environmental, Environmental Justice and Fishing Organizations

Subject: Comments on the Fifth Staff Draft of the Delta Plan

September 30, 2011

Our coalition of more than 200 organizations is pleased to provide comments as you continue the development of the Delta Plan and we look forward to your ongoing development of the Plan. We continue to be impressed with your work processes and transparency, which are raising the bar for public agencies.

At the same time, we have serious misgivings about the overall direction of the plan, especially as regards the balancing of the Public Trust, and we have recommendations for actions that are needed by the Council to arrive at a completed and legal Delta Plan. As required by Water Code §85203: “[t]he longstanding constitutional principle of reasonable use and the public trust doctrine shall be the foundation of state water management policy and are particularly important and applicable to the Delta.”

Thirty plus years of failure by state and federal agencies to protect the Delta and balance competing demands for limited water resources led the State Legislature to enact the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (Act). The Act created and directed the Delta Stewardship Council (Council) to develop a legally enforceable Delta Plan to achieve the coequal goals of “providing a more reliable water supply for California” and “protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem” in a manner that “protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place.” The Act also established a state policy of promoting regional self-reliance and reduced reliance on the Delta in meeting California’s future water supply needs.

The Delta Plan functions as a strategic document providing guidance and recommendations to cities, counties, and State, federal, and local agencies on how to restore the Delta ecosystem and provide a more reliable water supply for California. It contains regulatory policies and establishes a certification process for proposed projects to comply with the Delta Plan and envisions incorporation of other “completed” plans into the Delta Plan. In other words, the Council must “certify” that proposed plans, projects, and covered actions are consistent with the Delta Plan.

The California Supreme Court, in the Mono Lake decision, explicitly set forth the state’s “affirmative duty to take the public trust into account in the planning and allocation of water resources and to protect public trust uses whenever feasible.” The Council clearly has trustee

responsibilities in balancing the public trust. Planning and allocation of limited and oversubscribed resources implies analysis and balancing of competing demands. Inexplicably, we find little effort to balance the public trust obligations and resolve competing demands within the Fifth Draft of the Delta Plan.

Failure to define and quantify the coequal goals is undermining the Council's best efforts. It is not clear what is meant by: a more reliable water supply; protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem; enhancement of the Delta as an evolving place; regional self-reliance; and reduced dependence on the Delta. For example, reliably receiving full contracted quantities or receiving the present level of water deliveries is considerably different than reliably receiving water after the public trust has been balanced and the Delta ecosystem protected. What are the yardsticks by which success will be documented? Failure to define "getting well together" was the genesis of the CalFed debacle and resolving California's continuing water crisis is unlikely without definition and quantification of these terms.

The inescapable reality is that consumptive water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) exceed unimpaired flow into the Delta and contracts for state and federal project water are far greater than available supplies. Increased pollutant mass loading to the estuary has exhausted assimilative capacity and exacerbated water quality degradation. Ever-increasing diversion of water has led to the collapse of estuary's biological tapestry. These actions have injured beneficial uses and degraded public trust resources. Two recent state agency reports, developed through extensive public processes, conclusively establish that an increase in Delta outflow is necessary to protect and restore the estuary's aquatic ecosystem.¹

California's water system is seriously oversubscribed, operating in deficit, and incapable of meeting competing demands on the system. The Council's charge is to resolve this imbalance. In the near term, it's largely a zero sum game. More water to protect public trust values translates to less water for consumption values. Over the longer term, redefining the CVP and SWP to reflect legally available water supplies, improved efficiencies, conservation, reclamation, reuse and improved storage and diversion methods can significantly alleviate, but likely not completely eliminate water shortages. The Council cannot evade having to make difficult decisions regarding the distribution of limited water resources. Sadly, the Fifth Draft of the Delta Plan embraces the status quo and fails to provide the structure and information critically necessary to make intelligent, but painful decisions.

Economics is the science of choice and the study of the allocation of scarce resources among competing demands. Water is scarce in California. Consequently, any process that involves water allocation and protection of biophysical (instream) or in-Delta use values needs to consider the economic value of the public trust and the economic consequences of potential choices or alternatives – i.e., the balancing of the public trust and competing municipal, industrial and agricultural beneficial uses. As a state agency with public trust responsibilities, the Council is required to balance the public trust in both the Delta Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This requirement to balance the public trust is also intrinsic to other agencies in other and

¹ State Water Resource Control Board. August 2010. *Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem*; California Department of Fish and Game. November 2010. *Quantifiable Biological Objectives and Flow Criteria for Aquatic and Terrestrial Species of Concern Dependent on the Delta*.

future proceedings, including; the State Board's current San Joaquin Flow and South Delta Salinity proceeding and equivalent EIR, their anticipated Bay-Delta water rights proceeding and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan's (BDCP) Habitat Conservation Plan and EIR.

The Mono Lake proceeding was a classic public policy proceeding of allocating a scarce resource among competing demands. It identified the ecological uses of trust resources and their biological requirements, examined the relationship between water flows and impacts on ecological uses and compared the costs to the City of Los Angeles acquiring water from other sources with the economic benefits of protecting the ecological values of the lake's public-trust resources.² The City claimed that the costs of alternatives to diverting water from the lake were prohibitive. However, comprehensive economic analysis demonstrated that the economic benefits of protecting the ecological uses of the Mono Lake's public trust resources were more than 47 times greater than the costs to Los Angeles.³ The State Board considered other factors along with economic results in reaching a decision, but economic factors played a significant and pivotal role.

One of the significant flaws of previous and unsuccessful Bay-Delta proceedings has been the absence of a comprehensive economic evaluation of the benefits of protecting the estuary and in-Delta beneficial uses compared to the benefits of diverting and exporting water from the estuary. This absence has deprived decision makers and the public of critical information fundamental to reaching informed and difficult decisions on balancing competing demands.

The Fifth Draft Delta Plan is bereft of any economic analysis of public trust values. The current draft of the Delta Protection Commission's *Economic Sustainability Plan for the Delta*, which is scheduled to be completed 22 September 2011, only addresses potential economic **impacts** from several conceptual alternatives on Delta agriculture, recreation, infrastructure, and local economies. It excludes impacts to the commercial and subsistence fishing communities and the intrinsic ecological value of the Delta as an ecosystem. It ignores water quality impacts, other than agriculture. It fails to address the **value** of public trust resources, including the economic significance and the contingent valuation of fisheries, natural resources, and associated ecosystem services. Nor does it address the relative economic value of the uses to which water is applied. In short, it is a partial but wholly inadequate initial step to providing the comprehensive economic analysis necessary for the Council to balance the public trust.

The State Water Contractors recently presented BDCP with a report claiming that a peripheral canal would create about 7 to 10 jobs for every million dollars spent on construction or operation. However, published estimates of jobs created by investment in water/energy efficiency projects range from 15 to 22 jobs per million dollars of direct investment, with the added benefit of enormous water savings. Furthermore, a full socio-economic analysis would likely demonstrate

² Koehler, C.J. 1995. "Water Rights and the Public Trust Doctrine: Resolution of the Mono Lake Controversy." *Ecology Law Quarterly* 22: 451; Casey, E. 1984. "Water Law—Public Trust Doctrine," *Natural Resources Journal* 24: 809-825.

³ Loomis, J. 1987. "Balancing Public Trust Resources of Mono Lake and Los Angeles' Water Right: An Economic Approach." *Water Resources Research* 23: 1449-1456. August; Loomis, J. 1997. Use of Non-Market Valuation Studies in Water Resource Management Assessments. Colorado State University; Duffield, J. 2010. *Valuing Ecosystem Services in River and Lake Systems: Methods and Western U.S. Case Studies*. Presentation, Salt Lake City, April 28.

that a restored Delta ecosystem would generate economic benefits far in excess of any benefits arising from constructing a peripheral canal.

Beyond protecting California's common property right in public trust resources, the balancing of limited water supplies must address the relative economic value of competing interests. For example, what is the societal value in providing Kern County, comprising a fraction of one percent of the state's population and economy, the same quantity of Delta water as the South Coast, with half the state's population and economy? What is the value to society of using public subsidies to irrigate impaired lands to benefit some 600 landowners (some have estimated the vertically integrated ownerships to be even less, around 350), and that, by the nature of being irrigated, discharge prodigious quantities of toxic waste that impairs other beneficial uses? What is the economic value of using twice the amount of water to irrigate an orchard in the desert than is required elsewhere? What are the costs and benefits of reclamation, reuse, conservation and development of local sources? Should consumptive use of limited water supplies be prioritized on the basis of efficiency or economic value? Does health & safety take precedence over certain other uses?

The preceding are only examples of the difficult questions that must be addressed in any allocation of limited resources and balancing of the public trust. Economic analysis is crucial to providing the insight and guidance that will enable the Council to meet its mandate. Without such analysis, we do not believe the Council can successfully or legally comply with its legislative and constitutional obligations.

Comprehensive economic analyses are not academic exercises. They are routinely employed by state and federal agencies throughout the nation to address both market and non-market costs and benefits of water projects. A sampling of these resources and best practices is included as Attachment I. It is unlikely that a successful plan which meets the co-equal goals can be achieved without defining the goals that incorporate measurable performance objectives and which provide a scientific basis for evaluating the economic consequences of diverse alternatives. In the final analysis, the restoration of the Delta ecosystem cannot be measured in money spent, programs or projects implemented or acres converted to habitat. It must be measured by specific indices that quantify improvements in water quality and the health and abundance of fisheries and wildlife.

The entire document, while professing to espouse an understanding of the Delta cannot be complete without recognition that as a cultural area the first people of the state are not included or discussed in the document and that the water rights of the California Indians are still to be mitigated at this late date. Tribal uses of water must be considered in order to begin to embrace the failure of agencies to acknowledge tribal water rights as well as cultural rights guaranteed under treaty to access and use water ways and estuaries for tribal existence. California water law has refused to include the mitigation of tribal water rights as senior to all other, as well as the non-abrogation of water rights under treaty, despite the continued inference of the government to the Winters decision.

In addition to these above comments and recommendations pertaining to the Public Trust economic analysis, we have also based our remaining comments on the following overall findings:

1. The Delta is over appropriated and unless exports are reduced to a scientifically permissible level, the Delta estuary cannot be recovered in any scientifically acceptable sense.
2. The over appropriation stems primarily from CVP and SWP contract levels which cannot be met.
3. An aggressive water efficiency program – more aggressive and of longer duration than the 20/20 program – which includes both urban and agricultural users is a necessary component for reducing reliance on the Delta.
4. The Delta ecosystems and wildlife cannot be restored without significant reductions of pollutants that are currently being poured into the Delta and without significant improvements in the fabric of ecosystem habitats essential to sustaining beneficial uses of the Delta.
5. The water use reductions and savings shown in the EWC alternatives make major structural alternatives such as a canal or tunnel around or under the Delta and further surface storage unnecessary for water supply reliability.
6. While the Delta Reform Act provides broad narrative goals for the Delta Plan, it does not provide clear, specific, and measurable objectives as called for in Adaptive Management programs. The Delta Plan must not defer this next necessary step of Adaptive Management. The Plan must begin to establish clear and measurable goals, objectives, and performance measures; it must quantify goals and provide specific accomplishment dates. It must require the same of any BDCP plan that is incorporated into the Delta Plan.
7. As recommended in recent federal biological opinions, evaluations of fish passage around major Central Valley dams connected to the Delta should be conducted in order to determine the possible benefits to endangered salmonid species.
8. The Delta Plan must include actual consultation and planning that includes California tribal nations, federally and non-federally recognized, in order to include tribal needs and concerns for the uses of the waters into and out of the delta and how the transfer and use of these waters affects tribes and the inherent, non-abrogated rights of the tribes to these waters.

Our comments on specific chapters of the Fifth Draft Delta Plan follow.

CHAPTER 2 – SCIENCE AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.

Although here are no Policies or Recommendations to respond to in this chapter, we have the following general comments and recommendations:

1. The adaptive management program outlined in the Delta Plan, while promising to incorporate science into the decision making process, is little more than window-dressing facilitating business-as-usual. Although here are no Policies or Recommendations to respond to in this chapter, we have the following general comments and recommendations:
2. The Delta Reform Act requires inclusion of science-based adaptive management in the Delta Plan for ongoing ecosystem restoration and water management decisions. While the Delta Plan requires that all covered actions include an adaptive management plan incorporating the nine-step framework, there is nothing that describes how the adaptive management will be implemented, how implementation will be evaluated, or even that it actually be implemented. Indeed, the Delta Plan does not mention the words “adaptive management” in its *A More Reliable Water Supply, Restore the Delta Ecosystem, Improve Water Quality to Protect Human Health and the Environment, Reduce Risk to People, Property, and State Interests in the Delta* or *Protect and Enhance the Unique Cultural Recreational, Natural Resources, and Agricultural Values of the California as an Evolving Place* chapters. There is nothing in the Delta Plan to indicate that science, rather than the political agenda of water agencies, will determine water management decisions.
 - We therefore fully concur with the Delta Independent Science Board (DISB) recommendations that the principles of adaptive management must be applied in Chapters 4 through 8. These chapters must describe and demonstrate how adaptive techniques can be integrated into the actions proposed for the Delta Plan. Failure to do so would be a major oversight and, as indicated by the DISB, would undermine the legislative mandate for the co-equal goals.⁴
3. The panel convened by the National Research Council of the National Academies, in their 2011 evaluation of BDCP titled *A Review of the Use of Science and Adaptive Management in California’s Draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan*, observes that most adaptive management efforts worldwide have failed primarily without the agreement of the water users. The failure to define and quantify critical goals and inclusion of agreements that limit requirements on water users undermine and sabotage the very concept of adaptive management because of institutional problems that include lack of resources necessary for expanded monitoring, unwillingness of decision makers to admit and embrace uncertainties in making policy choices and lack of leadership

⁴ Delta Independent Science Board. *Final – Synthesis of Recommendations for the Delta Independent Science Board (DISB) on the Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan*. September 16, 2011.

implementation.⁵ The aims of adaptive management often conflict with institutional and political preferences. This is especially important, given the lack of definition of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration in the Delta Plan and the inherent contradiction between restoration of the estuary and requirements in the BDCP Planning Agreement that provide assurances that no additional restrictions on the use of land, water, or financial resources beyond agreed-on amounts will be required.

