

ORIGINAL

CALFED BAY-DELTA PROGRAM HEARING
September 14, 1999
7:00 p.m.
Visalia Convention Center
Visalia, California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTED BY STACY BALLANTYNE, C.S.R. 6139

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1

C-022375

C-022375

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

PAGE

SENATOR COSTA.....	3
NEIL FERNBAUGH.....	16
DOUG MOSEBAR.....	18
JACK STONE.....	21
GLENN H. RIDER.....	23
RON JACOBSMA.....	25
KOLE UPTON.....	28
JUDY CASE.....	30
NETTIE DRAKE.....	33
JOHN BIOVANNETTI.....	34
DON MILLS.....	37
JIM VERBTGON.....	39
BOB WESTFALL.....	41
TERRY BAKER.....	43
JOHN McCALL.....	45
WILLIAM COOKE.....	48
SHIRLEY BATCHMAN.....	49
BOB KEENUM.....	52
ALENE TAYLOR.....	54
LLOYD FRYER.....	56
MARY LOU COTHEN.....	58
STUART PYLE.....	60
ARTHUR UNGER.....	63
ADRIENNE MATHEWS.....	65
JOHN STOVALL.....	68
JIM BECK.....	70
MARY ANN LOCKHART.....	72
WILLIAM TAUBE.....	75
J. STEVEN WORTHLEY.....	77
ED YAMAMOTO.....	79
RUSS WAYMIRE.....	80
CARLA EGGMAN-GARRETT.....	82
BILL MAZE.....	84
DON LANDERS.....	85
SEAN GEIVET.....	87
BLAKE SANDEN.....	89
J. ALLEN AKKERMAN.....	91
BILL CARLISLE.....	94
ROGER REYNOLDS.....	96
BARBARA FERGUSON.....	99
MIKE GEORGE.....	101
BILL FERRY.....	103
GREG de ROULHAC.....	104
STEVE DALKE.....	107
BRENT GRAHAM.....	108

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PAGE

D.A. TUMA.....	111
MARTHA GUZMAN	113
VIANE TORRES.....	113
BOB BRISTER.....	114
DAN VINK.....	115
JIM PHENE.....	118
KEVIN HALL.....	119
KEVIN JOHANSEN.....	123
STEVE OFTENMUELLER.....	125
MARY ANNA MCKINLEY.....	127
BOB LUDEKENS.....	129
MEL TANO.....	131

---o0o---

1 SENATOR COSTA: I'm speaking as some who has
2 helped finance your internal efforts over the last four plus
3 years and the one that has put together real dollars pm on
4 the state and federal level to finance the projects that we
5 saw many of them displayed in that video just a few moments
6 ago. California is, I think at a crossroads. And the water
7 policy that we develop now for the next century will
8 ultimately determine whether or not California remains the
9 golden state into the new millennium. Let me suggest to you
10 what I think the long-term goals ought to be of CALFED.
11 What initially started to be a three year effort and that
12 has not had two year extensions.

13 The long-term goals of CALFED and the rest of
14 the state ought to be to provide water to meet the needs of
15 agriculture, urban growth and the environment. Secondly,
16 our long-term goals ought to be to develop a comprehensive
17 plan that would reduces the repeating demands for water in
18 the Delta.

19 Now let me suggest to you what I think our near
20 term goals should be, by near term, I'm talking about over
21 the close of the next four years. First of all, and many of
22 you have heard me say this in years past, all of our water
23 problems in California, if not directly related to one
24 another are indirectly related to one another and so the
25 five goals that I'm going to enumerate to you here while

1 some of them are directly a part of the CALFED effort, some
2 of them are not. But they all together must happen if we
3 are going to have success and make headway in the next four
4 years.

5 First we need to complete this water transfer in
6 Southern California in the next sixty days. It's critical.
7 The legislature put up last year two hundred thirty-five
8 million dollars to see it happen. We have had four agencies
9 in a very contentious process and we have given about it as
10 much time and patience as we possibly can. This must happen
11 because if it does, it can prove that California that as it
12 relates to our water source from the Colorado River means
13 business about getting to our 4.4 allocation. That will be
14 the first step. If we can complete that in the next sixty
15 days, then the plans that we have put fourth, that the
16 Department of Water Resources for a real 4.4 million acre --
17 plan in the Colorado River, I think can be achievable in the
18 next fifteen years. If we can do that, our lower basin
19 states, I think will support Secretary Babbitt next year in
20 allowing for river reoperation in the Colorado River. That
21 will reduce the demand from Southern California on water
22 from Northern California. And that is important for the
23 entire state.

24 In addition to that we need to have a water bond
25 placed on the ballot next year and we've done that as a

1 result of our efforts on Friday that will provide us interim
2 financing to deal with some of the solutions that CALFED is
3 recommending in the Delta as it relates to fish screens and
4 barriers and also to provide monies to deal with interim
5 water reliabilities to supply issues that are truly a need
6 here in the valley. So in the event that in the next year
7 or two, or three, that we have another delta smelt crisis,
8 we don't have the serious possibility of shutting off water
9 being exported south of the Delta.

10 The water bond provides funding for every region
11 of this state, but ladies and gentlemen let me tell you
12 there are some real important benefits for the central
13 valley and that's why I began this weekend developing the
14 team to support the water bond measure on a by-participant
15 grass roots basis for the March ballot next year. The
16 Governor will sign that water bond measure within the next
17 thirty days. And that is I think a very hopefully sign.

18 Finally, of the five achievements that are
19 necessary. While the water bond compliments the CALFED
20 effort, the water bond stands on it's own.

21 The fifth goal that we must achieve is to put
22 CALFED back on track. There are mid-course corrections that
23 I'm going to enumerate at this point and that I think many
24 of the other witnesses will testify to, that are absolutely
25 critical, if CALFED is going to maintain it's creditability

1 and be able to implement solutions that will solve real
2 problems. Now the following I think is what needs to be
3 done over the course of the next year.

