

## Comments on Water Supply

Alameda County Water District: During critically dry years we need to see 65% of our entitlement out of the swp. P

can't get around emphasis on demand for more water as one of the components- if there is a drought, there wouldn't be enough water to send through any type of conveyance. P

Q- Which alternative(s) increases/deceases water supply? San Diego? Central Valley? Add water supply to list of concerns.

A- Some improvement water supply reliability; some increase opportunities for water transfers, etc.= increased water supply. All address water supply to some degree. SD

RCRC: source counties have water needs as well. BK

Rummelsberg: see nothing in 2nd stage that will improve our water supply BK

RCRC: Watershed management can provide water supply increase of 12-22% SD

Local water cost is -7,000/af. Local use expected to rise. Is there a lower minimum deliverable that can be guaranteed in alts? Is there an underlying promise of more water for future? What is worst I can expect from this list? A. Can't fully answer. No district should rely on one source, this program won't meet all needs. Will create market opportunity, fix bottlenecks in systems. SD

Additional supplies should be addressed in depth in the enviro review process to make sure all aspects are covered. San Diego uses 1/5 of the water Imperial Valley uses. SD

The water supply alternatives will be most beneficial to our water users. SD

Need to improve water supply reliability for all users. SD

How much water could you get? RB

Which alternative has most potential? South needing more water has caused some problems. SAC

How many MAF goes out of Delta to So CA? If they didn't take water, would this project be necessary? RB

Problem is water going south. RB

Will there be enough water for the projected demand? RB

Tehama County needs water -- 2/3rds now ground water. RB

Why are you looking for all this excessive water? Why are you looking for more acre feet going into the Delta? RB

LA Chamber feels none of alts meet their needs. None provides reliability to So CA. None focuses on getting SO CA its share of Delta water. So CA has spent \$8 billion in infrastructure for water since 1982. BCH

If southern CA didn't take water, would this project be necessary? Are you talking about water going to LA? You don't want to give more water to San Joaquin? SAC

Will any water go to Las Vegas? Should not. SAC

Have you looked at amount of water being sold to Las Vegas? Suggest that this isn't going to supplement this supply -- would like to use water in the north. RB

Want to develop water in north state. SAC

Theme in the north is that south is taking out water. How can we deal with that? SAC

Supply reliability at 50% of today inadequate. Need to avoid ESA shut downs while protecting array of fish. MET likes aspects of ea alternative. BCH

RCRC: Source counties need more supply, transfers don't go uphill. BCH

What about reduction in exports? A: Shows broad info in workshop packet. O

Santa Clara Water District: concern with water supply to county, 60% of supply comes from water systems O

Water user concerns are not adequately stated and when we get down to making a decision, we're afraid that the program will be forced to select the alternative that does into meet our purposes. O

Change project purpose to reflect user needs. O

Selection criteria should include supply & reliability (vulnerability of supplies) -- new certainty re future ESA listings. BCH

Must make provision for urban deliveries. BCH

CUWA supports MET's comments. Want to establish system to get away from ESA. BCH

Cities always get the water first. People are at the top of the food chain and they need it first, but it usually comes at the expense of AG. There are few that list increased supply. People need food, and we supply it. The world food supply is threatened (mad cow disease, etc.) If we as nation want to develop, must have excess food production to sell wheat. Farmer needs assurance of continued water rights, seems that in every proposal just taking away from farmer. WG

(Perception is that) LA wants clean water, not from Delta, as expense of ag. WG

Does reliability imply decreased supply? A: It can. Some people have made a point of saying they want reliability and supply. BK

Kern County Water Agency: SWP is our sole source. Delta Accord not widely support here, but led to assumption CALFED would try to restore supply. Unhappy don't see that yet. BK

Would Alt C increase supply? A: It's possible. Would need further modeling. BK

B & F give no meaningful increase in water supply. G, H, & I are not implementable. BK

CA Farm Bureau: Districts will need water to solve current shortages. Prefer H, I, J. BK

California needs more water. BK

Stu Pyle: Inadequate definition of problem of mingling developed and natural water. CALFED objectives are not clear re increasing water supply. BK

Farmer needs dependability for row crops. BK

We see nothing in earlier stages that will improve our water supply. BK

95-2 Water supply problem statements missing key element such as inflow; recognize that Delta has no supply of its own. Delta hydraulics needs to be part of (T. Maddock)

95-4 Water supply problems statement - clarify the focus is on quantity, not quality. Water quality is a major water supply problem. Water supply problem statement - need distinction between env. Water needs in Delta and for export. (L. Rene & T. Berliner)

95-6 Water supply problem definition and objectives; Mission Statement. Supply statements downplay role of economics. Not sufficient supply to meet demand, outdated mode of

planning. Must recognize need for more flexibility to respond to future imbalances. Add there is a mismatch.. Comments on mission were nearly all addressed- jk (R. Weiner, D. Yargas, G. Bobker)

- 95-13 Sept. 14, 1995 Workshop. Contrary to CALFED statements, we do understand yield and needs. Underlying inefficiencies are lack of system integration
- 95-16 CCed comments to SWRCB; dont want more env. Water demand to be made on existing upstream water supplies and storage or on unappropriated water, which will preclude add. Water develop. By the M. Counties to meet growing needs. Unfair for them to pay for damage caused by others. Protect area of origin. (C. Williams)
- 95-17 Raise Friant. Could cir. water from DMC to SJRiver, then down to Delta. Comments re SJR barriers. Rec water constrained-can cause salt disposal problems from reuse areas. Transfers from trib water can cause loss of return flows
- 95-27 decline-replace "export" with diversion
- 95-31 Definition and Categories of Action-problem statements need to recognize impacts of operations from SWP and CVP; originally planned D. transfer facilities were never constructed. SWP contractors want improvements in supply form the D. Proposes new problem statement: "SWP unable to operate at planned or optimal level of water develop. due to impacts on B-D ecosystem.". Includes details on restrictions which negatively impact project yields. Mitigation of the projects and benefits to projects must be determined. (S. Pyle)
- 95-34 Sept. 26, 1995 Public Meeting. Return flows to the river and till then install Old River gate to close when pumps are running on out-going tide (V. Rosasco)
- 95-53 Must enhance water supply for S CAL- water supply augmentation. Conservation and reclamation not enough-must authorize building of facilities to transport and store water.
- 95-56 Must recognized forecasted need for 3 MAF more water for SoCAL in future. Would rule out overall state supply as objective for CALFED. Instead, must provide for ops of SWP and CVP at current levels within accord. CALFED actions should be related to Accord-change and manage D aquatic habitats, provide flows to meet needs. (S. Pyle)