4. Regulatory actions by state agencies, routine operation of the State Water Project, Central Valley Project and local facilities, as well as certain ministerial or emergency project and temporary water transfers are exempt from adaptive management requirements in the Delta Plan. Given the caustic review of BDCP's adaptive management program by the National Research Council's review team,⁶ it is highly uncertain to what extent BDCP will include a meaningful adaptive management process. And, given the fact that the BDCP must be incorporated into the Delta Plan, it is uncertain whether the Council can fundamentally modify elements of the BDCP adaptive management program.
5. Previous adaptive management efforts in the Delta have grievously failed. CalFed's adaptive management program chaperoned the accelerated decline of the Delta's ecosystem. The "red light," signaling "take" at the export facilities, was often disregarded and the Water Operations Management Team frequently rejected the recommendations of the technical review teams. Agencies have refused to enforce requirements for project operations that they adopted. For example, the State Water Resources Control Board repeatedly refused to enforce the terms of its Cease and Desist Order against the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for violations of South Delta salinity standards. It further ignored blatant violations of the Vernalis and Delta outflow standards in 2009. If project operators and oversight agencies can routinely discount the results from adaptive management, then the process is little more than a Hollywood storefront implying progress that doesn't exist.
6. While the Delta Reform Act provides broad narrative goals for the Delta Plan, it does not provide clear, specific, and measurable objectives as called for in this Chapter. The Delta Plan must not defer this next necessary step of Adaptive Management. The Plan must begin to establish clear and measurable goals, objectives, and performance measures; it must quantify goals and provide specific accomplishment dates; it must model linkages between objectives and proposed actions; it must select and evaluate actions for implementation; it must design implementation actions with appropriate monitoring; and it must be peer reviewed. If the plan cannot be enforced, it is illegal:
 - As required in CEQA §15126.4 (D) (2): Mitigation measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally-binding instruments. In the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other

⁵ Panel to Review California's Draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan, National Research Council. 2011. *A Review of the Use of Science and Adaptive Management in California's Draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan*: Washington D.C., page 38.

⁶ *Ibid*, pages 38-44.

public project, mitigation measures must be incorporated into the plan, policy, regulation, or project design.

7. This Chapter needs to specify who makes the decisions on how to Respond or Adapt as a part of the Adaptive Management process. There must be legally binding accountability. To date, many of those decisions have been made (or in many cases not made) by the water exporters. This kind of decision-making cannot be tolerated in the implementation of the Delta Plan.
8. Adequate monitoring, which includes particulates, concentrations, and invertebrates along with sediments and flow is needed to provide early warnings and preventative actions. The extensive network of existing monitoring data needs to be analyzed by scientifically credible agencies to ensure public trust values are not being harmed or degraded.

CHAPTER 3 – GOVERNANCE.

As stated in the draft, the Delta Plan is a strategic plan to provide guidance and make recommendations. The Water Code Section 85020 places some responsibilities on the Council that are state-wide and far reaching. The Council is to establish a structure upon which it may receive guidance and recommendations, both for covered and non-covered actions. The legislature also requires the Council to establish and oversee a committee of agencies responsible for implementing the Delta Plan. In the Fifth Draft there is still no mention of an Implementation Committee. Therefore, we continue to make the following recommendations relative to this responsibility:

1. Identify what relevant agencies must be included in the “*Governance or implementation Committee.*”
 - Governance should be inclusive of Delta interests and stakeholders and include at least representatives of NGO agencies, the Delta Conservancy, commercial and recreational fishing, in-Delta community representatives, and landowners. G P1.
2. It is our recommendation that other interest parties be part of the process of decision-making within the Governance Committee to broaden the process to include consideration of non-agency issues. Examples would be:
 - Delta Conservancy
 - NGO representatives
 - Commercial/recreational fishing representative
 - In-Delta Community Representatives
 - Science Advisory Board member
3. Develop an organizational chart, which will show clearly the structure of the governance process, and identifies what additional advisory boards, committees, and outside inputs will be associated with the “*Governance/Implementation Committee.*”
4. Develop a clear and concise list of responsibilities for the *Governance Committee*, and make clear the difference in process between covered and non-covered actions. Some areas of possible responsibility are:
 - The guiding principle of any governance committee should be the precautionary principle – First, do no harm. The fragility of the Delta ecosystem is such that it is already operating on the edge of tolerance, even with reduced reliance as mandated by the legislature. Hence, it is inappropriate to do anything that could risk additional stress.
 - General criteria for water operations, ensuring that appropriate Delta flows are maintained, water quality objectives are met, source water is protected, public trust values are protected, and beneficial uses are not degraded.
 - Restoration oversight to facilitate and implement restoration projects within the Delta to meet established restoration timing and completion dates.

- Work with the Science Advisory team to help manage the adaptive management efforts to ensure species recovery of aquatic resources.
 - Coordinate with the Delta Conservancy on efforts with Delta communities, counties, and landowners.
 - Establish and manage budgets to secure necessary funding both for the Council and for the other efforts in the Delta Plan.
 - Oversight and recommendations on implementation of state wide water conservation, water use efficiency and reclamation programs, and ensuring that strategic goals are being both established and met.
 - Meet with the SWQCB on important Delta issues – tributary flow criteria, Delta flow criteria, pollution issues in tributaries, illegal diversions, etc.
 - Meet with the Delta Protection Commission on Delta levee repairs and other Delta protection issues, and to ensure that deadlines are being met.
 - Meet with Delta and watershed communities to understand the best interface with them on local issues of concern, and to take actions necessary to ensure actions of the Council are protecting and enhancing the unique cultural, educational and agricultural values of the Delta and its watersheds.
 - Develop specific recommendations for the legislature or other appropriate state agencies for actions to facilitate the Delta Plan to meet its responsibilities of Delta ecosystem protection, restoration and enhancement, as well as water supply reliability.
 - Establish appropriate goals and objectives as well as timelines to achieve Delta restoration and water conservation, reclamation and efficiency strategies.
 - Meet regularly to discuss the obligations of the SWP and CVP, their oversight responsibilities, and ways to bring contractual obligations more in line with available water.
 - In addition to the above, there are other areas of concern that must be articulated within the process of governance, and in some cases, the governance structure must be designed to provide protections against outside interference. There must be a level of independence for decision makers. It must be clear that the science board will have influence on the decision making process, and not be left only as advisors hoping their advice is followed. It is unfortunate, but too many times politics has trumped science in decision-making in the Delta, and with water management in particular. In many ways, the success or failure of the Delta Plan may hinge on the ability to design a governance structure that protects decision makers from the impacts of those who have the desire to alter the process based on limited or short-term pressures.
5. There is little substance in the section titled: How Will The Policies Of The Delta Plan Work In Practice? (Pg. 56, line 28). We would suggest this is the perfect place to include a guidance outline of the process state and local agencies, landowners, and others would go through to meet consistency requirements of the Delta Plan. It is a good place for implementation actions required, as well as what enforcement actions are consistent with the authorities of the primary agencies. For example, recommendations in the area of water rights permit approval, changes in diversion points, or other water allocation issues that impact the co-equal goal requirement of the Delta Plan. (G P1)

6. On Page 54, line 27, we recommend changing the word “promote” to “meet.” The sentence would then read: “The Council may incorporate other completed plans related to the Delta into the Delta Plan to the extent that the other plans *meet* the coequal goals.” It would be a stronger statement if worded this way. (G P1)
7. Additionally, on line 35, under “Information, Comments, Advice,” it would be advisable to provide some guidance on how the Delta Plan Science Program would interface with the BDCP science program, with restoration, monitoring and adaptive management. Currently, the BDCP oversight and management is to be done by the permitting agencies and permittees though the Council has not yet determined which agencies will be included. None of these BDCP oversight entities are scientists, yet they would be allowed to decide questions only scientists should answer. This appears to be inconsistent with the co-equal goals responsibility of the Delta Plan. (G P1)
8. Since the Delta Plan is expected to incorporate the BDCP should state and federal wildlife agencies certify it, we recommend that the Council provide specific, consistent, and regular guidance to the BDCP on what would be required for BDCP to be consistent with the mandates from the legislature in the Delta Plan. An example of the current inconsistency is: The Delta Plan mandates the state water board to establish Delta flows and major tributary flows by 2014 and 2018. It is stated that this is **key to the achievement of the co-equal goals** (line 7, pg. 86). Yet, there is no such policy in BDCP, since petitioning partners in the BDCP are opposed to establishing these flow standards. If the BDCP does not incorporate or use these flow standards in the plan, it would then NOT meet the co-equal goals required by the Delta Plan. It is hard to understand how the BDCP could be incorporated with this current inconsistency, and if it were, the Delta Plan would likely be challenged in court.
9. There needs to be a clear policy on the role of wildlife agencies relative to governance of restoration and adaptive management. What role will they have relative to final decision-making, including on water operations, both annual planning and real-time operational changes? Since the Council may be relying on the BDCP to provide this, again, we recommend the Council provide guidance to the BDCP on what is required to meet the statutory mandate of the Delta Plan. It is our opinion that wildlife agency input is being marginalized in the current BDCP plan, and it is critical for the Council to help clearly communicate to the exporters that the engagement of the wildlife agencies is critical to success in the Delta, and critical to BDCP becoming part of the Delta Plan. (G P1)

CHAPTER 4 – WATER SUPPLY.

We view an aggressive statewide water efficiency and conservation program as a primary requisite toward reducing reliance on the Delta, as prescribed in your legislative mandate. A program that reduces overall water consumption throughout the state, especially in the intensive farming areas and major population centers relying on the Delta, makes possible the achievement of this critical mandate of reduced Delta reliance. The mandate likely will not be met without this cost effective water supply program.

One of the best opportunities to accomplish a thorough economic analysis of Public Trust values and balancing is by examining the alternatives to exported water. The alternatives to a continued high level of Delta exports are many, and they are contained in the efficiency and water use reduction solutions that are recommended in the EWC report: *California Water Solutions Now*, which is one of the alternatives being examined by your Council.

The Delta Flows Criteria promulgated by the State Water Resources Control Board clearly indicates that the state has reached – and exceeded – the amount of water that can responsibly be diverted from the Bay Delta. As a result, the Council should anticipate future limitations on Delta exports below the level of the 2000-2007 time periods in its Delta plan to meet the Delta ecosystems restoration goals. Those future reductions, at whatever levels they turn out to be, can only be accomplished if consumption levels are simultaneously decreased.

Climate change is likely to reduce the amount of water available from existing surface and groundwater sources; future climate conditions will also reduce the amount of water available for export from the Delta.

Our recommendations to be included in the Draft Delta Plan and DEIR are:

1. In view of the well-recognized over allocation of water supplies from the Delta, the SWRCB should be directed to use their constitutional authority to review and modify all CVP and SWP contracts and water rights to a yield that is historically and predictably achievable and which can be reliably supplied. “Water supply reliability” cannot be defined by the current contract levels or the current level of diversions. (WR P1)
2. The SWRCB should no longer issue permits for increased water diversions or contributions to storage until at least the SWRCB flow criteria have been established, especially in view of the over allocation of supplies from the Delta. (WR R5)
3. The water use reductions and savings shown in our alternatives may make major structural alternatives such as a canal or tunnel through the Delta and further surface storage unnecessary for water supply reliability. Cost savings to the state would conservatively approximate \$15 to \$20 billion. (WR R6, R7)
4. Direct the Department of Water Resources to regain public control of the Kern Water Bank and dedicate the water supply for the benefit all Californians. (WR P1)

5. The "Urban Preference" must be reinstated in the State Water Project contracts. The "Urban Preference" means that urban water users have priority over agriculture based on the California Water Code: during shortages, people take precedence over agriculture. This was arbitrarily removed from the State Water Project contracts by the Monterey Plus Amendments and needs to be reinstated. The "Urban Preference," combined with returning the Kern Water Bank back as a public asset, will assure that there will be less pressure on the Delta for water as the 2009 legislation requires. The Kern Water Bank can store the "Urban Preference" south of the Delta for times of drought for the 22 million urban users south of the Delta. (WR P1) (Version 2.1.)
6. The pumping of what is referred to as Article 21 "surplus water", which was put in place by the Monterey Plus Amendments to the State Water Project contracts, has proven so harmful to the fish and the environment that Judge Oliver Wanger required that pumping during the times that this so called "surplus" water was being pumped had to stop. Article 21 of the State Water Project contracts must be amended to reflect this reality. (WR P1) (Version 2.1)
7. The goal of reduced reliance on the Delta can be achieved by increasing groundwater storage facilities south of the Delta. To that end, we recommend that the Council require a complete evaluation of groundwater storage possibilities in the former Tulare lake bed, as advanced by the San Joaquin Valley Leadership Forum. (WR P1)
8. Because of the critical importance of emphasizing a conservation rate structure, it should be implemented sooner than December 2020, as called for in Draft Plan. (WR P1)
9. The Council should require water suppliers to document actual or projected net reductions in reliance on Delta exports as part of their reporting obligations; the reporting obligations should indicate the impact on the total Delta water budget. (WR P1, R3)
10. Establish a more ambitious long-term urban water conservation target, as indicated in our report, *California Water Solutions Now*, to succeed the 20/20 goal. We do not concur with the Draft Plan, which puts the establishment of that future target to some unspecified future date. (WR P1)
11. Establish a statewide agricultural water conservation target of 1 MAF by 2020, 2.5 MAF by 2030 and 3.5 MAF by 2040. (WR P1)
12. IRWMP projects must provide disadvantaged communities with water for health and safety purposes and that meet drinking water standards. (WR P1)
13. The Fifth Draft Plan continues to encourage "groundwater storage" (pp. 87- 98) and "conjunctive management" or "conjunctive use" (pp. 80, 83, 84, 88, 89, 90, 93) without illustrating what conditions must be met to enable ground water storage and/or conjunctive use, whether there are known problems and legal challenges to existing ground water storage and or conjunctive use projects, and whether these possible strategies are appropriate in all hydrologic areas covered by the Delta Plan. We caution

against using sweeping language of possibility regarding ground water storage and conjunctive use when, as the Plan discusses: "...the current status of groundwater management throughout California was unknown (DWR 2003a), and remains so today," (p. 92). In addition, serious impacts from current and historic practices have already altered some ground water basins severely (pp. 91 – 93), so the depth of uncertainty and acknowledgement of past failures should accompany any suggestions of ground water storage and conjunctive use. (WR R7)