4 First of all, the current focus must change from
5 process to implementation. The sixteen state and federal
6 agencies together in the last four years you folks have done
7 a marvelous job on process, but I must tell you as
8 constructive criticism, you have processed yourselves and us
9 to death practically. I think we really have to work on
10 implementation. I know it's been a long arguous effort.
11 But I think that we have to look at implementing some of the
12 things that you are now moving on. Of the two hundred and
13 fifty million dollars in projects for environmental efforts
14 and the additional three hundred ninety million that's
15 available with the EIS and the EIR must be completed.
16 CALFED unfortunately in the last eighteen months has not
17 shown a similar ability to implement projects that benefit
18 water users. That is where part of your credibility now is
19 suffering from, I believe. CALFED must balance it's work.
20 To date, because of efforts that I and many of my colleges
21 have been engaged in we have provided over one billion
22 dollars to deal with restoration in environmental areas. As
23 you said in the video it's the largest environmental
24 restoration project undertaken in the country. But only the
25 state bond money that we passed in '96, through 204 has been

1 allocated and I think it is important to note that projects
2 to water users.

3 I think additional funding is going to have to
4 be accomplished outside of CALFED. We must balance the
5 portfolio of water supply options. Currently in the
6 preferred alternative one, only ground water storage, are
7 only surface storage is being discussed. Neither of those
8 by themselves in my opinion will be sufficient.

9 CALFED must develop a storage portfolio that
10 includes both ground water and surface storage to be
11 successful. And the integrated investigation effort that
12 you are pursuing must be put on the front burner. And I'm
13 talking about within the time-line that you have established
14 before the middle of next year. CALFED must regain it's
15 credibility by making decisions based on scientific evidence
16 and fact, not allowing and not getting involved in the
17 political world. It's up to those of us who are elected
18 officials, I believe, to make political decisions. That's
19 not CALFED responsibility.

20 CALFED, I think, has been, unfortunately in the
21 last several years allowing politics to determine it's
22 preferred alternatives. What is acceptable, what is not
23 acceptable. I think fishery agencies have clearly stated in
24 the documentation, both at the federal and the state level
25 that alternative three is the most beneficial for fish and

1 others have said that it's the most beneficial for water
2 quality. However, that has been put, as we all know, on the
3 back burner. It's been given the short shrift as we say.
4 They will explain the three alternatives and they were
5 alluded to in the video earlier. But alternative three
6 talks about, and it's the last that CALFED is looking at, as
7 an isolated facility if the first two alternatives are not
8 successful.

9 I think CALFED must establish a governance
10 structure that is different from the current one. And it
11 must include all the state culgers (phonetic) to be involved
12 in those ultimate decisions that are critical.

13 One of the other criticisms that I have to offer
14 is the time lines. Time lines must produce results. One of
15 the other reasons I believe that you're suffering in
16 creditability these days, is because that the time lines,
17 frankly seem to continue to move. It started off with a
18 three year mandate. Now you have had two extensions. I
19 know this is slow and painful work. And as I tell my
20 colleges who engage in the water effort with us in the state
21 capital, that if this stuff were easy it would have been
22 done a long time ago. It's not easy. But the fact of the
23 matter is, is that critical decisions on a time line with a
24 EIF and a EIR must include the following; a decision on
25 surface storage, a decision with clear efficient government

1 structure that includes significant state -- participation
2 and three a stage one implementation program that provides
3 water for the water users before the end of state one and
4 that is a very important point.

5 In conclusion, let me offer the following
6 advice:

7 The Bay-Delta accord was negotiated as a result
8 of a water crisis caused by competitor water user interests
9 and environmental needs in the Delta. We have ratcheted the
10 Delta, which is the lynch pin of our putting system so far
11 down, that it has little flexibility anymore. And it was a
12 crisis that brought us to this point. Now a lot of folks
13 have had frustrations with the CALFED process, but I think
14 that we need to remember how we got here. CALFED was
15 created to develop a plan that would enable water users to
16 continue to divert water from the Delta, while at the same
17 time improving the Delta Eco system. To date much has been
18 done for the Delta Eco system through Prop 204 that carried,
19 along with Secretary of State, Bill Jones. The federal Bay-
20 Delta appropriations and the CBPIA restorations fund have
21 also been helpful in implementing your short-term projects.
22 However, nothing but planning exercises have been done to
23 improve our water supplies and that has to change. Under the
24 new water bond measure that we have for the March ballot, if
25 the voters of California approve it, money will be available

1 to deal with a host of water supply reliability needs.

2 I think we need to understand that as a result
3 of this past summers delta smelt crisis, it painfully
4 reminded all of what the down sides are if CALFED is not
5 successful. If CALFED is not successful, we could very soon
6 find ourselves in circumstances where the state and federal
7 pumps could be shut off for extended periods of time. That
8 is unacceptable. But perhaps more even frightening is
9 CALFED's current plans for stage one that had been fully
10 implemented and if they were operational this past summer,
11 we still might not have been able to avert the delta smelt
12 crisis. The entire concept behind CALFED is that every
13 region of the state gets healthy together. Under CALFED
14 stage one proposal, there is a great fear in this room this
15 evening that that will not happen.

16 Knowing what the alternatives are, I still
17 believe that CALFED is still our best hope after having
18 been, I think, somewhat critical. That I believe that
19 CALFED is our best hope, knowing what the alternatives are
20 to fix the problems in the Delta and to provide water
21 quality, water reliability and Eco system restoration for
22 every region of California. But it's time to make the mid-
23 course corrections in this process if we are going to insure
24 the success of CALFED. Because if we don't make the mid-
25 course corrections, at this point in time, together with

1 Governor Davis' administration and the federal
2 administration back in Washington, we know, that the lack of
3 success can only portend terrible economic consequences to
4 California's agricultural industry. The growth of it's
5 urban communities and the restoration of the environment.
6 That's what is at stake ladies and gentlemen. I remain
7 committed to this effort. I want to continue to work with
8 all of the parties involved, but we must make the course
9 corrections necessary if you are going to restore the
10 credibility necessary to implement the solutions. To solve
11 the water problems in California and that's what is at
12 stake. Thank you very much.

