

Comments on Process

- 96-111 Packaging of environmental actions into various alternatives, makes it difficult to support an environmental "good" which is coupled with a "water supply bad." (F&G)
- 95-14 Sept. 14, 1995 Workshop. Should include Bay in program; dredging is linked to upstream activities such as, salinity distribution in bay and project ops linked; bottom salinity , new species (L. Smith)
- 95-19 Materials for Oct. 12, 1995 Workshop Specific comments on problem/objective and action category statements
- 95-21 Speed of CALFED process-keep page
- 95-26 Oct. 12, 1995 Workshop. General comments on Primary Problem-Objective Statements. Likes them. (R. Wood)
- 95-29 Oct. 18, 1995 BDAC Meeting. Need to keep focus on the Bay as well.
- 95-38 Mission Statement; Problem Statement; Alternative Categories, et al. Process must integrate other key programs (eg Trinity) (M. McDonald)
- 95-42 Actions not well defined (D. Aladjem)
- 95-43 Dec. 4 workshop - formation of alternatives concerns with boundary. Try SCRUB method? (S. Pyle)
- 95-44 Dec. 4 workshop - alternatives. Baseline should not follow CVP process, don't stand in way of projects in process, need new baseline yield figures from DWR, reduce x-D fish transport thru G. Slough. More funding for SB 34 program, include a proposed alternative based on action categories. See response (D. Forkel)
- 95-51 Any losses in Accord agreements (considered baseline) must be made up by CALFED actions. Example: restoration plan in CVPIA- \$ deleted from budget, expect this action now to be part of CALFED. (R. Weiner, A. Notthoff, H. Candee)
- 95-52 Alternative development process. Concerned with confusion of process-Supports split of restoration effort as separate component. Better to have specific actions rather than continue to use general categories. (M. Ford & S. Buer)

- 95-53 Look for process to address broad range of alternative without pre-judging merits on political or financial bases. (D. Calvert Jr.)
- 95-54 Need clear statewide socio-economic and envir goals - decisions must be evaluated against these (D. Underwood)
- 95-56 Planning objectives/alternatives. Limit objectives to fulfilling operational object. of Accord. Limit actions to those within current practical, financial capability of state, feds and water users. May need to screen action as to if they solve state-wide planning issues or CALFED objectives of Accord- may be matter of degree or cost. Can't be open ended on cost. Program should relate to problems caused by the two projects in the D (impacts to fishery etc.) Concerned with Program scope. (S. Pyle)
- 95-57 December 4 Workshop - alternative development process. Imprecise wording problematic. Specifics on perf. measures. Restoration aspects of Program should not be driven by ESA, rather long term consideration. Ideas on core actions. CCed memo from Frank on core actions. (P. Chadwick)
- 96-4 Draft Problem Summaries (8/95) Impacted water user groups defined as ag, urban and envir-leaves out social community values which underlie current uses-critical role water has in communities must be recognized. Need room to consider impact of changes on ag and fishing communities-econom integrity. Must change mistrust. BDAC should not be tech advice, rather provide dialogue on values and reflect diverse interests. (Family Farmers)
- 96-7 Don't want overreliance on new tech or engineering solutions. Model program is almond growers and pesticide management - practices can change (Family Farmers)
- 96-14 Comments on Draft Alternative Report. Range good, reasonably balanced. Must have cost estimates even if rounded to nearest million. Water supply implications must be explored, can't narrow further unless we know what redistribution would be like. General nature of alts continues to make analysis difficult (S. Buer)
- 95-3 Include SF Bay in program problem definition (R. Raab)