14. The Sacramento River is California's largest river, and its watershed's contribution to the State's economy and communities is unquestioned, but it is not invincible to human activities. The Sacramento River and its tributaries have many impaired segments on the 303(d) list, its salmon runs are still struggling to survive, it is home to many more imperiled species, and the farms and communities within its boundaries have significantly stretched its water resources. The State has long looked to the Sacramento River watershed as a solution for escalating demand south of the Delta. An early attempt at conjunctive use in Butte County in 1994 revealed the folly of moving forward with large ground water extractions when so little was (and still is) known about the hydrologic region.
15. Seventeen years later, the Plan's proposed ground water storage and conjunctive use proposals have the potential to cause significant impacts in both the areas of origin and the receiving areas.' As noted above, there remains minimal scientific knowledge regarding the interactions between ground water and surface water and the needs of species in the watershed that California relies upon the most. Yet it is possible that "Fundamental scientific principles (e.g., effective stress and its key role in poromechanical response of an aquifer) have been well understood for decades, and validated predictive modeling of aquifer response is well within the capabilities of modern science and engineering practice," (Mish 2008). The state of hydrological knowledge is sufficient to recommend protective actions on groundwater based on the Precautionary Principle. If ground water storage and conjunctive use remain tools in the Plan's toolbox, we insist that the DSC require the kind of scientific research on aquifer mechanics that Professor Mish explains is not only possible, but common, *prior* to implementation of any new or expanded ground water storage and conjunctive use projects. (WR R7)
16. Attempting to establish conjunctive use and ground water banking in the Sacramento Valley, and expanding efforts south of the Delta, raises serious unanswered questions regarding the risks associated with such exploitive actions that have already devastated the Owens and San Joaquin rivers and valleys. It is helpful that the Plan highlights some of the significant damage from current and past excess ground water pumping and manipulation of hydrologic systems, yet the Plan seeks to use the same practices that created the problems that the Plan seeks to ameliorate. Knowing this, we continue to encourage the Council to consider a new paradigm that is provided in our comments on the Plan's first draft. (WR R7)
17. However, relying on ground water storage and conjunctive use as a significant part of the Delta Plan, the Delta Plan and the Environmental Impact Report must disclose and

analyze the risks associated with these strategies and expound upon the uncertainty. Those risks include (WR R7):

- Hydrogeological Risks
- Water Quality Risks
- Legal Risks
- Financial Risks
- Public Health and Safety Risks

18. The Trinity River is a Delta Tributary Watershed under California Water Code Section 78647.4(b) and is shown in Figure 1 of the Delta Plan. Figure 1 states that the Delta Plan “may affect” other areas of California, including the Trinity River. However, it is clear from the legislative and administrative record that the diversion of Trinity River water is limited to water that is surplus to the needs of the Trinity River basin, which includes the amount of water necessary to meet the federal government’s Tribal Trust obligations to protect and restore the fishery resources of the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes. Therefore, the Delta Plan should contain a policy that meeting the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration shall not adversely impact the Trinity River, as defined by meeting the flow requirements of the Trinity River Record of Decision⁷ and meeting Trinity River temperature objectives contained in the “Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region”⁸ by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

⁷ See http://www.trrp.net/?page_id=72, accessed 9/14/11.

⁸ See “Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region” Table 3-1, page 3-8.00, footnote 5, located at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/083105-bp/04_water_quality_objectives.pdf, accessed 9/14/11.

CHAPTER 5 – RESTORE THE DELTA.

As indicated in the Preface to the Fifth Draft Delta Plan: “California’s Delta has long been a battleground for the many competing interests that have a stake in how it is used - and abused..... Conflict over what to do, when to do it and how to pay for it continues to embroil the Delta in controversy.” An analysis of the economic and Public Trust values of the Delta, if accomplished on a par with the thoroughness of the Mono Lake case, would resolve much of the current controversy and point to solutions that would have long-term benefits for all Californians.

We were struck by the Palmer, et al 2005 criteria for successful ecosystem restoration, and their first recommendation that was included in the Fourth Draft of the Delta Plan: “The project should be based on a clear guiding image of the type of dynamic and healthy ecosystem to be achieved.” We are also struck by the fact that this reference no longer exists in the Plan. Though the 5th draft gives glimpses of what the Council would like to see, there continues to be little definition of what a restored Delta should look like, or when some success is expected. We recommend that the Delta Science Board be tasked with creating measurable criteria of what a “recovered” Delta should look like.

For listed species and species that are key to the livelihood of many communities, commercial, and recreational fishing as an example, this is critical. Neither have unlimited time for restoration work to produce results. In the case of listed species, they survive on the thinnest of threads, and need action sooner than later. Defining what and when improvements are needed, and how that will happen is important. Additionally, there is a priority to what needs to be done, defined by species vulnerability, and we suggest that the Council put in language that requires the Delta Science Program to prioritize actions, with date certain, like that of the SWRCB flow requirements for the Delta and major tributaries. What are the highest priority species, and what actions need immediate funding and action?

1. We agree that development, implementation, and enforcement of new and updated flow requirements for the Delta and high priority tributaries is key to the achievement of the coequal goals. (ER P1)
2. We agree with the dates required for the SWRCB flow recommendations for both the Delta and major tributary rivers. We also agree with the review date in 2013, and ask the Council to be most demanding of the SWRCB to complete these recommendations on time, and if not, to hold to limitations of further water rights authorizations, or other increased authorization for water uses suggested in the two bullets on page 114, lines 1-7. (ER P1)
3. We would recommend adding, “establish an enforceable mechanism to ensure water exports from the Delta and water transfers are consistent with the flow standards established by SWRCB recommendations and, until they are issued, the current Biological Opinions for Delta Smelt and Salmon/steelhead should apply.” (ER P1)
4. We agree with the Council’s reliance on the Conservation Strategy for Restoration of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecological Management Zone and the Sacramento

and San Joaquin Valley Regions (DFG 2011). We would recommend that the Council require DFG to fully integrate restoration with inputs from the NMFS and FWS, both for riverine as well as terrestrial habitats. (ER P2)

5. **Additional EWC recommendation:** We ask for upstream recommendations for habitat restoration be made to other agencies that have that ability, as it will bring greater species recovery success and resiliency, and reduce overall in-Delta recovery needs. Water use and diversions north of the Delta, as well as land use decisions, have great influence on the Delta's ability to be supportive of fish and wildlife.
 - As recommended in recent federal biological opinions, evaluations of fish passage around major Central Valley dams connected to the Delta should be conducted in order to determine the possible benefits to endangered salmonid species.
 - The recent NOAA/NMFS decisions and programs to reintroduce salmon above the rim dams as well as the other restoration projects demand that any plans for the Delta consider the effects of pumping on salmonid population migration into and through the delta and on to the upper rivers of the state.
 - Alternative flow schedules that provide colder releases to sustain these fish populations during critical time periods also needs further examination.
6. We appreciate the need to expedite habitat restoration in the Delta, and the prioritization of the areas listed in this section. It is our opinion that listed species do not have time to waste, and acknowledging this through this section is critical to survival and restoration of several listed species on both the Federal and State Endangered Species list. (ER R1)
 - As stated in Chapter 5: "An overarching goal for ecosystem restoration in the Delta Reform Act is to restore fish and wildlife to include more viable and resilient populations of native resident and migratory species." We see no recommendations in this chapter that are specific to the recovery of endangered fish species; **we regard this as a major oversight.** Measurable goals for species recovery need to be included as part of the ecosystems recovery actions. (ER P1, R2)
 - We recommend language and actions which reflect that: "every effort will be made, consistent with the FWS and NMFS recovery plans for listed species, to recover all listed species to viable, self-sustaining populations." Changes in Delta conveyance that would contribute to species extinction are impermissible under the California Endangered Species Act, the Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act, the federal Habitat Conservation Plans as well as Sections 7 and 10 of the Federal Endangered Species Act. (ER R8)
7. The priorities for the Delta Conservancy all appear to be appropriate and necessary. It is appropriate for the Council to make some recommendations on timeframes for

accomplishing each of the listed tasks, or at least request the Conservancy to provide timeframes for each area, and to prioritize the projects based on which will provide the greatest return for listed species. Additionally, some recommendations on how the Conservancy should interface with private landowners and others who have ownership of Delta lands, and could contribute to recovery without land purchase. It is critical that the Conservancy, if they are to be the lead on restoration, identify and work with everyone who can be helpful. (ER R2)

- Delta counties and landowners must be full partners in developing and implementing habitat restoration programs so that a desirable mix of aquatic habitat restoration and sustainable agriculture is achieved. See the previous recommendation related to Governance. (ER P2, ER R1, ER R2)
8. We agree that State and federal fish agencies should complete ongoing negotiations toward a habitat credit agreement with water supply agencies. But with this recommendation, we request that language be put into this section that prevents water supply agencies from receiving increased water supplies based on giving a habitat credit agreement. There should be no opportunity for a quid-pro-quo on water and habitat. (ER R3)
 9. The Delta Plan needs to be realistic regarding proposing habitat measures, such as riverine habitat on project levees, since vegetation is not allowed by USACE. (ER R4)
 10. **Legacy Stressors** - Though we understand these came from the Delta Independent Science Board, we agree that past impacts cannot be undone, but some can be improved or eliminated in the future. We would hope that several of the listed issues will be addressed and changes made that improve conditions in the Delta.
 11. **Current Stressors** – One of the recommendations we have made in all our inputs to the Council is reducing the inflow of selenium and other toxic inflows from primarily the San Joaquin valley. The current CVRWQCB waiver on meeting water quality standards from agricultural lands simply continues this “legacy stressor”. We strongly recommend the Council ask the SWRCB to block the waiver, and work with the CVRWQCB to establish a process for reduction of non-point pollution in the central valley to the level that it is brought into compliance with the state and federal water quality standards, like everyone else in the state must meet. Since toxic inflows were identified as one of the three primary drivers of the pelagic organism decline (POD), it seems more than necessary to deal with its causes as soon as possible. A strong recommendation to the state water board from the Council, with a date certain (like the flow recommendations) seems a reasonable ask.
 12. Although we agree that controlling and reducing impacts for invasive species is an important part of improving the Delta, it is also clear that in some cases water management has led to some of these problems. The clam problem in Susuin Marsh is one example. Additionally, there has been much focus lately on Striped Bass because they prey on listed salmonids. It is our opinion that Striped Bass have been part of this

ecosystem since 1879, and are fully integrated into the fabric of the Delta. They are one of California's prized sport fish, and their numbers have gone up and down proportionately with both Delta Smelt and Salmonids. They were present in greater numbers in 2005 when fall run Chinook numbers were close to one million, and were part of the estuary when salmon and steelhead numbers were in the several millions. Additionally, in those times Striped Bass numbers were high as well. We would recommend that invasive species control actions not include Striped Bass.

13. We agree that the Department of Fish and Game should prioritize and fully implement the list of "Stage 2 Actions for Nonnative Invasive Species" with the exception of Striped Bass, discussed above. (ER R6)
14. We agree the workshops would be a good way to engage a wider audience, and develop ways to reduce the stressor impacts. (ER R7)
15. **General Comments on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan** - The BDCP has not defined "greater water supply reliability," but it is well known that the applicants and their contractors are working to remove more water from the Delta System. Additionally, incorporation of the BDCP into the Delta Plan is anticipated if DFG, FWS, and NMFS certify it as meeting their biological standards. We ask the DSC to provide guidance to the BDCP on what is required to meet the legislative mandates of Delta ecosystem recovery, improved water quality in the system for fish and wildlife, as well as the Delta human needs, and the need to factor in the State Water Board's Delta and tributary flow requirements coming in the future.

The definition of "water supply reliability" is important and can impact economic sustainability of the Delta. The Delta Plan acknowledges multiple strategies or objectives referenced in the Delta Reform Act that must be addressed to improve water supply reliability. A more specific definition of water reliability allows for economic analysis or at least the presentation of factors relevant to economic sustainability. For example, if water reliability is defined as export levels prior to 1970, reduced by the effects of climate change and needs within the watershed, this might represent the average level of exports which could realistically be more reliable. This level had less of an impact on fish populations than the impact of exports from 1970 to 2010. The 1970 level of export is conceivably sustainable with through Delta conveyance and this would have a different impact on economic sustainability than that of expanded exports. Expanded exports utilizing isolated facilities, which has been proposed in the BDCP, would have a footprint that takes farmland out of protection, off local tax rolls and could alter channel flows threatening the salinity of the Delta. These conflicts with the Plan's proposed performance measure in Chapter 8, which states that progress toward improving economic sustainability of Delta land uses and protection of the Delta's agricultural values should be measured by "total agricultural acreage and gross revenue in the Delta (that) will be maintained or increased in the future." A more precise definition of "water supply reliability" could avoid these kinds of conflicts.