13 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you very much Senator
14 Costa and Assembly member Reyes.

15 (Pause in the proceedings.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 MR. BODOVITZ: We'll now move to the formal
2 hearing, which we hear from you.

3 My name is Joe Bodovitz. Although I
4 work with CALFED Bay-Delta Program, I'm not part
5 of it. Whether -- I have a small nonprofit
6 organization that works throughout agreements on
7 possible on -- contentious issues we'll be
8 discussing tonight. My own background having been
9 first Director of the Coastal Commission and later
10 Executive Director of Public Utilities Commission,
11 among other things, regulates all the vector owned
12 companies in California. So I have some
13 experience with the issues we'll be discussing
14 tonight.

15 My purpose in being here and the
16 reason I've been asked to conduct the hearing is
17 to help assure that these are independent,
18 unbiased hearings on the CALFED preferred
19 alternative and the draft environmental impact
20 statement.

21 In a moment I'll explain the ground
22 rules for tonight, which are really pretty
23 simple. Before that I want to introduce some of
24 the CALFED people who are here with us tonight.

25 Luana Kiger of the National

1 Resources Conservation Services.

2 Ryan Broadkick, Department of Fish &
3 Game, Army Corps.

4 A.J. Yates, Food and Agriculture.

5 In addition, a member of the
6 Bay-Delta file committee, Stuart Pyle is here.

7 Thank you all for coming here.

8 We will be recording, tape recording
9 and also transcribing all the testimony tonight.
10 So, you may be assured even the members of CALFED
11 that are not here will be acquainted with what you
12 all say tonight.

13 The key ground rule for this evening
14 is to fill out one of these yellow cards, if you
15 wish to speak. We have a large number of cards
16 already, so I assume most of you may already know
17 that, but if you wish to speak tonight it is
18 necessary to fill out one of the yellow cards.
19 And this is all -- the other 16 hearings being
20 held around the state, we take speakers in the
21 order in which the cards are filled out, believing
22 that is about as fair a way to apportion the time
23 as possible.

24 Now, as to the ground rules
25 quickly. You may submit written comments on the

1 CALFED proposals of any length.

2 And there's a leaflet on the table
3 outside that explains how to do that, where you
4 send them and what the deadlines are in this
5 hearing as in all the others. However, verbal
6 statements will be limited to three minutes. That
7 will -- let's us hear from a lot of people and
8 still let everybody go home at a reasonably
9 reasonable hour.

10 This is the microphone you'll use.
11 And to help you know how you're doing with three
12 minutes we have a little traffic light up here.
13 When you start speaking the light is green. When
14 you have one minute left, the light will be
15 yellow. When your time is up, the light will be
16 red. And we ask in fairness to the people yet to
17 speak you conclude the sentence you're on. It's
18 possible to say a great deal in three minutes, as
19 we've learned from these hearings.

20 Finally, in an effort to help move
21 things along, I will call three names at a time.
22 There are a lot of us here tonight which have --
23 you will be in the middle of the rows, somewhere
24 near the back, if you hear your name called, it
25 will help us make good use of this evening's time

15

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

C - 0 2 2 3 8 9

C-022389

1 if you move out to the aisle and get ready when
2 your name is called, so we won't spend too much
3 time.

4 If all that is clear, let's get
5 started and hear from you. The first three names
6 are Neil Fernbaugh, Doug Mosebar and Jack Stone.

7 MR. FERNBAUGH: By being first, I don't
8 know, I'm probably the most unique stranger in the
9 room to some of you. I'm also probably the only
10 person in the room that is both a member of the
11 Farm Bureau and a leader in the Sierra Club, so I
12 risk offending both parties tonight.

13 My wife and I have a small ranch out
14 north of Ivanhoe. We have citrus and we rely on
15 CALFED water and we need that water. Okay. So,
16 in no way does what I say reflect negatively on
17 the farming interests.

18 I think often many environmentalists
19 don't recognize that farmers have been -- many
20 more crops with much less water. And I think the
21 environmental community needs to hear that
22 statement. I think we need to get rid of the old
23 way of thinking. I have seen a lot of negativity
24 that is not true. Can and will continue to work
25 together. We've got to get rid of the old way of

1 thinking. We have to quit intensifying urban ag.
2 And CALFED can do that and needs to offer bold new
3 solutions.

4 I think a lot of the conflict in the
5 room tonight may be unnecessary. I think, first
6 off, there is a flood water analysis that you're
7 using that makes it appear that we need new dams
8 and new water supplies. In fact, the MWD Water
9 District was using the same amount of water
10 fourteen years ago despite a 30 percent increase
11 in population. The city of LA is now using a
12 hundred thousand acre feet less water than it was
13 using in 1990.

14 Can we solve these problems? Yes,
15 we can. In our own little ranch we just tore out
16 a quarter of our trees. I expect we'll reduce
17 water use by five to ten percent at least. It's
18 not we want to give up any of the water we have, I
19 think the numbers have shown me that we're going
20 to need more. And that's a concern that I have
21 because as we ask for water controls and as we
22 expect to work out a solution for this, if we all
23 keep asking for more, none of us will get what we
24 need.

25 So as a result, I'm urging you to

1 pursue the idea that we not go for new reservoirs
2 or canals during stage one. Not to say there
3 won't be a need for new water storage in the
4 future. First let's start simpler, less expensive
5 alternatives.

6 The taxpayers will not support
7 massive new water projects. We're not the only
8 voters in this state and nobody wants to subsidize
9 craziness. Stop polluting the source. We're
10 responsible on our farms. Ag is certainly doing
11 its part to preserve and investor's interests have
12 to take their role there. Let's seriously develop
13 ground water, managing management, pollution
14 protection and water treatment.

15 MR. BODOVITZ: That is enough.

16 MR. FERNBAUGH: I'll submit my rest
17 later. Thank you.

18 MR. BODOVITZ: Doug Mosebar, Jack Stone,
19 Milton Smith.

20 MR. MOSEBAR: Good evening. I'm Doug
21 Mosebar, First Vice President, FAL, Santa Ynez
22 farmer. Even though these hearings are at a busy
23 time of the year half the California farmers have
24 attended in large numbers. Just look at this
25 crowd. I'm proud of this crowd.

