

APPENDIX O

*CALFED Bay-Delta Program
Appendices - Phase I Summary Report*

DRAFT *June 21, 1996*

APPENDIX O - SCOPING COMMENT SUMMARY

The CALFED Program EIS/R scoping period ran from April 8 through May 20, 1996. More than 700 Californians confronted Bay-Delta problems at nine events in April and May including 7 scoping meetings, Workshop 6, and a public meeting in Los Banos. Listed below are the dates, locations and numbers of people who attended the meetings and Workshop.

Date	Location/Event	Attendance
April 8	Oakland/Scoping	47 people
April 9	Walnut Grove/Scoping	37 people
April 10	Red Bluff/Scoping	84 people
April 15	Sacramento/Scoping	37 people
April 15	Sacramento/Workshop 6	250 people
April 16	San Diego/Scoping	39 people
April 17	Long Beach/Scoping	23 people
April 17	Pasadena/Scoping	25 people
April 18	Bakersfield/Scoping	80 people
May 6	Los Banos/Public Meeting	110 people
	9 Events	700+ people

Most of the comments provided constructive criticism of the 10 alternatives and the process used to develop the proposed Bay-Delta solutions. Agricultural representatives argued against significant land fallowing. Some environmental interests requested more detail on ecosystem restoration goals, while urban water users asked for water quality assurances. At Workshop 6, additional issues, such as key information sources, financial approaches, and CEQA and NEPA considerations were discussed.

Oral comments were generally consistent with comments contained in the over 160 letters received by the Program. The hundreds of comments from the workshop, meetings, and letters are synthesized below by component category to identify key emerging themes and issues. By no means comprehensive, this list highlights significant issues identified as needing to be addressed during the refinement of the alternatives. A complete scoping comment document including Program responses is included following this summary.

General Water Supply

1. The alternatives do not appear to increase overall supply of water. The Program must clearly show how alternatives will increase the opportunity to move, store, and use more water.
2. The issue of the integrity of the common pool concept must be addressed. Many believe that the common pool approach should be retained and expressed concern that any portion of flow redirected through an isolated facility would undermine this concept. Others suggest that some flow might be isolated without jeopardizing the common pool provided assurances are iron-clad.
3. Area of origin concerns must be considered as alternatives are proposed and impacts analyzed.

Ecosystem Restoration

1. Clarify and elaborate the Program's vision for ecosystem restoration. Provide additional definitions, goals and objectives. A fully developed Ecosystem Restoration Plan should be part of all the alternatives.
2. The Program needs to expand watershed management and actions as part of the overall effort.
3. The Program should more explicitly show how it is treating the need for increases in critical Delta outflow and the need for additional instream flows for the benefit of fish and wildlife. This concept should be explicit in the Ecosystem Restoration Plan.
4. Ecosystem restoration will entail changes in current land uses and configurations. Resulting impacts to existing habitats and current economic uses of those lands must be predicted and thoroughly analyzed.
5. The Program needs to address the concerns of commentors who believe that the Program fails to provide benefits in core and essential actions to other areas aside from ecosystem restoration. Benefits in system vulnerability, water quality, and water supply reliability need to be brought into better focus.

Water Quality

1. Reduction of pollutants at the source should be a core action.
2. The alternatives need to clarify how each will seek to obtain the best source of water for end users' needs. Public health requirements must be explicitly addressed as part of the assumptions which guide alternative development.
3. The mere dilution of pollutant elements will not satisfy the objective of improving water quality.
4. Alternatives must clearly express how each will address salt and chemical recirculation problems now associated with Delta water.
5. The Program needs to address the San Joaquin drainage issue.
6. The Program must address potential water quality impacts of various facility and non-facility proposals. A common pool proposal may have water quality impacts to south of Delta users; an isolated facility may have impacts to in-Delta users. Any alternative which degrades Delta water quality must not be chosen.
7. Degradation of water quality, when water is transported through the Delta, affects the ability of urban agencies to recycle water.
8. Disinfection by-products resulting from bromides in Delta water are a concern.
9. Improve and augment water quality actions in all alternatives.

Conveyance

1. Dual and through Delta conveyance options protect Delta water quality. Explain how an isolated facility be will be implemented to protect quality in the Delta.
2. Regional flood control issues should be described in all conveyance options.
3. Analyze the seismic vulnerability of facilities.
4. Discuss isolation of drinking water for the dual conveyance option.
5. Discuss water transfers and potential impacts.
6. Discuss the need to remove Delta constraints before storage can be effective.

Storage

1. Discuss, as a high priority, expanding existing storage (raise dams).
2. Prioritize conjunctive use first, then groundwater banking.

Water Use Efficiency

1. Water use efficiency should be a stronger theme and part of every alternative.
2. Land retirement elements of alternatives must be reconsidered. Current ranges in alternatives could have major redirected impacts and therefore may not meet solution principles. Re-think land fallowing vs. retirement. Evaluate the potential for third-party impacts, and re-evaluate the total number of acres proposed as part of willing seller buy-out program.
3. Recognize the difference between long-term conservation and shortage measures.
4. Water use efficiency needs to be preserved as a local implementation item.

Continued System Vulnerability

1. A greater level of levee stabilization (such as the PL 99 Standard) should be implemented in each alternative.
2. Many parties expressed support for an enhanced levee stabilization program.
3. Flood control measures in the North Delta need to be included in all alternatives.

Institutional Guarantees and Assurances

1. The Program needs to develop guarantees so that the ecosystem actions will be effective.
2. The Program needs to develop mechanisms to link the Program components in ways which ensure that all parties will eventually achieve the desired benefit, even in cases when one component is staged before another component.

Detailed Scoping Comments and Responses

The above summary provides an overview of issues raised as a result of scoping. The following pages provide a detailed compilation of the scoping comments and the Program responses.

******Note: 20-30 pages of scoping comment/response will be included
at this location when compiled over the next few weeks******