- With reference to the Delta Flow Criteria adopted by the State Water Board, the Council should determine specific maximum quantities of water that can be exported under varying water type years and hydrological conditions in order to provide measurable criteria for the goal of “water supply reliability.” We cannot manage what is not measured. (ER R8)
16. BDCP is currently developing alternatives for evaluation, focused on alternative conveyance sizing, operations, and level of restoration. We ask the Council to work with the BDCP to help them establish a list of alternatives for evaluation that would likely provide information based on the Council’s understanding about **“less reliance on the Delta.”**
- Analyze, or require BDCP to analyze, at an equal level of detail, conveyance facility capacities from 3,000 cfs to 15,000 cfs as well as alternatives that would utilize existing conveyance without major new conveyance facilities. (ER R8)
 - Direct the BDCP to perform a full economic analysis with Public Trust values considered in each of the alternatives they examine. If this is not accomplished by BDCP, the Delta Stewardship Council should have the analyses performed in order to produce a legally compliant EIR. (ER R8)
17. We agree with the recommendation that they complete the BDCP consistent with the provisions of the Delta Reform Act. However, as stated above, this is unlikely to lead to BDCP meeting either the flow requirements or the water quality standards envisioned in the Delta Plan, and as such, likely would not meet the recovery objectives. Since BDCP is a 50 year plan, it must meet the Delta Reform Act mandates, and from a practical sense, the Council must work closely with BDCP on issues like developing alternatives. (ER R8)
- The purpose of the evaluation of any Delta facility is to decrease the physical vulnerability and increase the predictability of Delta supplies, not to increase Delta diversions. (ER R8)
18. The list of performance measures is a start on narrowing in the requirements for achieving the vision of the Delta Plan. That said, it is a must that these “general” measures become more specific. The listing of the 3 types of performance measures - Administrative, Driver, Outcome - with a listing of issues is a good start to bringing specificity and targets to the process.
19. We would advise that input from the Delta Science Program could be asked to bring more “real time” timeframes to these measures, and at least provide some goals both on “due dates” as well as some numbers for restoration levels. Too many of the issues have no “due date, or target numbers”. More specificity brings the process to life. How many resident and migratory fish species? What is a viable population, and how long should it take to achieve it? How many acres restored where and by when? How does adaptive management fit into performance measures? How will adaptive management be done, and how often will evaluation be done on completed projects,

and how will the adaptive management work be applied, and how will change be integrated? Some guidance from the Council needs to be part of the Delta Plan.

- Of course, who pays for what is still a huge question that looms, and must be answered so this actually has legs on the ground.

CHAPTER 6 – IMPROVE WATER QUALITY.

Nothing is more illustrative of the inherent contradiction between the coequal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem protection than the discussion and recommendations regarding water quality in Chapter 6 of the Delta Plan. As mass pollutant loadings to the estuary have inexorably increased, residence time, flushing flows to the sea and dilution has substantially decreased. Diversions by the Central Valley Project and State Water Project caused residence time for pollutants in the Delta to increase 100% by 1987.⁹ Since then, residence time and pollutant concentration have continued to increase in step with greater exports from the system.

The cumulative and interactive effects of multiple physical, chemical and biological stressors, including discharges of municipal and industrial stormwater and wastewater, agricultural return flows and ubiquitous urban and agricultural chemical application have impaired the Delta's sustainability as a viable habitat for a rich mix of productive species, compromised sources of municipal drinking water, diminished recreational activities and adversely impacted agricultural production. Increased pollutant loading and/or increased quantities of water diverted from or around the estuary will significantly exacerbate existing water quality problems and further impact Delta agriculture, recreation, municipal water supplies and the sustainability of the ecosystem.

California's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act was adopted in 1969. Sections of Porter-Cologne were used as the basis of the federal Clean Water Act, which was adopted in 1972 and amended in 1977 and 1987. The Clean Water Act states that it is the "national goal that the discharge of pollutants into the navigable waters be eliminated by 1985" and it is the "national policy that the discharge of toxic pollutant in toxic amounts be prohibited."

Almost 40 years after adoption of the CWA and Porter-Cologne, virtually every significant water body in the Central Valley, including the entire Delta, is identified as "impaired" and incapable of supporting identified beneficial uses because of multiple pollutants. With the exception of several legacy pollutants, these impairments exist because the chronically understaffed¹⁰ agency

⁹ Rozengurt, M., et al. 1987. "Analysis of the Influence of Water Withdrawals on Runoff to the Delta-San Francisco Bay Ecosystem (1921-1983)," Technical Report Number 87-7, Tiburon Center for Environmental Studies. May. Page I.7.

¹⁰ The Executive Officer of the Central Valley Board, Ms. Pamela Creedon, acknowledged in an August 2007 presentation to the State Board titled *State of the Central Valley Region* that the Board had only: a) 12% of the staff minimally necessary to regulate stormwater discharges (NPDES), b) 37% of those necessary to control municipal wastewater discharges (NPDES), c) 26% of those necessary to issue WDRs, d) 16% of those required to regulate dairies, e) 22% of the staff crucial to enforcing conditions of the controversial agricultural waivers, and f) only 11 of the 38 people necessary for the basin planning unit to update the Basin Plans that are fundamental to all Board actions. The Board's surface water ambient monitoring program had only 2 person-years (PYs), its enforcement unit was assigned only 3.5 PYs, the water quality certification unit had only 2.6 PYs to process more than 400 certifications annually. Further, the underground storage tanks unit had only 17 of 41 staff needed for several thousand cases, the timber harvest unit had only 9.2 PYs to regulate and monitor discharges from thousands of timber projects covering 45% of the state's harvested timber and the Title 27 unit had only 40% of those needed to regulate leaking landfills and surface impoundments. And finally, the Board had only 16 PYs to develop, implement

charged with implementing water quality statutes has been unwilling or unable to carry out its mandated responsibilities.¹¹

Despite the serious and broadly recognized impacts that deteriorating water quality poses to the viability of the Bay-Delta, Chapter 6 calls for no new, meaningful actions to address this threat. Rather, Chapter 6 simply reiterates existing efforts and already-planned initiatives that will do little to reverse the ongoing slide. It requests understaffed agencies to accomplish measures they have been unable or unwilling to do over the last 30 years.

The Water Quality Chapter plays the critical role in the Delta Plan of describing the regulatory and water quality status quo in the vast primary and secondary planning areas covered by the Delta Plan, and then making recommendations to address the uncovered problems.¹² Preventing and addressing pollution at its source is essential to ensuring that people and environment can use water safely and affordably – especially given that water treatment costs regularly exceed the costs of many water pollution prevention measures.

As was discussed in our earlier comments on the Second Draft Delta Plan, State and Regional Water Board impaired waters assessments demonstrate that water body impairments already run broadly throughout the planning area and impair numerous aquatic habitats. We provided further information demonstrating that water quality issues in the Delta and the planning areas are both pervasive and well known.

Below, we reiterate a few of numerous examples of why the Council’s approach and recommendations, with respect to water quality, are inadequate, counter-productive, and unlikely to secure improvement in water quality.

1. Agricultural Discharges

It is notable and a complete failure that Chapter 6 merely mentions in passing the ineffective Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board agricultural runoff waiver, or the utter

and monitor TMDLs covering over 300 water body/pollutant combinations identified as “impaired” throughout the Central Valley (Note: there are now 730 water body/pollutant combinations identified as impaired and Regional Board staffing levels have been reduced since 2007).

¹¹ The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board is responsible for issuing 65 municipal wastewater NPDES permits (permitted discharge of 983 million gallons/day, 721 mgd in the Delta), 62 industrial wastewater permits (951 mgd, 480 mgd in Delta) and over 1,100 Waste Discharge Requirements regulating wastewater discharges to land. It is also responsible for issuing more than 90 municipal stormwater permits, approximately 2,000 industrial stormwater permits and some 5,500 construction stormwater permits, as well as regulating over 1,600 dairies, more than 400 other confined animal operations, approximately 400 wetland fill projects annually, discharges from 45% of the state’s timber harvest projects and runoff from thousands of irrigated farms spanning more than 6 million acres in the Central Valley.

¹² As noted in the Notice of Preparation, the Delta itself plus the Watershed of the Delta, and areas tributary to the Watershed, span a wide swath of the central part of the state. Delta Stewardship Council, “Notice of Preparation: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Delta Plan,” Figure 1: Proposed Planning Area for Delta Plan Environmental Impact Report,” p. 12 (Dec. 10, 2010), available at:

http://www.deltacouncil.ca.gov/docs/DSC_Notice_of_Preparation_120910.pdf.

lack of any regulatory controls at all on agricultural runoff within the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Board purview. After 28 years of “conditional waivers,” the Central Valley Regional Board cannot identify who is actually discharging, what pollutants are being discharged, the localized impacts to receiving waters, whether management measures are being implemented or if implemented management measures are effective in reducing pollution. This failure reinforces the gross inadequacies of this chapter in addressing water quality problems in the Delta. (WQ R1, R5, R6)

Irrigated agriculture is the largest source of pollution and impairment in the Central Valley, responsible for 57% of impairments where sources are identified and almost 80% of identified sources that can be reasonably regulated and controlled. By contrast, urban runoff is only identified as causing impairment to less than 12% of known sources of impairment.¹³ The only region-wide assessment of data collected at 313 sites by U.C. Davis and the agricultural coalitions, pursuant to the Irrigated Lands Program, reveals epidemic pollution.¹⁴ The Council should consult the State Water Board’s recent report to the Legislature on data and strategies for reducing agricultural pollution runoff into the Delta, as well as a detailed summary of existing Delta agricultural regulatory programs.¹⁵ Among other things, the report finds that “over 60 percent of the exceedances of water quality objectives we have identified occur during the

¹³ See State Board’s *2010 Integrated Report Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List / 305(b) Report* that was submitted to U.S EPA in August 2010. Category 5 (impairments requiring development of a TMDL) and Category 4A (impairments being addressed by USEPA approved TMDLs) identify some 730 pollutant/water body impairments in the Central Valley. Agriculture is identified as the source of 269 pollutant/water body segments covering 1,572 waterway miles and 96,147 acres of open water. Sources of impairment to 257 pollutant/water body segments remain unidentified. However, it is likely that agriculture will ultimately be identified as causing or contributing to many, if not most, of these impairments, as the pollutants or causes are closely linked to agricultural areas and activities.¹³ The largely intractable source of resource extraction caused by legacy mining is identified as causing 257 pollutant/water body impairments. Urban runoff is identified as causing 55 impairments. Invasive species, hydro-modification, recreation, construction and historic land management are responsible for approximately 2.7% of impairments. The State Board report can be found at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2010.shtml

¹⁴ Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, *Irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver Program: 2007 Review of Monitoring Data*. The report revealed that: 1) toxicity to aquatic life was present at 63% of the monitored sites (50% were toxic to more than one species), 2) pesticide water quality standards were exceeded at 54% of sites (many for multiple pesticides), 3) one or more metals violated criteria at 66% of the sites, 4) human health standards for bacteria were violated at 87% of monitored sites and 5) more than 80% of the locations reported exceedances of general parameters (dissolved oxygen, pH, salt, TSS). While the adequacy of monitoring (i.e., frequency and comprehensiveness of monitoring) varied dramatically from site to site, the report presents a dramatic panorama of the epidemic pollution caused by the uncontrolled discharge of agricultural wastes. See, e.g., Letter from California Sportfishing Protection Alliance to Central Valley RWQCB, “California Sportfishing Protection Alliance Comments on Draft Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program - Program Environmental Impact Report” (Sept. 27, 2010), p. 51, available at: <http://calsport.org/doc-library/pdfs/31.pdf>. The Report itself can be found at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/water_quality_monitoring/staff_monitoring_data_analysis/2007_monitoring_data_report/index.shtml

¹⁵ SWRCB and Central Valley RWQCB, “Report to the California State Legislature Joint Legislative Budget Committee on Reduction of Agricultural Pollution Runoff into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta” (Dec. 2010) (Report to Legislature), available at: <http://www.cacoastkeeper.org/document/report-to-legislature-on-delta-agricultural-pollution.pdf/> (Table 2, page 13 of the report provides a summary of existing Delta agricultural regulatory programs; this summary is expanded in the report’s Attachment 1).

irrigation season;”¹⁶ the Report then demonstrates the impacts of this finding through a summary in Table 1¹⁷ (inserted below) of the significant agricultural contributions to water quality exceedances. The Report provides an expanded analysis of this summary information in its Attachment 2 ; such information should be carefully reviewed and included as appropriate.

Table 1
AGRICULTURAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO WATER QUALITY EXCEEDANCES IN AGRICULTURALLY DOMINATED WATERWAYS IN THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER WATERSHED AND SOUTH DELTA

| Parameter Category | Water Body/Pollutant Exceedances | | | Programs to Address | Goal date for Full attainment of Beneficial Uses |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | Total Count | Irrigation Season | Non-Irrigation Season | | |
| Agricultural Practices Likely Cause or Contribute to the Problem | | | | | |
| TDS/Electrical Conductivity | 668 | 56% | 42% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ San Joaquin Salinity and Boron TMDL ▪ CV Salts | 2014 - 2026 Under Development |
| Pesticides | 208 | 72% | 28% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ San Joaquin River and Delta Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos TMDLs ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program | 2010 - 2011 2011 - 2019 |
| Legacy Pesticides | 139 | 82% | 18% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (addressing through sediment control) ▪ Legacy Pesticide TMDL | 2011 - 2019 Under Development |
| Toxicity, Sediment, Scud (Hyalella) | 73 | 62% | 38% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sediment Quality Objectives | Under Development |
| Toxicity, Water Column, Water Flea (Ceriodaphnia dubia) | 63 | 69% | 31% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program | 2011 - 2019 |
| Nutrient | 34 | 69% | 31% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program ▪ Dairy Program | 2011 - 2019 |
| Selenium | 2 | 33% | 67% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ San Joaquin River Selenium TMDL | 2010 |
| Agricultural Practices that Potentially Cause or Contribute to the Problem | | | | | |
| E. Coli | 611 | 59% | 41% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program ▪ Dairy Program | 2011 - 2019 |
| Dissolved Oxygen | 530 | 69% | 31% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program ▪ Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel TMDL | 2011 - 2019 2011 |
| Toxicity, Water Column, Algae (Selenastrum) | 95 | 57% | 43% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program | 2011 - 2019 |
| Uncertain Agricultural Contribution | | | | | |
| Metals | 411 | 63% | 37% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program | 2011 - 2019 |
| pH | 131 | 69% | 31% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program | 2011 - 2019 |
| Toxicity, Water Column, Fathead Minnow (Pimephales Promelas) | 21 | 52% | 48% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program | 2011 - 2019 |

8

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, referenced extensively in the SWRCB Report to the legislature but essentially ignored in Chapter 6, has also produced a wealth of water quality data. In Attachment I, we provide a summary of just some of the findings of two recent reports from this effort that should be considered in developing the final Chapter 6. (WQ R1, R3, R5)

An additional missing discussion is on the cumulative impact of mixtures of contaminants on Delta health, particularly pesticides. For example, the Delta Independent Science Board’s recently released Delta Stressors Memo¹⁸ highlights pesticide pollution as a key Delta stressor, with contamination from pesticides currently killing fish and degrading ecosystems even at low and legal concentrations. For example, a study by NOAA and Washington State found that five of the most common pesticides used in California and the Pacific Northwest – diazinon,

¹⁶ *Id.* at 2.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 8.