1 And farmers and farm workers are
2 hard to get to hearings because they're doing what
3 they do best, that is produce. As evidence to
4 that, it was 1930, it took nine days for a typical
5 family to earn enough money to buy enough food for
6 the year. Now, that day is forty days. In other
7 words, food check out day is February 9th,
8 contrast that with Tax Freedom Day, which is
9 May 10th. That's scary.

10 We have brought you a consistent
11 message, CALFED must do more for the people of
12 California. We must create a program that meets
13 the needs of fish, wildlife and people. It must
14 move more aggressively and quickly to additional
15 water supplies and minimize potential large impact
16 on California's productive farmlands.

17 I know some people have been
18 surprised by the turnout of farmers at these
19 meetings, especially when large groups arrive at
20 Oakland, San Jose and Pasadena. But farmers have
21 a huge stake in the outcome of CALFED'S program
22 not to make -- be philosophic or get something off
23 our chests -- even though a lot of them will
24 tonight, but because your decisions will affect
25 our families, our land, our jobs, our very way of

1 life.

2 I've been to several of these
3 hearings and been disappointed at times of the
4 tired out notions some people like to mistaken --
5 80 percent of California's water, when -- the vast
6 bulk of the rain and snow that falls each year
7 stays in the environment. Some people insist all
8 we have to do is conserve, especially if it's
9 farmers that do the conserving. Well, farmers
10 have conserved all-told less water today than we
11 use in 30 days again and our tonnage increased 67
12 percent more efficient by our ability to produce
13 more. Less water has not improved reliability of
14 our water supply. The only thing saved farmers
15 from severe water shortages is we've had five
16 straight wet years. Even then San Joaquin Valley
17 has 30 percent shortages. We know what will
18 happen when the next dry weather starts, since --
19 more widespread and hit farmers worse, first and
20 worse. CALFED cannot continue to delay work. The
21 time is now.

22 By the way, we don't need more, we
23 hope to keep what we have. We just hope to keep
24 producing what we produce. Plans for large scale
25 conversion to habitat California farmland is an

20

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

C - 0 2 2 3 9 4

C-022394

1 important agreeable significant resource. CALFED
2 must review environmental facts. Farmlands are
3 reversion.

4 Thank you for your time.

5 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you for your time,
6 Mr. Mosebar.

7 MR. STONE: My name is Jack Stone. I'm
8 a farmer. And I've been watching this development
9 on the west side and everything for many, many
10 years, starting out with guys like Pat Brown and
11 Russell Giffen, Jack O'Neill, all those fellows.
12 And they had great ideas of what should happen
13 here. And those founders, if they'd seen some of
14 these plans you guys have planned now, I think
15 they'd be devastated.

16 I didn't come here mainly to talk to
17 this group up here. We've been talking to you
18 guys for four years and I think right now we got
19 to start talking about the taxpayers and people
20 that need water and are paying for it. It's
21 important.

22 And now I'd like to make a couple
23 other little comments, such as with an estimated
24 twenty million people going to move into
25 California shortly and we come up with a plan like

1 this, spending 10 billion dollars and don't have
2 any water storage for -- additional water
3 storage. That's dumb. That's about as dumb as
4 that little room you put all these people in. And
5 all the other people in many, many cities around
6 here. Hanford can only water their lawn really
7 three days a week. Many can't water the lawn or
8 flowers. My wife said probably soon one day a
9 week. That means we're getting close. And that
10 means the next thing is rationing. And I don't
11 like rationing, that is lousy. Especially when
12 you know each year 30 million acre feet of water
13 are going out into the Bay every year.

14 We've got engineers that can work on
15 that. You're being advised not to turn your air
16 conditioners on on the hot days because you might
17 have a power shutdown. And that's the truth,
18 we've had them. And as I see it, in this new
19 program there's nothing in there to improve our
20 hydro-electric plants, not anything at all, that I
21 know of. And then Central Valley Improvement Act
22 pushed by the environmentalists, including George
23 Miller is taking 800,000 feet of our water away
24 from us every year. That's enough water to farm
25 500 square miles of farming in the valley every

1 year. That's a lot. And it's worth 44 million
2 dollars of taxpayers' money that these people put
3 forth. That's a lot of loot.

4 Then for every acre foot of water we
5 do get they charge us \$60.88 to improve the
6 environment. And we do that, that's another six
7 million dollars out of our money to spend in this
8 area. And I don't know what they do with that
9 water -- or that money.

10 Is that -- is that red?

11 MR. BODOVITZ: That's red. You're going
12 great, but the three minutes are gone.

13 MR. STONE: Thank you.

14 MR. BODOVITZ: Milton Smith, Glen Rider,
15 Ron Jacobsma.

16 MR. SMITH: My name is Milton Smith.
17 There are so many here, I'll relinquish my time to
18 somebody.

19 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

20 Glenn Rider, John Jacobsma?

21 MR. RIDER: I'm going to speak to you
22 about some of the environmental history. In 1992
23 at the United Nation Conference called the Earth
24 Summit at Rio DeJaneiro, the plan released global
25 bio-diversity assessments. The bio-diversity

1 treatment and agenda began in 1993. President
2 Clinton signed an outline of this treaty. In 1994
3 it was sent to the Senate for ratification. The
4 promoters of this treaty tried to push it through
5 just before adjournment of the Senate in its
6 outline form saying it would be completed by a
7 conference of its signers after it was ratified.

8 Just hours before the scheduled vote
9 it was discovered the fact the treaty and a copy
10 was introduced in the Senate by Senator K. Bailey
11 Hutchison of the United Nations, which is who put
12 this thing together, had been caught in a lie.
13 The UN promoters, George Mitchell, Democrat of
14 Maine, just didn't dare let the senators see what
15 was in that treaty.

