01272

JUN 29 1998

Neil Evans
1138 Deetz Rd.
Mt. Shasta, CA 96067

CALFED Bay Delta Program
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155
Sacramento, CA 95814

June 22, 1998

Dear Representatives:

I have read much of the documentation prepared by CALFED pertaining to the upcoming plans for changes in water and Delta management in California and would like to make the following comments and suggestions.

PLANNING FOR NEW STORAGE

I see little in the Progammatic EIRS/EIR about the details of providing new storage facilities. I am in favor of providing new storage in the western Sacramento Valley, but I am very concerned about the proposed "plumbing" system to fill those reservoirs. **Rather than raise Shasta Dam, an absurd proposal, a pipeline (or two, three or four) should be built from Shasta dam to the west side canals (or to new canals) This would allow surplus winter flow to be channeled directly to the canals supplying water to the offstream dams.** It would reduce flood problems along the Sacramento River between Redding and Chico, and possibly farther south, as the outflow from Shasta Dam could be split. It would also eliminate the need to pump water from the river, with the associated diversion dam," hard points", and fish screen problems.

A Whiskeytown tie-in would also allow for surplus Trinity flows to reach these new reservoirs. Gravity feed directly from Whiskeytown and Shasta could place the water at a higher point on the western slope to reduce pumping costs. It might be possible to entirely eliminate the need for the Red Bluff Diversion Dam and fish screen and the Glen-Colusa Canal pumps and fish screen. This would probably have a favorable effect on salmon populations and reduce the need for rip-raping to maintain "hard" pumping points.

In addition, the flows in the Sacramento River, especially the upper river, could be better managed for fishery enhancement since water for

the South could be returned to the stream farther down stream. There would be increased flexibility in managing water flows throughout the system and reducing possible high-flow damage to fisheries.

New offstream storage capacity should be primarily held for drought years. Drawdown during wet years should be minimal, although stored water could flow through the pipe and canal bypass from Shasta during the summer to maintain current water contracts and regulate upper river flows. **No new contracts for additional water should be allowed unless new storage facilities are built that would provide such water, even in drought years.**

DELTA TRANSFER IMPROVEMENTS

Although against the original Peripheral Canal plan, I now feel that Alternative Three is probably the best plan for improving urban water quality and flow reversals. My main concern is that in 20 years an increase in water demand may result in additional pumping from existing points, thereby negating any permanent benefits of this expensive proposal. Operational controls to minimize fish loss should be mandated by law before the new canal is built and not subject to changes due to increased agricultural/urban demand or droughts.

DELTA LEVEE IMPROVEMENTS

While it is desirable to maintain the integrity of islands in the Delta, I wonder how we will deal with the long-term subsistence of delta soils. Is this another postponement of facing the facts?

WATER USE EFFICIENCY

I was quite disappointed in this part of the proposal. **The term "cost effective" was used so much that the whole program could be negated by this factor.** This section seemed to me to be written by water agencies that want to maintain current pricing, but have more and better quality water. In other words "have their cake and eat it too". There are few teeth in this proposal as so much is voluntary and left up to individual agencies. I saw what happened during the last drought, and many, many people were very unhappy with the inconsistent application of water rationing/conservation programs in various parts of the state. All

urban homes should have water meters (even in Sacramento), and water use should be on a graduated payment scale, with a triple rate or more for use beyond a reasonable amount (which does not include filling swimming pools or excessive landscaping).

There is a basic principle that the South doesn't seem to be willing to accept, and I for one, think its time they did. **If you want to live in a desert region, or if you derive an economic benefit from activity there (such as farming), then you must live like desert animals and plants, and do everything possible to conserve water.** Water is "expensive" to native desert animals. They pay by being restricted to night time activity and often to areas near water holes. Desert plants often have to shut down their photosynthesis (stomates close and CO2 availability is less) during the heat of the day or during droughts and growth suffers.

Yet man just expects to have all the amenities that are present in wetter locations, plus "evaporation ponds" (swimming pools), and growth is not to be limited by lack of water. Well, it will be eventually because there is only so much water available. If we continue to supply current water users with more water we will only be increasing the demand and postponing the problem for a few years, sort of a "head in the sand" philosophy. **In addition, source counties may have their future growth limited by prior appropriation of water.**

In the drier areas of the state growing plants with overhead or flood irrigation where evaporation rates are high should be discouraged, and farmland in some areas should be taken out of production or severely limited. Perhaps some crops should not even be grown. On a trip down I-5 in March, I was shocked to see the recent (last 5 years) and rapid conversion of marginal farmland (formerly grazing land) into orchards, primarily almonds, which as permanent crops, will have a high priority for water in drought years. **Is the best use of our scarce water resources the growing of Pistachios and almonds on the west side of the SJ Valley?**

Urban landscaping in the dry areas should be minimal and use xeropyhtic plants. Lawns should be discouraged. Fountains and golf courses should use reclaimed water or not exist. CALFED and water district funds should be used to help urban areas install piping to utilize reclaimed water. **Going without things that are present in areas with lots of water should be part of the price one pays for living in a dry, sunny climate, or part of the price one pays for a**

relatively inexpensive home built on desert land (Lancaster - Palmdale area for example).