¹⁸ Memorandum from Delta Independent Science Board to Delta Stewardship Council, “Addressing Multiple Stressors and Multiple Goals in the Delta Plan,” Attachment 2, p. 4 (Jan. 26, 2011), available at: http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta_science_program/isb/isb_meetings.html (highlighting “pesticide release” from agriculture, industry and residential use as a current Delta stressor).

malathion, chlorpyrifos, carbaryl, and carbofuran – act in “deadly synergy” by suppressing an enzyme that affects the nervous system of salmon.¹⁹ Even where exposures to a single chemical did no harm, pairing chemicals lowered enzyme activity, sometimes fatally. Scientists concluded, “[s]ingle-chemical risk assessments are likely to underestimate the impacts of these insecticides on salmon in river systems where mixtures occur.” In other words, the above research and numerous other studies²⁰ demonstrate that even if current laws are implemented fully, they will fail to protect fish, because the standards on which they are based are too low. Unfortunately, as is well-known, many Delta and planning watershed waterways do not even meet current, inadequate, standards, and are in fact significantly polluted, in many cases well above standards. (WQ R8, R9)

Significantly, none of the suggestions in Chapter 6 include the overhaul of the current, weak Central Valley Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, which has failed, and will continue to fail without significant modifications, to protect the health of the Bay-Delta Estuary. Indeed, under “Policies” on page 148, the Plan incredibly states “No policies with regulatory effect are included in this section.” The inadequacies of the existing Central Valley Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program have been exhaustively documented.²¹ We recommend that the Delta Plan specifically address those inadequacies and recommend changes outlined by NGOs, including the following:²² (WQ R5)

- Individual Growers Covered; Not Third Parties: Individual growers would apply for coverage. No third-party applications would be authorized.
- Farm Water Quality Management Plans (FWQMPs): Growers would be required to develop and implement individual FWQMPs in order to minimize discharge of waste to groundwater and surface water from irrigated agricultural lands.
- Tiered Approach: Fields would be placed in one of three tiers based on their threat to water quality. The tiers represent fields with minimal (Tier 1), low (Tier 2), and high (Tier 3) potential threat to water quality. The tiers would be used to adjust the monitoring requirements, assist the dischargers in determining the level of management measures

¹⁹ Laetz, Cathy, *et al.*, “The Synergistic Toxicity of Pesticide Mixtures: Implications for Risk Assessment and the Conservation of Endangered Pacific Salmon,” *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Vol. 117, No. 3 (March 2009), available at: http://www.eenews.net/public/25/9960/features/documents/2009/03/03/document_gw_01.pdf

²⁰ Casillas, E., *et al.*, NOAA-NMFS-NWFSC, “**Estuarine Pollution and Juvenile Salmon Health: Potential Impact on Survival**” (2007), available at: <http://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/publications/techmemos/tm29/papers/casillas.htm>; Scholz, Nat, NOAA, “Health effects of pesticide mixtures: Unexpected insights from the salmon brain,” (AAAS Annual Meeting, Feb. 2008), available at: http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2008-02/nh-nsa_1021208.php; *see also* NOAA Office of Communications, “New findings on emerging contaminants: Chemicals in our waters are affecting humans and aquatic life” (AAAS Annual Meeting, Feb. 2008), available at: http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2008-02/s-nfo020808.php.

²¹ *See, e.g.*, Letter from California Sportfishing Protection Alliance to Central Valley RWQCB, “California Sportfishing Protection Alliance Comments on Draft Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program - Program Environmental Impact Report” (Sept. 27, 2010), p. 51, available at: <http://calsport.org/doc-library/pdfs/31.pdf>.

²² *Id.*

necessary to meet BPTC, and assist the Regional Board in prioritizing enforcement inspections.

- Non-Water Quality Monitoring: All growers would conduct nutrient tracking, pesticide tracking, and implemented tracking of management practices.
- Surface Effluent Quality Monitoring: Within areas where Coalitions are currently required to prepare and implement a management plan, all Tier 2 and 3 farms within that management area that are discharging any pollutant which triggered the management plan, must prepare and implement a discharge monitoring plan for the pollutants governed by the management plan as well as basic parameters that serve as indicators of pollution discharges.
- Groundwater Monitoring: Growers who qualify as Tier 2 or Tier 3 for groundwater pollution should be required to conduct individual monitoring annually as described for the Tier 3 groundwater growers in the PEIR.
- Additional Fee Authority: The State Board must increase current fees to cover all of the costs of the program. It is unreasonable to base a regulatory program regulating the largest source of pollution to Central Valley waters on the political reluctance of the Board or Administration to assess appropriate fees to support a regulatory program that is capable of enforcing statutory and regulatory requirements. The fees for the irrigated lands dischargers, as well as fees on existing NPDES permittees, including stormwater permittees, should also be adjusted to accommodate a separate regional monitoring program.

2. Discharges of Municipal and Industrial Wastewater

Chapter 6 briefly references permits issued pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and “encourages” the timely development and enforcement of the program without inquiring whether or not the program is working as intended. It’s not. Resource constraints and pressure from the regulated community have undermined the integrity of the NPDES permitting program.

Almost two billion gallons per day of wastewater is discharged into the Delta watershed (1.2 BGD in the actual Delta) from some 64 municipal wastewater treatment plants and 62 industrial dischargers. The Central Valley Regional Board is allowing flow limits and, in many cases, the mass loading of pollutants to be increased in many, if not a majority, of NPDES permit renewals. Frequently, these renewed permits allow for increases in loading of pollutants identified as actually “impairing” a water body. For example, in recent years, the Central Valley Regional Board has allowed increased loading of impairing pollutants into the Delta from Stockton, Manteca, Tracy, and Lodi, among others, and even issued a new permit to the municipality of Mountain House to begin discharging impairing pollutants into Old River; one of the most degraded areas of the Delta.

State and federal antidegradation requirements are routinely ignored and, consequently, the Regional Board has little idea of the total mass loading of pollutants in a watershed. For example, the Regional Board issued a permit granting Linda County Water Agency all of the remaining assimilative capacity for salt in the Feather River. Subsequently, Yuba City was granted the same assimilative capacity in their permit renewal.

It is well known that numerous constituents interact additively and synergistically. Many of these interactions are well documented in the scientific literature. Yet, the Regional Board doesn't consider these interactions in developing permit limits.

Under pressure to get NPDES permits issued, the Regional Board has embraced cookie-cutter templates and out-sourced much permit development to individuals far removed from California who are not professional engineers and who frequently lack an understanding of local conditions. NPDES permits issued by the Regional Board now routinely ignore and violate explicit state and federal regulations governing permit issuance and, consequently, are not protective of surface waters and beneficial uses. Attached is an evaluation of the failure of the Regional Board to comply with fundamental permitting regulations.

The Council should recommend that the Legislature increase funding to the water boards to ensure that they have adequate resources to comply with their NPDES permitting mandates. We also strongly urge the Council to recommend that the Regional Board fully comply with NPDES permitting regulations, including antidegradation requirements, and that it address additive and synergistic interactions in developing permit limits. The Council should further require the Regional Board to prepare pollutant specific mass load estimates for the Delta and tributary watersheds and documented estimates of progress should be provided to the Council on a yearly basis.

3. Municipal Stormwater Discharges

Chapter 6 fails to acknowledge or discuss the failure of the municipal stormwater program to reduce mass loading of toxic and impairing pollutants. Examination of stormwater monitoring reports reveals that most stormwater discharged routinely exceeds water quality criteria and is frequently toxic to aquatic life.

Not a single municipality discharging stormwater pollutants into the Delta or its tributaries can document or quantify reductions in the mass loading of pollutants over the last twenty years. Nor has the Central Valley Regional Board incorporated enforceable TMDL waste load allocations developed in TMDLs in recently issued MS-4 permits.

The Council should recommend that the State Water Resources Control Board and the Central Valley Regional Board adopt limits in municipal stormwater permits restricting increases in the mass loading of pollutants. The water boards should provide the Council with a yearly documented update on progress in reducing the concentration, toxicity and mass of stormwater

discharged pollutants, as well as, documentation that enforceable waste load allocations are being included in TMDLs.

4. TMDLs

Chapter 6 focuses much of its discussion, many of its recommendations and a number of its performance measures on the completion of TMDLs. Table 6-1 identifies 27 TMDLs approved and under development in the Central Valley, Delta, and Suisun Bay, and is indicative of the paucity of the Delta Plan's approach to water quality. The identified TMDLs are only the tip of the iceberg; State and Regional Boards are legally obligated to develop and approve literally hundreds of TMDLs.

With several exceptions, the TMDLs in the table address problems that were amply extensively identified 20, 30, even 50 years ago. For example, the pervasive toxicity of diazinon and chlorpyrifos in the San Joaquin River were identified in the late 1980s, low dissolved oxygen in the Stockton Deep Water Channel was chronicled in the early 1960's, and factors causing excessive salinity in the San Joaquin River were documented far earlier. A long string of programs, MOUs, Basin Plan amendments, legislatively mandated Toxic Hot Spot cleanup plans, and toothless waivers litter the historical landscape but the problems continue to plague the Delta and tributary waterways. TMDLs are only the latest programmatic rabbit-hole to avoid the repercussions that would accompany timely direct action.

TMDLs do not ensure compliance with Basin Plan water quality standards. While the "technical TMDLs" adopted by the Central Valley Regional Board tend to be scientifically defensible, crucial implementation plans are sadly lacking. To date, there have been few, if any, documented and quantified reductions in pollutant loading attributable to TMDL implementation. Reduction in loading of organophosphorus pesticides was the result of growers switching to less expensive and more potent chemicals, for which there is little monitoring and no TMDL under development. Treatment plant upgrades in Stockton resulted in reduced ammonia loading to the Stockton Ship Channel but the largest identified sources of low dissolved oxygen remain unaddressed. Although the Grasslands Bypass Project has reduced selenium loading to the San Joaquin River, selenium concentrations in the San Joaquin River continue to routinely exceed the 5-microgram limit at Hills Ferry and the 2-microgram limit in wetland and refuge water supply channels. Existing water quality standards are inadequate and the US Geological Survey (USGS) has concluded that standards may have to be reduced 5 to 50-fold to be protective of aquatic and avian life. Having secured the low hanging fruit, remaining technical obstacles are enormous and uncertain and any solution will cost hundreds of millions of dollars that are not likely to become available.

The poster child for the failure of the TMDL program is the San Joaquin River Salt and Boron TMDL. Salinity problems on the river have been recognized for over a century. Operation of the CVP and SWP exacerbated conditions by importing an estimated 700 thousand tons of salt

annually into the San Joaquin Valley. Some 400 thousand tons of salt migrate to groundwater. Much of this salt enters the San Joaquin River via accretion or direct discharge. The TMDL has been characterized as the first 100-foot TMDL in the nation's history, only protecting a short stretch of river below the San Joaquin's confluence with the Stanislaus River. Water quality violations continue to occur upstream of the confluence and immediately downstream: this despite the fact that EPA regulations and the Central Valley Board's Basin Plan require that standards must apply throughout a water body, not simply at a single compliance point. While TMDL implementation plans must ensure attainment of water quality standards, the salt TMDL contemplates a 19% exceedance of standards in critical years and a 7% exceedance in dry years. The TMDL fails to reserve any assimilative capacity, thus depriving downstream farmers of the ability to legally irrigate and discharge return flows. Although the State Water Board has expressly and repeatedly directed the Regional Board to move the salt compliance point upstream, it has failed to do so.

Even where TMDLs have been adopted they may not be protective. For example, the Methylmercury TMDL is not protective of subsistence fishermen and their families, or those with impaired immune systems, pregnant women, or children.

It is not enough to simply measure progress in protecting water quality by programs initiated or TMDLs completed. We recommend that the Council condition approval of covered actions on inclusion of enforceable implementation plans in TMDLs, including performance measures and interim yardsticks with specific quantifiable load reductions. This should apply to all sources of impairing pollutants, including municipal and industrial stormwater and wastewater and irrigation return flows.

Water bodies must be identified under Clean Water Act Section 303(d) as "impaired" due to low flows, rather than just chemical or biological pollution, so that flows are carefully considered in all Total Maximum Daily Loads later developed to restore the water bodies to health. However, this has yet to be accomplished in the Central Valley Region. As described in extensive comments that were submitted by a coalition of groups, the state must identify and restore water bodies impaired by altered flows, as required by the Clean Water Act.²³ This should be a specific recommendation added to the Plan to begin to ensure its effectiveness. (WQ R8, R9)

5. Grasslands Project and Selenium

It is notable in Table 1 above that selenium is the only pollutant in which water quality objectives are violated more often during the non-irrigation season. This is indicative of the pervasive selenium pollution of the shallow aquifers of the Western San Joaquin Valley

²³ Letter from California Coastkeeper Alliance *et al.* to State Water Resources Control Board, "Notice of Public Solicitation of Water Quality Data and Information for 2012 California Integrated Report" (Aug. 30, 2010), available at: <http://www.cacoastkeeper.org/document/ccka-comments-on-2012-303%28d%29-list.pdf>. This letter also provides relevant discussion regarding the Clean Water Act requirements to address impaired groundwater that may be threatening hydrologically connected surface water.

mobilized during the wet winter months. The 2010 goal of meeting selenium water quality objectives has passed and the Central Valley Regional Board has extended the time for compliance until the end of 2019, justifying the action because no solution exists. If the BDCP as currently proposed is implemented, a greater percentage of Bay-Delta water will come from the San Joaquin River. As a result, Bay-Delta selenium concentrations and residence time will increase with predictable disastrous biological impacts.