16 And that is the point, the treaty
17 was quite -- at that point the treaty was quietly
18 removed from consideration. The Clinton
19 administration didn't give up. They continued
20 with their plan that the EPA had published in 1993
21 that outlined the administration's environmental
22 strategy, said in part, quote, "Plans national
23 policies to achieve international objectives," end
24 quote.

25 We are now seeing the cutting edge

1 of this international objective in the CALFED,
2 CPBA bio-diversity United Nations large sites
3 wildland projects, U.S. Plan, Strategic Plan, UN,
4 USA, large corridors. Wild Earth, Border 21 are
5 large river programs. B & M buy-out of farmland
6 down in Alpaugh. It stretches the logic way
7 beyond breaking point to elevate the needs of
8 every conceivable, fish, fowl and animal as equal
9 to man.

10 This nation is strong because we the
11 people produce wealth and only as long as we do
12 will we stay a sovereign nation. This -- a
13 question here tonight is not this -- the question
14 here tonight is about natural resources, which
15 water, of course, is one. And above all, the
16 freedom to use them to create wealth. Without
17 wealth we lose the ability to control our own
18 political destiny. And that is collectively what
19 is planned for with us with these treaties.

20 MR. BODOVITZ: Mr. Rider, time is --

21 MR. RIDER: Gone, thank you very much.

22 MR. BODOVITZ: Ron Jacobsma, Kole Upton,
23 Judy Case of Fresno County.

24 MR. JACOBSMA: Ron Jacobsma, Friant
25 Water Users, State of California. We're getting

1 crowded and the water isn't always where its
2 needed. Friant Water Users Authority is one
3 million acres of the productive farmland in the
4 world. Twenty-five districts represented here
5 tonight will be making comments on their own
6 districts as long as the authority -- the
7 authority has been deeply involved in the Vernalis
8 Adaptive San Joaquin River Agreement, San Joaquin
9 Repair Flow -- San Joaquin Repair Flow Pilot
10 Program. The authority has also participated in
11 the ag urban process in an effort to understand
12 and stay informed on the CALFED districts and to
13 coordinate our comments with the rest of the
14 effected water community. Thus can be seen we've
15 followed with great interests the deliberations of
16 CALFED.

17 We have a clear stake in the outcome
18 of this process. We support planned answers that
19 benefit the San Joaquin Valley and the state now
20 for some specifics. The Friant Users Authority
21 preaches the recognition and priority given to
22 implementation of the San Joaquin River Agreement
23 which incorporates the Vernalis Adoptive Program.

24 We endorse and adopt specific
25 comments by the San Joaquin River Group by --

1 separately we believe more impasses and resources,
2 additional water surface storage. We look to
3 CALFED for leadership to move this along more
4 rapidly.

5 Additional water supplies must be
6 developed. This is especially true for the upper
7 San Joaquin River if restriction from activities
8 continue CALFED should continue viable ground
9 water and congective use of available water
10 supply. These studies and projects must be
11 locally sponsored and driven.

12 CALFED has recently supported the
13 authority and the National Resources Defenses
14 Council by funding pilot programs to throw on
15 dispersible seeds and low cottonwood trees. We
16 commend CALFED for the support and look forward to
17 your continued support to these mutual
18 rejuvenations of the San Joaquin River.

19 CALFED needs to include moneys to
20 continue to support pilot programs and other
21 activities for the upper mainstream. We are
22 content the proposal to convert 243 acres of
23 farmland for obtaining the water goes with it
24 serious impact with the local complexion and could
25 be impossible to mitigate the need for a through

1 Delta conservation facility.

2 More seriously considered as part of
3 the CALFED program, the current documents are
4 vague in their description of the program. CALFED
5 is obligated to lead this effort and must give
6 higher priority. CALFED'S efforts to move forward
7 with the south Delta's -- improve conditions in
8 that area increases both water supply and supply
9 for south Delta water users.

10 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Jacobsma.
11 Kole Upton, supervisor Case, Nettie
12 Drake?

13 MR. UPTON: Good evening. Kole Upton,
14 farmer from Chowchilla, Friant Water Users. Time
15 to rock and roll here. We need to know when we're
16 done whether you people agree with us or not.
17 Very few have time to speak and we need to know
18 exactly how we feel about water in this part of
19 the valley.

20 Second thing we need to do is,
21 farmers and representatives of the people that --
22 using the water is call our assembly, state
23 senators and Congress and even U.S. Senators and
24 ask them what they're doing to give us an
25 affordable, adequate water supply.

1 Thank you. Get the name of a staff
2 member and ask where they stand. If you don't get
3 an answer in a week. Find out these people, ask
4 to run for this position. They ought to do the
5 job.

6 Our message for CALFED is very
7 simple. The draft plan is pandering to the
8 radical environmentalists. I don't want to --
9 radicals there, but also some reasonable ones, but
10 what this consensus -- process has pandered to the
11 most radical of them -- what I specifically mean
12 is by having no new storage for the current and
13 the -- Senator Costa addressed that -- and the way
14 we look at that is, they're looking at the valley
15 to get the water for the future.

16 We've learned a few things in the
17 past years we have been in the water business on
18 how to protect ourselves. One was Madera ran many
19 projects they tried to stuff down our throats
20 without local concerns. One way county ordinances
21 areas, boards and rights, that kind of thing.
22 Wouldn't want to leave you with the impression,
23 well, in the valley sitting on our hands, leading
24 us in the future. We also think of ways to
25 protect ourselves if it's not a good plan.

1 We don't feel there's any shame in
2 what we do as far as producing food and fiber for
3 this nation.

4 Lastly, as far as the message for
5 the CALFED plan and for you folks tonight, our
6 message is very simple. When the next drought
7 occurs, you're going to need some water and if the
8 plan you adopt finally don't -- have a middle
9 course direction, Senator Costa, for sand flea,
10 Delta smelt or you will need water through
11 development in Southern California for the -- make
12 up for lack of planning, thought and courage in
13 this plan.