Secondly, **water is too cheap.** As a former resodent of Fremont, CA, and a user of South Bay Aquaduct water, I have some idea of urban water rates. **When your monthly water bill is less than your electricity, gas, or telephone bill (for most families), there is no incentive to conserve. There is plenty of "room" for increases in current water rates.** Sure people will complain, but educational programs need to emphasize the relatively low cost of water, yet the high costs (both monetary and environmental) of providing this water. In addition, if water were more expensive, desalinization would be a more feasible alternative for southern cities. A lot more programs would be "cost effective" if water were priced much higher, especially for urban users.

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

One of the themes presented by some people from the North State at the hearing in Redding was that more logging and vegetation removal would release more soil moisture for runoff. There are at least two problems to this simplistic approach. First is that the slowing of runoff by vegetation and forest litter tends to reduce flooding. Second is that disturbance of forest soils and ground cover (litter, shrubs, etc.) by logging machinery inevitably increases erosion, as would the increased speed of the runoff. Extra sediment reduces water quality, fills up reservoirs, increases dredging costs in the Delta and SF Bay, and raises the floor of Delta channels to increase the chance of levee breaching.

It is true that northern residents have gotten little to nothing from past removal of water originating in the north, but more logging will cause more problems than it solves. The ecological problems may be just transferred from the Delta to northern forests. Watershed management is a good idea if done properly and erosion control is certainly one area where improvements are needed. While some removal/thinning of forest understory is good for reducing the fire danger, it should not be done with a goal of increasing runoff.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

It is here that the source counties have suffered. While San Joaquin and

Southern California counties have prospered from the supply of water sent south, Northern counties have received little economic benefit (mostly as revenue from recreation money due to the larger dams). Landowners in the south have greatly benefited from turning poor soils or desert land into farms and housing tracts. **Perhaps the State should lend the Northern counties the money to build new dams and let them pay off the dams from water they sell to the South (similar to what Yuba county has done). That way in drought years water would be unavailable to the South or they would have to pay more for it. Water conservation would be enhanced, the northern source counties would have assurances that it would have water when their growth or the weather dictated that they needed it, and it would provide an economic benefit to these counties, which tend to be quite poor when compared to urban counties.** The money could be used to build or repair their infrastructure, for welfare costs, job training, enhance recreation (their main economic attraction), and to attract industry.

WATER TRANSFERS

The plan to allow northern water users to sell their surface allotments and pump from underground is a recipe for ecological disaster. Two major problems will develop if this happens. One is the probability of over using underground replacement sources, as has happened in the southern San Joaquin Valley. The other is described in the enclosed article which appeared in the California Waterfowl Association's June/July magazine. If rice gets changed to cotton, then any wetland enhancement as part of the CALFED environmental restoration plan will be offset by habitat loss in the Sacramento Valley. If land is taken out of production, then I see less of a problem with water transfers, since no underground water would be pumped. Please do NOT implement this proposal.

WHO WILL PAY

The basic premises suggested in this plan need to be revised. **Water users should pay nearly the entire cost of implementing this plan. Other than for the maintenance of Delta levees, there should be no cost to Source counties (unless they have control over the water and can sell it to the highest bidder.....**

desirable, but unlikely that this will happen) or to unaffected areas of the state. The use of Prop. 209 funds should be more than adequate to cover the rest-of-the-State's share.

It is unconscionable that lower-salaried residents in poorer rural counties not only lose their resource, but then are being asked to pay for ecosystem restoration made necessary by the removal of that resource to the south. Urban and agricultural users derive great economic benefit from the diverted water. The ecosystem problems are largely the result of water diversion to the south and urban areas so they should pay for this as well as new transfer or storage facilities. If they weren't using this water, and demanding more, the ecosystem restoration needed would be minimal. Source counties receive no benefit from loss of their water.

I will let others comment on assurances and the ecosystem restoration aspects of the plan. Thank you for considering these comments and suggestions as you formulate a revised plan.

Sincerely,

Neil Evans