On September 2011, US EPA released scientific documents by the US Geological Survey documenting the existing Bay-Delta selenium water quality standard of 5 micrograms is inadequate to protect Bay-Delta fish and wildlife. The EPA documents provide the basis for changing this toxic standard to a selenium water quality standard of 1 microgram or less. This change is needed to protect economic resources of the Delta Estuary and Bay including salmon, steelhead, sturgeon, and diving birds, and should be a recommendation in the Delta Plan.

Furthermore, the just released Reclamation water quality monitoring reports for the Delta Mendota Canal adjacent to the Mendota Pool on the San Joaquin River confirm selenium violations for five months out of the first six months of 2011. This source water goes to thousands of acres of wildlife refuges, duck clubs, and wetlands in the San Joaquin Valley and is upstream of the Delta. Failure to address this water pollution and monitor the sources has been ongoing for years. The Delta Plan should recommend that the Central Valley Regional Board enforce selenium water quality standards for agricultural polluters.

Reclamation confirms that the west side drainers are no longer monitoring selenium and other pollution that is being discharged into the San Joaquin River below Crows Landing near the Merced River, nor is this pollution being monitored as it travels to and through the Bay-Delta. The Delta Plan should recommend a comprehensive selenium-monitoring program for the Bay-Delta estuary and lower San Joaquin River.

The Bay-Delta Conservation Plan's goal to provide increased water supplies to the heavily subsidized poisoned ground of the Western San Joaquin Valley will further contaminate our fish, wildlife, food, and water supplies with toxic amounts of selenium. Ceasing irrigation of these toxic lands will reduce costly public water, power, and crop subsidies, improve water quality, and decrease the demand for pumping from the Delta. There is no cost effective or technically viable solution other than to stop sending clean water from Northern California and the Sierras to poisoned ground. The Delta Plan should recommend retirement of lands from irrigated agriculture, which creates selenium contamination to the tributaries and aquifers that drain into the Bay-Delta.

Given that no selenium solution exists other than land retirement, the Delta Plan should include a recommendation that the SWRCB convene a Wasteful and Unreasonable Use hearing to revoke water permits used for the irrigation of seleniferous, saline lands which degrade Bay-Delta water quality. The Draft Plan gives the impression that this problem is solved. After a quarter of a

century of studies and legal maneuvering, selenium and other pollutants mobilized by irrigation of the toxic lands of the Western San Joaquin Valley are still not solved.

6. Inadequate or Lack of Protective Water Quality Standards

Many thousands of unregulated chemicals, including pharmaceuticals and personal care products, industrial chemicals, and other potentially hazardous chemicals, are discharged to waterways, including the Delta and its tributaries. Chapter 6 briefly acknowledges the potential toxic and sub lethal impacts from the maelstrom of emerging and industrial chemicals that gather together in the Delta. It's likely that the synergistic and additive interactions of constituents acting on the immune, endocrine, and reproductive systems of aquatic life pose a greater threat to pelagic species than overt toxicity. The Council should do more than simply recommend that the State and Regional water boards conduct special studies of selected emerging contaminants by 2014, it should make the funding and implementation of aggressive suite of such studies a condition of approval of covered actions.

Existing water criteria fails to address many issues that must be considered in considering impacts on aquatic life. For example, during the State Water Board's Delta flow hearing, Dr. G. Fred Lee testified:

“The current US EPA criteria development approach only considers some and in some cases a small part of the impacts of chemical contaminants on aquatic life. For example, the approach currently used to develop water quality criteria does not include additive/synergistic properties of regulated chemicals that occur in concentration below the water quality criteria allowing unanticipated adverse impacts to aquatic life. Adverse impacts of chemicals to aquatic life that occur for especially sensitive species, such as zooplankton which serve as fish food organism were not included in the development of the water quality criteria. These criteria are only applicable to protecting about 90% of the species. Therefore there could readily be fish species in the Delta and its tributaries that are more sensitive to a chemical than those used to establish the water quality criterion value. There is also very limited information on chronic exposure to sub lethal impacts of a chemical and mixtures of chemicals to fish populations. Another issue is that other stressor such as low DO, ammonia etc. that can impact the lethal and especially sub lethal impacts of chemicals. It has been well known for over 40 years through biomarker studies that fish and other organisms show organism biochemical responses to chemical exposures at concentrations well below the water quality criterion. The significance of these biomarker responses to an organism or group of organisms is largely unknown. Chemicals can adversely impact the health of the fish and other aquatic life that weaken their ability to resist adverse impact of stressors such as low DO, elevated

temperature and predation as well to disease. It's been known for over 40 years that very low levels of copper affect the "breathing" rate of some fish.²⁴

Developing more protective water quality standards is likely to be technically difficult, expensive and time consuming. More immediate benefits are likely to be achieved by reductions in the mass loading of pollutants to surface waters. We reiterate our previous recommendation that the Council should require the Regional Board to prepare pollutant specific mass load estimates for the Delta and tributary watersheds and documented estimates of progress should be provided to the Council on a yearly basis.

Chapter 6 notes that there are impairments in the Delta that are caused by total organic carbon, nutrients and other contaminants for which there are no federal or state water quality criteria. We recommend that the Council go farther than simply recommending that the water boards develop and adopt criteria for nutrients by 2014 and make the adoption of criteria a condition of approval of covered actions.

Recommendation 9 calls on the Water Boards to "conduct or require special studies of pollutants including selected emerging contaminants." However, this Recommendation fails to note how this effort would be different than the review already being conducted by the State Board and its contractors.²⁵ Furthermore, there is no mention of utilizing existing monitoring results as a foundation for preventative actions and enforcement of existing standards to prevent further degradation of drinking water supplies, higher treatment costs, and damage to ecosystem habitat, and preventing harm to other beneficial uses. A meaningful Recommendation would have considered the work already being undertaken, evaluated it for potential weaknesses, and provided useful guidance on where additional work is required. (WQ R9)

Of the approximately 100,000 chemicals registered for use in the United States, only about 200 are regulated with respect to water quality. The Priority Pollutant List is an artifact of a legal settlement several decades ago, has never been peer reviewed and is an inadequate surrogate for the maelstrom of chemicals found in our waterways today. Further, degradants, a product of chemical breakdown in the environment, are little understood but are often highly toxic. We recommend that the Council urge U.S.EPA and the State and Regional Water Boards to upgrade the Priority Pollutant List through a scientifically defensible process.

7. Drinking Water Quality

We support recommendations WQ R1, WQ R3, and WQ R4 and take no position on WQ R2. We believe that WQ R5 (CV-SALTS) while an interesting concept, will cost many billions of

²⁴ Lee, G. Fred. 2010. Comments on Water Quality Issues Associated with SWRCB's Developing Flow Criteria for Protection of the Public Trust Aquatic Life Resources of the Delta, 11 February 2010. Page 3. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/deltaflow/docs/exhibits/cspa/cspa_exh22_lee_test.pdf

²⁵ See <http://www.sccwrp.org/ResearchAreas/Contaminants/ContaminantsOfEmergingConcern.aspx>.

dollars and is serving as a rabbit-hole to justify a failure to pursue imposition of regulatory requirements and numerous near-term efforts that would result in significant reductions of salt loading. Effective regulatory enforcement would likely be more effective in achieving significant near-term reductions of salt loading. We recommend the Council add quantitative yardsticks to this recommendations and condition approval of covered actions on compliance with those yardsticks.

Other aspects of the Drinking Water Quality section of the plan are inadequate. While we appreciate the paragraph referring to the problem of nitrate contaminated drinking water for low-income communities, no connection is made between this observation and the larger issue of controlling salinity. The section also ignores the problem of nitrates for large communities, particularly in the North Valley. Both Ripon and Modesto, for example, report having to close several wells due to nitrate contamination in the last 10 years, and both are either using or seeking surface water to supplement the lost yield. The Delta Plan must establish a clear connection between water supply and water quality and again specify quantitative yardsticks to measure progress.

8. Lack of Timetables, Yardsticks, Performance Measures, and Consequences

Given the extensive information on pollution impacts in the Delta, a credible Delta Plan must provide the yardsticks to evaluate progress (including mass loading reductions), end points, and citizen enforcement tools to hold all polluted discharges to account, and provide consequences for failure. Chapter 6 fails to do this. Rather, it simply restates existing efforts and suggests (without mandates or accountability) future efforts that may or may not be undertaken. For example, WQ Recommendation 6, the first Environmental Quality recommendation, simply references the fact that the State and Regional Boards “are currently engaged in regulatory processes, research, and monitoring” and recommend only “these ongoing efforts be completed and if possible accelerated.”

The Delta ecosystem and beneficial uses that the estuary supports cannot be restored without compliance with water quality standards. Monitoring results need to trigger automatic actions prior to violating the standards to prevent irreversible ecosystem damage and degradation of beneficial uses. (WQ R1)

Specific quantifiable timetables, yardsticks, performance measures, endpoints, and consequences for failure are the necessary drivers of any meaningful plan that realistically expects to achieve the coequal goals and improve water quality. We recommend that the Council recommend inclusion of these specific measures in all programs and projects related to salinity, drinking water quality, and environmental water quality and condition approval of covered actions on their inclusion. This should apply to all sources of pollutants including point and nonpoint discharges.

CHAPTER 7 – REDUCE RISKS IN THE DELTA.

In general, the Fifth Draft Delta Plan contains a number of good policies and recommendations to reduce Delta flood risks that we agree will be beneficial. What is needed is a partnership with local, state, and federal agencies to reduce flood risks.

1. The planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of all Delta levee and floodplain improvements shall include consultation and maximum feasible participation by those living in the Delta. (RR R1 thru R12)
2. The Council should require the PL 84-99 levee standard (Class 3 in Table 7.1) or higher classes of levee standards contain a 22-foot crown width as a minimum for all delta levees. A 22-foot crown width in lieu of the 16-foot crown is recommended as a means to accommodate raising levees to meet sea level rises greatly in excess of the rates experienced in the last 300 years and to allow two-way passage of trucks in the event of a flood. The Delta Plan should identify levees that don't meet PL 84-99 criteria and develop a plan for reviewing them to determine whether they should be improved and improving the selected levees during a phased timeline. (RR R4)
3. The Delta Stewardship Council should accept and support as a covered action in the Delta Plan the Delta Protection Commission's recommendation in their Economic Sustainability Plan to: "Improve many core Delta Levees beyond the PL 84-99 standard that addresses earthquake and sea-level rise risks, improve flood fighting and emergency response, and allow for vegetation on the water side of levees to improve habitat. Improvement of most core Delta levees to this higher standard would cost \$1 to \$2 billion. While this is a longer-term program, planning should be initiated immediately."²⁶ (RR R3 thru R7)
 - There is a plausible public interest in providing public funds to Delta reclamation districts and other Delta interests for levee upgrades because the Delta serves as the water conveyance facility for much of California. Water exporters should be required to identify which levees, if any, *they want to fund to a higher standard* (for example more earthquake resistant) to protect their water supply, beyond the current standards. Recommendations should also include assisting Delta counties and communities in meeting FEMA/NFIP programs. The plan should also contain a recommendation to support and increase public funding for permanent continuation of existing and highly successful statutory cost-share formula and funding for Delta (Subventions) Levee Program. Public safety and flood protection must remain the top priority of the State Plan of Flood Control, including its levees and bypasses. (RR R# thru R7)
 - Because earthquake risks to the levees are one of the main justifications for a Peripheral Canal or Tunnel in the Delta, and there is evidence that the earthquake risks to the Delta levees may have been exaggerated in previous drafts of this report,

²⁶ Delta Protection Commission. Second Draft Economic Sustainability Plan, July 21, 2011. Chapter 11, Page 222. [http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/ESP%20\(2\)%20Ch%2011.pdf](http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/ESP%20(2)%20Ch%2011.pdf)

the comparison of costs of the two alternatives (\$1-2 billion for levee strengthening versus \$15-\$16 billion for new conveyance) is significant and should be incentive enough to immediately initiate this levee reinforcement program and make catastrophic levee failure a questionable justification for new conveyance. The comment “Delta levees are fragile’ may be refuted by the fact that there has been a reduction in the number and severity of Delta levee failures since 1988. (RR R5)

4. We concur with the Policies shown in this Chapter (RR P1 thru RR P4)
5. We agree that there should be support for Delta dredging to improve flood conveyance and to provide material for levee maintenance or subsidence reversal in the Old River, Middle River and the South Fork Mokelumne. However, we have concerns about the environmental impacts from deepening the Sacramento Deepwater Ship Channel and the Stockton Deepwater Ship Channel and we reserve judgment pending comprehensive environmental review and full mitigation. (RR R2)
6. We agree in general with the concept of identifying lands that will be needed for flood control improvements including setback levees. We also agree with the importance of identifying and setting aside these lands. However, the locations for flood control improvements have yet to be identified which creates uncertainty in land use decisions and in the absence of that knowledge, private and public land use decisions may foreclose opportunities for flood control improvements in the future. Until these decisions are made, it creates burdensome uncertainties for Delta residents and communities. Therefore we urge the Delta Stewardship Council to identify these areas sooner rather than later in order to provide land use certainty to residents and local government. (RR R4)
7. We agree that the Delta Stewardship Council should convene a working group to develop and evaluate recommendations to DWR to address appropriate actions to both routine and catastrophic levee failure. We also recommend that the working group include development of recommendations for local Delta agencies as well. (RR R7)
8. We partially agree with the recommendation for termination of state leases on Delta lands subject to subsidence. However, every effort should be made to work with farmers to keep Delta lands in agricultural production. The purchase by the State and non-profits of Delta islands such as Twitchell and Sherman and elimination of agricultural activities in some of those areas negatively impacts the Delta economy. Termination of state leases should be a last resort if a farmer is completely unwilling to participate in practices and programs to halt or reverse subsidence on Delta islands. In the event a lease is terminated, every effort should be made to find a lessee who will keep the land in production who will work to reverse and eliminate subsidence. An alternative consideration should be a 400-foot easement around Delta levees and adoption of policies to add more fill behind Delta levees to reinforce them. (RR R11)
9. We concur with each of the other Recommendations in this Chapter (RR R1, R3, R5, R6 and R12.)