14 Then we have a plan of our own.
15 There's only one way you're going to get more
16 water out of this water and that is after the
17 fight --

18 MR. BODOVITZ: Supervisor Case, Nettie
19 Drake.

20 Supervisor, go ahead and then Nettie
21 Drake and then John Giovannetti.

22 MS. CASE: Judy Case, Fresno County
23 Board of Supervisors. I brought to you today a
24 resolution our board passed unanimously: "Whereas
25 the County of Fresno has been the leading food and

1 fiber county in the state and the nation for
2 almost 50 consecutive years, generating 29 billion
3 dollars in farm commodities.

4 And whereas agriculture is the major
5 industry in Fresno County, is the driving force in
6 the local and regional economy.

7 Whereas one in five jobs in the
8 county is directly dependent on agriculture and
9 one dollar of revenue contributes \$3.50 of revenue
10 to the local economy.

11 And whereas Fresno County's
12 agriculture industry is one of the most productive
13 and efficient in the world, is dependent upon a
14 reliable water supply.

15 And whereas over one-third of Fresno
16 County's gross agriculture production has been
17 hard hit by chronic water shortages from federal
18 environmental limits, export of water from the
19 San Joaquin water to western Fresno County.

20 And whereas these ongoing water
21 shortages have added to unemployment, economic
22 hardships in profit in rural farm communities,
23 particularly on the west side, which increases the
24 economic and social burden on the county as a
25 whole.

1 Whereas the CALFED Bay-Delta
2 Program has developed long-term comprehensive
3 environmental water supply, reliable flood control
4 and water quality problems in the San Joaquin
5 Valley and is seeking public comments, it's --
6 preferable alternatives, the Board of Supervisors
7 recognizes the need to restore a reliable water
8 supply to maintain the county's viable agriculture
9 industry throughout.

10 Therefore, be it reinvolved, Fresno
11 County Board of Supervisors supports CALFED
12 Bay-Delta Program alternative that offers equally
13 emphasis balanced and equitable solutions,
14 addresses water supply reliability and protect our
15 productive viable agriculture industry.

16 Moreover, the Board further resolves
17 CALFED Bay-Delta program must include components
18 to develop ground waters and off-stream water
19 storage facilities, improve conversation and
20 reduce conflicts, developmental export sites and
21 support other appropriate actions to restore and
22 improve water supply to standing as number one
23 agriculture county in the nation."

24 Thank you.

25 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Supervisor.

1 Nettie Drake then John Giovannetti and
2 then Don Mills.

3 MS. DRAKE: Nettie Drake, Entire
4 Conservation East Side San Joaquin Valley.
5 Tonight I have three points.

6 One is, after comments heard last
7 night in Los Banos and replies to questions, I
8 thought all day today, and a concern that really
9 bothered me -- and I heard many comments last
10 night about what is the answer to the question,
11 what is the current or thoughts about planning the
12 monitoring, engaging of the water use efficiency
13 south of the Delta.

14 If water use efficiency is going to
15 be key component to water development then you
16 better have a plan to be able to monitor it coming
17 out of Southern California and south of the Tracy
18 pumping plant. When I asked that question last
19 night I got a giggled and cluckish answer, so I
20 pose it as a note again for this evening to go on
21 the record.

22 Secondly, as I said last night and
23 say again today, it's imperative if you want water
24 quality and water quantity and environmental
25 habitat for wildlife, aquatic life, any others,

1 you have include the watershed work plan to all
2 the common programs in this process or it won't
3 succeed. You got to deal with the source, not the
4 end result if you want to clean up the mess.

5 And, lastly, when going through the
6 integrated storage investigation, it will be
7 absolutely imperative that science and fact create
8 the final results, but also in the process they
9 have got to include an investigation from all the
10 diverse stake holders and needs, not just some --
11 excuse me, Theresa core formula for -- bureau
12 formula for cost benefit ratio that doesn't
13 account for agricultural land or individuals that
14 don't believe in a municipality. Most
15 rationalists don't live where there's 60,000
16 people and you can't exclude them from a cost
17 benefit ratio if you're trying to decide for
18 off-stream storage.

19 So I encourage you to think about
20 that. It's thoughts I had as a result of the --
21 last night's -- last evening's meeting. And I
22 will submit more in writing.

23 MR. BODOVITZ: John Giovannetti, Don
24 Mills, followed by Jim Verbgon.

25 MR. GIOVANNETTI: I'd like to start out

1 by turning the microphone because unlike the
2 CALFED process I don't want to turn my back on
3 anyone.

4 My family has been farming on the
5 west side since the 1930's and in the Sacramento
6 valley since 1950. We farm on both sides of the
7 Delta. Our farm is as family run business
8 consisting of my dad, two of my brothers, two
9 nephews and me.

10 One of my favorite sayings is the
11 mind is like a parachute, it only works when it's
12 open. I try to maintain an open mind in dealing
13 with the everyday challenges in life, including
14 farming. But that is getting increasingly more
15 difficult when it comes to living with an
16 uncertain water supply resulting from the federal
17 government's water policies.

18 I've been following the CALFED
19 Bay-Delta Program for the last four years with an
20 open mind and a vested interest, waiting to see
21 what workable solutions will be proposed to
22 address our water supply problems in the west
23 side. I'm still waiting. The preferred
24 alternative places high heaps on increased water
25 conservation and water transfers. Too many

1 solutions already used extensively in the
2 Westlands.

3 We use some of the latest irrigation
4 technology and closely monitor to achieve water
5 efficiency, significant amount of water from other
6 sources each year and yet we are still water
7 short. These practices certainly help maximize
8 our water use, but that alone won't solve our
9 water supply problem.

10 I'm waiting to hear new solutions to
11 restore -- I say restore our water supply,
12 specifically storage, aerations. New conservation
13 facilities will become part of the exclusion. It
14 makes sense to capture water and store it in wet
15 years and develop and distribute that water
16 efficiently where it's needed during dry years.
17 That's balance.

18 I don't understand why they don't
19 understand. It's really quite simple. I'm going
20 to skip around because I know I'm going to run out
21 of time.

22 Water has been allocated away from
23 agriculture to environment. 800,000 good signs to
24 show where it's been used or how it's improved the
25 environment in the Delta, simply throwing away

1 millions of dollars, prejudicial justification is
2 not reasonable management of a limited resource.

3 I'd like to tell you what 800,000
4 acre feet means to me. 800,000 acre feet means 10
5 trillion, 240 million heads of lettuce. 800,000
6 acre feet means 4 trillion pounds of garbanzos.
7 800,000 acre feet means 5 trillion, 40 million
8 canteloupes. And 800 -- or 800 each of those
9 is -- or -- or 28 trillion, 160 million pounds of
10 tomatoes.

11 Farmers are firmly committed to
12 improving the Delta environment, but must not
13 overshadow the department. Can't -- water supply
14 impairment to the economic backbone and jobs.
15 The --

16 MR. BODOVITZ: Mr. Giovannetti, the time
17 is gone.

18 MR. MILLS: Good evening. Don Mills,
19 Kings County Water. Throughout the document you
20 reinforce the fact additional water storage makes
21 the program's goals achievable. Sadly, no action
22 approach to the construction of the storage
23 facilities, the approach produced who hope to
24 return California to the 1850's.

25 This short-sighted reckless stand,

1 water rationing in on California's plan to the --
2 for the expected population growth of our state
3 and corresponding need for increased water
4 supplies instead of the balanced water plan we
5 were promised. We have a massive water grab by
6 state and federal agencies in the name of
7 environmental restoration.

8 There are a few things in the plan
9 we can commend. We specifically support the
10 enlargement of Millerton Lake by 760,000 acre
11 feet. This project set an example of
12 multi-purpose benefit. All fed -- CALFED'S goals
13 getting Delta water, water and supply reliability
14 would all be improved with this project.

15 Additional benefits to water use
16 additionally -- and water transfers match other
17 positives, such as additional flood control
18 regions and clean hydro power. This is a solid
19 project. Should be constructed, not studied in
20 phase one, debated in phase two and found
21 applicability incorrect in phase three.

22 Only 1.3 percent of your proposed
23 phase one spending goes to study surface storage
24 and not one dollar for any construction. This is
25 unacceptable. You see, we know how it is to kill

1 a proposed surface storage project, no matter how
2 benefit studies address major change. And
3 environmental laws change after 20 years of study
4 and endangered weed, sedentary stone blocking.
5 The completion in the Redlands. Or one threatened
6 rat, like the Tipton Kangaroo rat, put one
7 valley -- blocked energy on Lake Success and
8 Kaweah in 1997.

9 These can block the wishes of the
10 majorities of the taxpayers and projects this
11 large. It is truly time to get mad and not allow
12 insects and rodents dictate the water policy of
13 this great state.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. BODOVITZ: Jim Verbgon, Bob Westfall
16 and Jim Gowens.

17 MR. VERBGON: I'm Jim Verbgon. I sit on
18 the Board of Directors of the California Farm
19 Bureau. A water storage has never been
20 successfully solved by reor -- water quality
21 suffers along with water quantity. When you don't
22 have enough water, the water quality is also
23 harmed.

24 We need to fix the Delta flows to
25 help the fish and also transport the water across

1 the Delta so we get some more reliability. We
2 need to get the endangered species out of the
3 Delta, not continue to try and solve around all
4 these fish.

5 We have to decide this is the course
6 of action we got to make a stable flow into the
7 Delta and live with it. We can't continue to
8 micro manage, takes water from us. This program
9 will fail if it does not include water storage
10 both north and south of the Delta because if you
11 don't have additional supplies north of the Delta
12 to give you the environmental flows that you need
13 and also the amount of water to successfully carry
14 water across the Delta, it's not going to work.

15 If you have a dam south of the Delta
16 and you can't get water across the Delta, you've
17 got a dam that don't have any water in it.
18 Neither one of those works.

19 We have a growth and population of
20 this state. The new growth is going to require
21 one acre foot -- one acre foot per family every
22 year. That same family is going to require three
23 acre feet worth of food to feed them. Where is
24 this water going to come from currently meeting
25 storage requirement? We have storage by

1 over-pumping the ground water.

2 If we don't do something to resolve
3 that and that means additional surface water
4 storage, if we don't re -- if we don't do
5 something to shut off our pumps we will exhaust
6 our supply. We're using a deleting supply.

7 Finally, the solution must come from
8 water storage and that storage must be maintained
9 in the wet years in order to service the
10 requirements in the dry years as needed by the
11 fish, that is needed by the cities and also needed
12 by us farmers.

13 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Verbgon.

14 Bob Westfall, Bill Gowens, Terry Baker.

15 MR. WESTFALL: Bob Westfall, farmer,
16 Kings County, along the Kings River, also
17 California State Grange.

18 There's been enough statistics put
19 out tonight, so don't need to go into all of
20 that. We need to get more storage. I think the
21 CALFED program has been putting the cart before
22 the horse. They talk about off-stream storage.
23 Where they going to get the water to put into
24 those storages? They need to get the Auburn dam,
25 the Roger Crossing Dam built and all the other new

1 storages they've got proposed.

2 They talk about a 20 million
3 population increase in the next 30 years. Where
4 are they going to get the water to feed these
5 people? They need to get these storages built.

6 The population in the rural
7 communities are watered by pumps. The ground
8 water is going down and down and down. And it
9 will put them homeless if they don't get a better
10 water supply. We need to get more storage.

11 They talk about the conservation of
12 water in Los Angeles and other cities, they didn't
13 mention that it's also the -- rationing water down
14 there. You can only water your lawn on certain
15 days and cut back everywhere that you can.

16 The buying of agricultural land and
17 putting it out of production, I think, is
18 asinine. When is -- why is the government getting
19 into the land purchasing business anyway?

20 The water that is -- went out to the
21 ocean the last few years on the Kings River on my
22 portion of testimony, it has washed out the river
23 bottom approximately three feet. That's sediment
24 has went to the Delta.

25 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you Mr. Westfall.