CHAPTER 8 – DELTA AS AN EVOLVING PLACE.

While our coalition is in general agreement with the majority of recommendations that are presented in this chapter, we feel that it has serious overall shortcomings and oversights. They are: a lack of specifics or quantitative data by which performance can be measured; no recognition that water quality and improved water flows through the Delta are an integral part of the Delta as Place; the absence of integral involvement of Delta residents and Delta communities in the planning for the Delta's future. No one can fully understand the "Delta as Place" without living there and experiencing the unique place that it is. In this present draft, Delta communities are described as theme park type of small towns rather than the working communities that they are. Furthermore, recreation and tourism are given more weight than agriculture, when agriculture is the primary economic activity within the Delta. Without comprehensive and meaningful involvement of Delta residents, there cannot be a Delta Plan that will be favorably accepted or that can be successfully implemented. In short, this chapter has not provided the focus on the Delta that it deserves.

When comparing the co-equal goals with the object of Congress in granting swamp lands to the states (1850 Swamp and Overflow Land Act), the co-equal goals should be consistent with *increasing the general prosperity* of the Delta, as required by the Act. The reflooding of Swamp and Overflowed Lands, the deprivation and degradation of the water supply to such lands, and other acts of the State detrimental to the productivity and prosperity of such lands is clearly inconsistent with the State's obligation to carry out the purpose for which the lands were granted to the State.

Additionally, Water Code Sections 12200 - 12205 are specific as to the requirements to provide "adequate water supply in the Delta sufficient to maintain and expand agriculture, industry, urban and recreational development". An evolving Delta consistent with Water Code Section 12201 is one which maintains and expands agriculture, industry, urban and recreational development. The Delta as an evolving place is to be positive not negative. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009 cannot be properly interpreted to allow harm to the future prosperity of the Delta.

Other important considerations that must be an integral part of the Delta Plan are:

1. The Delta Protection Act of 1992, which was enacted to prevent inappropriate or excessive conversion and urbanization of farmland in the Primary Zone of the Delta. The Delta Plan must take this important point into consideration.
2. The Delta Protection Commission's Land Use & Resource Management Plan which identifies agriculture as the primary land use in the Delta and seeks to protect its economic production throughout whole Delta. Between 1984 and 2008 almost 560,000 acres of Prime Farmland was lost or converted statewide due to urbanization, low density rural residences, mining, and ecological restoration projects. This statewide loss is equal to the size of Solano County, and should be avoided when possible by focusing on government lands and existing habitat areas that could be improved to benefit additional species.

3. Other local plans such as Suisun Marsh Habitat Management Plan, Delta County HCPs, and Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area Land Management Plan must be factored into the Delta Plan, including many other local plans that have spent years and millions of dollars to develop and manage.
4. A recognition of the high level of uncertainty associated with BDCP Conservation Measures and recent criticism from the National Academy of Sciences for critical gaps in science, which should necessitate a cautionary approach by the Delta Stewardship Council to endorse or support widespread farmland conversion to habitat that will have significant economic impacts to the area.
5. Although a new water conveyance system is being planned by BDCP, it may never be completed or permitted, or may be stalled for decades due to litigation (the legal dispute between Sacramento County and EBMUD lasted 40 years before resulting in the new Freeport diversion facility). Therefore, the Delta Plan should include strategies on how to improve the co-equal goals if the new water conveyance facilities are delayed or not constructed.
6. The Delta Plan should not only focus on the amount of additional habitat to be restored, but should first prioritize increased management and functionality of existing habitat restoration areas that were completed in preceding years, before converting more farmlands to habitat. Over the last several decades, numerous habitat projects have been funded and constructed in the Delta, but after several years, many of these existing projects are experiencing neglect due to lack of adequate funding to manage and monitor them for species benefits. The Delta Plan should also focus on how habitat areas can be integrated into current and evolving agricultural lands.
7. The Delta Plan should set forth policies and recommendations for safe harbor agreements, good neighbor policies, and a secured endowment to cover any future claims for damages to property owners resulting from habitat restoration in the Delta.
8. The Delta Plan should reiterate the Delta Conservancy's mandate that land will be required for restoration purposes only from willing sellers. In addition, the Delta Plan should call for additional applied science and economic analysis of the tradeoff of terrestrial habitat for additional aquatic habitat, which may be good for water export permits but harmful to Delta communities.
9. The Delta Plan should create a long term funding mechanism for dealing with public nuisances if recreation is to be promoted as a greater economic driver within Delta communities. Funding needs to be secured to handle public safety issues, littering, theft, vandalism, and vagrancy for Delta landowners, as present levels of law enforcement are woefully inadequate to address any increases in tourism.
10. The Delta landowners and economy should not have a disproportionate burden for Delta fixes that intended to benefit statewide interests. Therefore, securitized endowment funding should be recommended for: fish screening and consolidation of existing intakes;

loss of local tax revenue and assessments; third party impacts; and maintenance of restored habitat areas.

There must be recognition of tribal cultural use of the Delta as a major trading place and center of many tribal community ceremonial places as well as the need and respect for the Delta as the transformation place of salmon from fresh water to salt and back again. The Plan fails to include tribal interests in the Delta and the importance of the waters to lifeway and salmon habitat restoration and continuance.

Our responses to your individual recommendations are:

1. We concur that the Delta Protection Commission's Economic Sustainability Plan should include recommendations on public safety, economic goals and policies, updates to DWR's flood management plans, and encouragement of recreational investment. (DP R1)
2. We agree that The Delta Protection Commission should initiate recommendations related to designation of the Delta and Suisun Marsh as a National Heritage Area. (DP R2)
3. We agree that The Department of Transportation should partner with local cities and counties to establish major gateways and improve access. (DP R3)
4. We agree that The Department of Parks and Recreation should develop funding sources and partner with other state and federal agencies, counties, conservancies, and nonprofits to conduct recreation use surveys as indicated in the Plan. (DP R4)
5. We support that The Department of Fish and Game's collaboration with other organizations to expand recreational opportunities. (DP R5)
6. The Department of Boating and Waterways should certainly coordinate with the U.S. Coast Guard and state and local agencies on an updated marine patrol strategy for the region. (DP R6)

CHAPTER 9 – FINANCE PLAN.

1. As stated in the cover letter to these comments, Public Trust balancing must be incorporated into all aspects of a Delta Plan, especially in the economic analyses that must be an integral part of the Financial Plan. (FP P1)
2. Based on the BDCP Costs shown on Page 209, Water Conveyance Costs (the Water Supply Reliability portion of the Co-Equal Goals) are 70% of total project costs. This represents a wide disparity in the legislatively mandated Co-Equal goals for Water Supply and Delta Ecosystems Restoration. This very unequal apportionment of project costs by BDCP is the clearest indicator that increasing water supply is the overriding objective of the BDCP sponsors and that ecosystems restoration will never be an equal goal. This discrepancy needs to be communicated by the Council to the BDCP as an indicator that the eventual DEIR produced by BDCP will not meet the legislative requirements set for the “Co-Equal Goals.” (Version 2.1)
3. Under the category of “Immediate Needs,” please include “public health” as requiring urgent expenditures. The Pacific Institute report cited in Chapter 6 identifies a need for capital infrastructure for communities with nitrate contamination at \$150 million, but urgent expenditures are needed for interim solutions, including operation and maintenance of treatment systems, and funding for point-of-use or point-of-entry. No funding is available for either of these options to provide safe drinking water in the short term. (Page 208, line 17)
4. The call for DWR to develop an assessment of the state’s water infrastructure needs through the California Water Plan is a guarantee that water quality will be slighted. Unlike DWR, both the State Water Board and the Department of Public Health develop regular Needs Surveys for wastewater and drinking water infrastructure. These surveys and the Project Priority List for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund should inform any needs survey. While this recommendation currently looks at small-scale storage and conveyance projects, it ignores basic investments like water meters, replacement of leaking pipes, and conservation incentives for residents of small water systems. (FP R5)
5. Despite the objections to Diversion Fees expressed in previous Draft Delta Plans, we recommend that the Council continue exploration of a water diversion fee and a Delta export fee by the Council and the State Water Resources Control Board. The top priority of such diversion and export fees should be to support ecosystem restoration efforts. This system of fees is founded on the responsibility of all water users under the public trust to contribute to ecosystem restoration. Development of these fees should consider the following: (FP R6, R8, R10)
 - Long-term habitat restoration and species recovery funding required to achieve the co-equal goals.
 - An appropriate share of public funding for ecosystem restoration efforts, as well as likely state and federal funding, given the pressures on the state and federal budgets.

- Contributions by water users to other system-wide ecosystem restoration efforts. Site specific, water agency local mitigation costs (e.g. the installation of fish screens) should not be considered for crediting in the development of these user fees.
 - These water fees should not be used for the purchase of water to achieve compliance with regulatory requirements, as was the former CALFED Environmental Water Account.
6. The development of information related to financing (such as the identification of beneficiaries and stressors and detailed financing scenarios) should be undertaken simultaneously with the development of major capital decisions, in order to inform planning efforts. The Council should assure that this is being accomplished by the BDCP in order for BDCP to be able to produce a plan that is consistent with the requirements of a Delta Plan. Development of finance plans should not be delayed until the conclusion of capital planning efforts. (FP R6, R8, R10)
 - We note that the word “Framework” has been added to this chapter title with the introduction of the Third Draft. While we understand that: “Many of the policies recommended in the Delta Plan will not be fully developed and more detailed costs will be determined at a later date” (from the Second Draft), we recommend that as much detail as possible on alternative costs be included in the Draft EIR; presenting only a *framework* for a finance plan will not be adequate.
 7. The primary purpose of a public goods charge should be to fund investments in efficiency, water recycling, groundwater clean-up, stormwater capture, and other tools that can reduce reliance on imported supplies. (FP R12)
 8. A public goods charge could ensure a minimum investment by all urban and agricultural water agencies in water user efficiency and other tools that can reduce reliance on imported water. It could also provide consistent funding over time. (FP R12)
 9. The CPUC’s recommended water public goods charge is focused on water efficiency – broadly defined -- including agricultural and urban water use efficiency, water recycling, stormwater capture and groundwater clean-up efforts, and resulting surface water quality impacts. We recommend that the Delta Plan require a volumetric approach to such fees as well as contributions by both agricultural and urban water users. (FP R12)
 10. Finally, the Council needs to expand its vision on fee possibilities. A Water Resources Renewal and Protection fund should be established that places a volume fee on both water exported and discharged. These fees need to go to more than just conservation efficiency projects. Funding needs also to include watershed protection projects throughout the Sierra, the Coastal Regions, and other suitable areas of the state.

David Nesmith

David Nesmith, Facilitator
Environmental Water Caucus

The following 206 organizations are signatories to this comment letter:

Bill Jennings
Executive Director
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

Zeke Grader
President
Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's
Associations

Carolee Krieger
Executive Director
California Water Impact Network

Jonas Minton
Senior Water Policy Advisor
Planning and Conservation League

Ron Stork
Senior Policy Advocate
Friends of the River

Jennifer Clary
Water Policy Analyst
Clean Water Action

David Lewis
Executive Director
Save the Bay

Joan Clayburg
Executive Director
Sierra Nevada Alliance

Debbie Davis
Legislative Analyst
Environmental Justice Coalition for Water

Deb Self
Executive Director
San Francisco Baykeeper

Jim Metropulos
Senior Advocate
Sierra Club California

Chris Wright
Executive Director
Foothills Conservancy

John Merz
President
Sacramento River Preservation Trust

Conner Everts
Executive Director
Southern California Watershed Alliance

Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla
Executive Director
Restore the Delta

Caleb Dardick
Executive Director
South Yuba River Citizens League

Dave Steindorf
California Stewardship Director
American Whitewater

Barbara Vlamis
Executive Director
AquAlliance

Caleen Sisk-Franco
Spiritual Leader & Traditional Chief
Winnemen Wintu Tribe

Sheila Davis
Executive Director
Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition

Victor Gonella
President
Golden Gate Salmon Association

Jim Cox
President
West Delta Chapter, CSBA

Nile Malloy
Program Director
Communities for a Better Environment

Geoffey McQuilkin
Executive Director
Mono Lake Committee

Huey D. Johnson
President
Resource Renewal Institute

Adam Scow
California Campaign Director
Food and Water Watch

Leda Huta
Executive Director
Endangered Species Coalition

Roger Mammon
President
Lower Sherman Island Duck Club

Warren Truitt
President
Save the American River

Dana Stolzman
Executive Director
Salmonid Restoration Federation

Capt. Roger Thomas
President
Golden Gate Fishermen's Association

Mondy Lariz
Director
Santa Clara County Creeks Coalition

Larry Collins
President
San Francisco Crab Boat Owners Association

Deirdre des Jardins
California Research Associates

Leaf G. Hillman
Director, Karuk Department of Natural
Resources
Karuk Tribe

Lloyd Carter
President
California Save Our Streams Council

Patty Clary
Executive Director
Californians for Alternatives to Toxics

Eric Wesselman
Executive Director
Tuolumne River Trust

Todd Steiner
Executive Director
Salmon Protection and Watershed Network

Laurel Firestone
Co-Executive Director
Community Water Center

Don Rivenes
Sierra Foothills Audubon

Esmeralda Soria
Legislative Advocate
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation

Mark Rockwell
Co-Conservation Director
Northern California Council Federation of Fly
Fishers

Florence LaRiviere
Chair
Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge

Dan Bacher
Editor
Fish Sniffer

Alan Levine
Director
Coast Action Group

Zeke Grader
President
Institute for Fisheries Resources

Siobahn Dolan
Director
Desal Response Group

Andrew J. Orahoske
Conservation Director
Environmental Protection Information Center

Nadananda
Executive Director
Friends of the Eel River

Mati Waiya
Executive Director
Wishtoyo Foundation

Todd Steiner
President
Turtle Island Restoration Network

Jason Weiner
Associate Director
Ventura Coastkeeper

Jim Wheaton
President
Environmental Law Foundation

Tracey Brieger
Co-Director
Californians for Pesticide Reform

Karen Schamback
California Field Director
California Public Employees for Environmental
Responsibility

Rich Cimino
President
Alameda Creek Alliance

Jack Ellwanger
President
Pelican Network

Tara Hansen
Executive Director
California Native Plant Society

Jeff Miller
Conservation Advocate
Center for Biological Diversity

Bill Wells
Executive Director
California Delta Chambers & Visitors Bureau

Bill Ferrero
Owner, President
Mokelumne River Outfitters

Lorna Elness
President
San Joaquin Audubon

Michael Warburton
Executive Director
The Public Trust Alliance

Sylvia Kothe
Chairperson
Concerned Citizens Coalition of Stockton

Frank Egger
President
North Coast Rivers Alliance

Luke Breit
Legislative Advocate
Forests Forever

Marily Woodhouse
Director
Battle Creek Alliance

Jodi Frediani
Director
Central Coast Forest Watch

Jeremy Terhune
Coordinator
Friends of the Calaveras

Don McEnhill
Riverkeeper
Russian Riverkeeper

Drea Traeumer
Secretary
Upper American River Foundation

Tim Little
Co-Director
Rose Foundation

Steve Shimek
Chief Executive
The Otter Project

Greywolf, Jeff Kelly
Chief
Modoc Nation

Layne Friedrich
Founding Partner
Lawyers for Clean Water

Jeff Darlington
President
Sierra Cascade Land Trust Council

Shera Blume
Sierra People's Forest Service

Alan Harthorn
Executive Director
Friends of Butte Creek

Larry Hanson
Manager
Northern California River Watch

Steve Shimek
Program Manager
Monterey Coastkeeper

Craig Thomas
Director
Sierra Forest Legacy

Steve Pedery
Conservation Director
Oregon Wild

Larry Glass
President
Safe Alternatives for our Forest Environment

Mauro Oliveira
Director
Stop Clearcutting California

Lynne Plambeck
Executive Director
Santa Clarita for Planning and the Environment

Marie Logan & Jessie Raeder
Co-Presidents
SalmonAid Foundation

Karen Schambach
President
Center for Sierra Nevada Conservation

Rain Ananacel
Executive Director
Northcoast Environmental Center

Michael Schweit
President
Southwest Council Federation of Fly Fishers

Chris Poehlmann
President
Friends of the Gualala River

Nate Rangel
President
California Outdoors

Jeff Darlington
Executive Director
Placer Land Trust

Peter Brucker
Klamath Forest Alliance

Chet Ogan
Conservation Chair
Redwood Regional Audubon Society

Susan Robinson
Board Member
Ebbetts Pass Forest Watch

Bob Dean
President
Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Council

Trevor Kennedy
Executive Director
Fishery Foundation

John Buckley
Executive Director
Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center

Dan Silver
Executive Director
Endangered Habitats League

Jane Humes
Chair
Waldo Holt Conservancy

Michael Garabedian
Friends of the North Fork American River

Mike Hudson
Small Boat Commercial Salmon Fisherman's
Association

Trevor Atkinson
Vice Chair
Campaign for Common Ground

Allison Boucher
Project Manager
Tuolumne Conservancy

Michael Martin, Ph.D.
Director
Merced River Conservation Committee

Beth Werner
Baykeeper
Humboldt Baykeeper

Fred Evanson
Board Member
Ecological Rights Foundation

Lydia Miller
President
San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center

Kelli Gant
President
Trinity Lake Revitalization Alliance

Sue Lynn
Secretary
Cascade Action Now

Larry Glass
President
South Fort Mountain Defense Committee

Seymour Singer
President
Pasadena Casting Club

Dick Harris
President
Santa Clarita Casting Club

Stan Elijah
President
Tracy Flyfishers

Richard Dale
Executive Director
Sonoma Ecology Center

Mission Peak Fly Anglers

Tom Bartos
President
Foothills Angler Coalition

Bill Carnazzo
President
Spring Creek Guide Service

Steve Frisch
Sierra Business Council

Mark Allen
General Manager
Adventure Connections, Inc.

Randy Upton
President
Las Vegas Fly Fishing Club

Lew Riffle
Conservation Chair
Santa Barbara Flyfishers

Lew Leichter
President
Santa Lucia Fly Fishers

Greg King
Siskiyou Land Conservancy

Jim Yarnall
President
Humboldt Area Saltwater Anglers

Joesph Vaile
Campaign Director
KS Wild

Marueen McCorry
President
San Joaquin et al

Ron Forbes
Conservation Chair
Delta Fly Fishers

Denise Boggs
Executive Director
Conservation Congress

Kim Glazzard
Executive Director
Organic Sacramento

Bill Carnazzo
President
Spring Creek Guide Service

Bill O'Kelly
President
Sierra Pacific Flyfishers

Cindy Charles
Conservation Chair
Golden West Women Flyfishers

Ted Shapas
Conservation Chair
Diablo Valley Fly Fishermen

Randy Upton
President
Las Vegas Fly Fishing Club

Darrell Tichurst
Chairman
Coastside Fishing Club

Aaron Newman
President
Humboldt Fisherman's Marketing Association

Mark Micoch
Co-Chairman
Northern California Guides Association

Dan Blanton
Chairman
StriperFest

Mike Augney
Co-Owner
USA Fishing

Jim Martin
Director
Berkeley Conservation Institute

Bob Mellinger
Vice-President
Water for Fish

Mike Stiller
President
Santa Cruz Commercial Salmon Association

Randy Repass
Founder
West Marine

Bart Hall
Producer
Fred Hall Shows

Brian Layng
President
International Sportsman's Exposition

Bruce Tokars
President
Salmon Water Now

Bill Karr
Northern Calif. Editor
Western Outdoor News

Galen Onizuka
Owner, President
Johnson Hicks Marine

Todd Fraser
Owner
Bayside Marine

Gordon Robertson
Vice-President
American Sportfishing Association

Jeff Pontius
President
Zebco Brands

Angelo Pucci
President
P Line

Dick Pool
President
Pro-Troll Fishing Products

Ken Elie
Owner, President
Outdoor Pro Shop

Mike Shipp
F/V Chloe Marie

Bill Divens
Salmon King Lodge West

Craig Hanson
Outdoor 1050 Radio

Paul Johnson
Monterey Fish Market

Bob Kotula
Outwest Marketing

Danny Layne
Hawkeye Marketing

Gary Coe
Kokanee Power

Glen Fukumoto
Outdoor Pro Shop

Bill Divens
Salmon King Lodge West

Capt. Bill Smith
Riptide Charters

Capt Bob Ingles
Queen of Hearts Charters

Capt Brian Cutty
Chubasco Charters

Capt Brian Guiles
Flying Fish Charters

Capt Chris Acacelo
Chris's Fishing Charters

Capt Chris Chan
Ankeny St. Sportfishing

Capt Chris Duba
Silver Fox Charters

Capt Craig Shimokosu
New Salmon Queen Charters

Capt Dale Walters
Que Sera Sera Charters

Danny Layne
Fish'n Dan's Guide Service

Capt David Ryan
Caroline Charters

Capt Dennis Baxter
New Captain Pete Charters

Capt Don Franklin
Soleman Sportfishing Charters

Capt Ed Gallia
New Easy Rider Charters

Capt Frank Rescino
Lovely Martha Charters

Capt Harry Necees
Checkmate Charters

Capt Jack Chapman
Lovely Linda Sportfishing

Capt Jacky Douglas
Wacky Jacky Charters

Capt James Robertson
Outer Limit Charters

Capt Jay Yokomozo
Huck Finn Charters

Jimmy Robertson
Outer Limits Charters

Capt Joe Gallia
El Dorado III Charters

Capt John Atkinson
New Ray Ann Charters

Capt John Kluzmier
Sir Randy Charters

Capt Ken Stagnaro
Stagnaro's Charters

Capt Nick Lemons
Star of Monterey Charters

Capt Peter Bruno
Randy's Fishing Trips

Capt Randy Thornton
Telstar Charters

Capt Richard Thornton
Trek II

Rick Kennedy
Tight Lines Guide Service

Capt Rick Powers
Bodega Bay Sportfishing

Capt Robert Gallia
El Dorado Charters

Capt Sean Hodges
Hog Heaven Charters

Capt Steve Talmadge
Flash Sportfishing Charters

Capt Todd Magaline
Blue Runner Charters

Sal Vallone
Bob Sands Fishing

Capt Tim Klassen
Reel Steel Sportfishing

Vance Staplin
Vance's Tackle

Barbara Emley
F/V Autumn Gale

Chuck Powell
Guide River Run

ATTACHMENT I
A SAMPLING OF RESOURCES AND BEST PRACTICES FOR PUBLIC TRUST
ECONOMIC ANALYSES
ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION COMMENT LETTER TO THE FIFTH DRAFT DELTA
PLAN

1. The U.S. Water Resources Council's *The Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies (P&G)*. The *P&G* helps federal agencies plan water-related projects. It's somewhat out of date but the National Research Council of the National Academies' review of proposed changes to the *P&G* contains valuable insight into current best economic practices.²⁷
2. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) developed the *Economic Analysis Guidebook (Guidebook)* in 2008 to address deficiencies in the *P&G*. The *Guidebook* employs up-to-date methods and describes the environmental consequences, social effects, and monetary and non-monetary costs and benefits of water-management alternatives economics.²⁸
3. DWR has also developed a 2005 four-part study that describes the importance of considering the full range of economic costs and benefits of public policies that affect aquatic resources.²⁹
4. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released the third edition of its *Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses (Guidelines)* in December 2010.³⁰ It accounts for new literature published since the last revision and brings the *Guidelines* consistent with current best economic practices. The latest update includes detailed recommendations on identifying and describing baseline conditions that would exist with and without a proposed policy revision or regulation and an expanded description of methods of defining and valuing ecological benefits of projects and policies that protect natural resources.

²⁷ National Research Council of the National Academies. 2010. *A Review of the Proposed Revisions to the Federal Principles and Guidelines Water Resources Planning Document*. Committee on Improving Principles and Guidelines for Federal Water Resources Project Planning, Water Science and Technology Board, Division on Earth and Life Studies.

²⁸ California Department of Water Resources (CDWR). 2008. *Economic Analysis Guidebook*. The State of California. January.

²⁹ California Department of Water. 2005A. *Ecosystem Valuation Methods. Revised Draft*. Multi-Objective Approaches to Floodplain Management on a Watershed Basis. May. 2005B. *Natural Floodplain Functions and Societal Values Revised Draft*. Multi-Objective Approaches to Floodplain Management on a Watershed Basis. May. 2005C. *Middle Creek Flood Ecosystem Restoration Project Case Study: Benefit and Cost Analysis*. Multi-Objective Approaches to Floodplain Management on a Watershed Basis. May. 2005D. *Floodplain Management Benefits and Cost Analysis Framework. Revised Draft*. Multi-Objective Approaches to Floodplain Management on a Watershed Basis. June.

³⁰ National Center for Environmental Economics. 2010. *Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA 240-R-10-001. December.

5. EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) has also released a report titled, *Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services* in May of 2009.³¹ The report describes methods of identifying and describing the economic significance of natural resources and associated ecosystem services affected by policies or projects. The SAB noted the importance of valuing ecosystem services using up-to-date economic methods, and promoting collaboration among social scientists and biophysical scientists. Many of the recommendations have relevance to assessing the economic effects of water allocations in the Delta.
6. EPA also has prepared a guide for assessing cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis for groundwater programs.³²
7. Even a cursory review of widely used textbooks and the scientific literature reveals numerous approaches and tools that meet generally accepted and prevailing standards of practice for evaluating alternative approaches and balancing public trust uses with other beneficial uses of scarce water supplies.³³

³¹ Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Science Advisory Board. 2009. *Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services*. EPA-SAB-09-012. May.

³² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1993. *Guide for Cost-Effectiveness and Cost-Benefit Analysis of State and Local Ground Water Protection Programs*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, and Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water. April.

³³ Field, B.C. 1997. *Environmental Economics*, 2nd Edition. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc. - Lesser, J.A., D.E. Dodds, and R.O. Zerbe, Jr. 1997. *Environmental Economics and Policy*. - Goodstein, 1999. *E.S. Economics and the Environment*. - Field, B.C. 1994. *Environmental Economics*. - Rossi, P. and H. Freeman. 1982. *Economics*, 13th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. - Roback, J. 1982. "Wages, Rents, and the Quality of Life." *Journal of Political Economy* 90: 1257-1278; 1988. "Wages, Rents, and Amenities: Differences among Workers and Regions." *Economic Inquiry* 26: 23-41. - Partridge, M. and D. Rickman. 2003. "The Waxing and Waning of Regional Economies: The Chicken-Egg Question of Jobs Versus People." *Journal of Urban Economics* 53: 76-97. - Blomquist, G.C. and D.R. Johnson. 1998. "Resource Quality Information and Validity of Willingness to Pay in Contingent Valuation." *Resource and Energy Economics* 20:179-196. - Loomis, J., T. Brown, and J. Bergstrom. 2007. "Defining, Valuing, and Providing Ecosystem Goods and Services," *Natural Resources Journal* 47: 329-376. - Daily, G.C. (ed). 1997. *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.