1 Jim Gowens, Terry Baker then John
2 McCall.

3 Bill Gowens.

4 Bill Gowens.

5 Terry Baker, John McCall, Mayor William
6 Cooke of the City of Tulare.

7 MR. BAKER: I'm Terry Baker, the Tulare
8 County Farm Bureau. And many people have spoken
9 about the -- I have two points many people have
10 spoken about. One of them the increased storage.

11 I don't see how many of us don't see
12 how the program could be that successful without
13 increased amount of storage. We have a storage
14 system that is -- that's old, needs to be
15 increased. The newest one, Kaweah, 40 years old,
16 go older than that. So we need increased
17 storage. That's one point.

18 Another point that I'd like to go
19 over is, you know, as a farmer -- I'm a farmer
20 myself and sometimes it's hard for us to see the
21 big picture of what's going on. I think this
22 works sometimes in the government. I see that
23 happening where I wonder who is coordinating these
24 programs. We seem to have different agencies at
25 different times doing different things and it's

1 not coordinated. Who is taking care of these
2 things? This CALFED thing seems to be one more of
3 those types of things that I just wonder, you have
4 different people, different agencies here, but
5 then there's other ones that come in that is doing
6 other things. Definitely a real challenge for us
7 at the farm level.

8 For example, we have the CALFED
9 process going on. Also here in Tulare County at
10 the moment we have a program by the Department of
11 the Interior that is buying up 15,000 acres of
12 land in Tulare, Fresno and Kings County. Now, how
13 does this all work together? How does this
14 coordinate? And what are the implications for
15 CALFED, this Department of the Interior situation
16 situation?

17 We also have a group that's putting
18 itself together for watershed management in the
19 local area. How does that tie into CALFED? With
20 the ownership of government land or the ownership
21 of land in California is another one of these
22 concerns that goes right along with the
23 coordination.

24 The CALFED process is talking about
25 243,000 acres they will take out of production to

1 implement the CALFED process. The eco system
2 restoration, 930,000 acres. Those two today are
3 over a million acres of ag land or land that will
4 be affected by this process.

5 Then you throw -- throw in another
6 115,000 and others happening the same way. Where
7 is the coordination? Already in -- already in
8 California there's -- over 20 percent of the land
9 is owned by the government. That frightens me
10 quite a bit.

11 MR. BODOVITZ: Mr. Baker, hate to stop
12 you.

13 MR. BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you.

15 John McCall, Mayor Cooke of Tulare,
16 Shirley Batchman.

17 MR. MCCALL: My name is John McCall,
18 automatic dope Bon, Southern California. Mostly
19 spend my time in Sacramento. I live in Winters
20 outside of Sacramento.

21 Taught when you want to participate
22 effective in a environmental review process you
23 are supposed to focus in on the details of the
24 plan and expose technical flaws, erosion around
25 the state. Much more of a chance for the public

1 just to talk about your alternatives. Do they
2 work for them?

3 I'm more wearing two buttons tonight
4 as I did in Stockton because I believe that,
5 again, and this isn't so much for you as the other
6 people in the room, that we need to really try to
7 develop more partners. We've done more of that in
8 ag land preparation than we've done with the
9 California endangered species.

10 If Senator Costa cared for farmers
11 and ranchers how are we going to do it on water.
12 Good first step is the passage of water bonds. If
13 folks didn't hear that, I sure did. There's a
14 minimum acre feet of new water, dry year water
15 generated from the recycling infrastructure
16 improvements of the bond measure we'll all see on
17 the March ballot. I hope that that is deserving
18 of support in the agriculture community.

19 I've heard a lot tonight about
20 environmental environments, beetles and weeds.
21 There were some points made at the Stockton
22 hearing by agricultural interests from Delta. I
23 want -- for the record and for this audience some
24 of the Delta farmers make -- regional
25 self-sufficiency. No pump rates and quantities in

1 Delta quality water option to private segments
2 there of concern about conversion of agricultural
3 farmlands, limitation on water transfers and
4 development of additional water supply importing
5 areas.

6 I'm not sure the disagreements we
7 fashion are environmental versus agriculture. I'd
8 like outcome of this process -- ag to sit down and
9 talk about these issues clearly in the ag
10 community. I hope that -- I'm sure with your
11 leadership there is some discussion about how to
12 balance your internal, shall we say, different
13 interests.

14 So I hope that we can get away from
15 the rhetoric and move towards a common ground. I
16 certainly don't believe that -- that environment
17 restoration should be born on the backs of
18 agriculture. I don't think that has to happen.
19 And I hope we can get to the point where we can
20 talk about how to insure reliability. And
21 certainty for the agriculture qualities at the
22 same time meet the goals of ag land protection and
23 environmental environments.

24 I'm not sure that can happen in
25 CALFED, but it can happen somewhere else.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. McCall.
Mayor William Cooke, Shirley
Batchman, Bob Keenum.

MAYOR COOKE: Good evening. I am Bill
Cooke, the mayor of the City of Tulare, community
of about 41,000. It's about ten miles from where
we sit right here tonight. And on behalf of the
City of Tulare I would like to address concerns
that affect us.

First of all, Tulare -- as is the
case with most communities in the valley, has an
agriculture based economy. We are in an area with
dairies that supply many of our major employers,
where -- an area of high unemployment. If
farmers, whatever they produce, were to lose their
water supply necessary to prosper the effect on
every member of the community would be high.

I agree with the Farm Bureau that it
is a very real threat to this valley's water
supply, a major source of export trade would
disappear. And the already painful unemployment
rate would escalate.

If the cost of irrigation water were
to climb sufficient to force farmers to pump
ground water, lowering the water table -- we have

1 yet to recover from the last dry years and that
2 also is unacceptable to us.

3 Tulare's water supply comes from 23
4 wells. There is no other source. We are
5 conscientiously trying to conserve, but if wells
6 would have to be drilled deeper, the cost to the
7 city for tapping and pumping water would be
8 staggering.

9 I urge you to please remember that
10 our people, our economy and much of the nation's
11 food supply can very easily be placed at risk.
12 Please use caution in the decisions that you
13 make.

14 I also want to add that when we take
15 farmland out of production, we also take much of
16 the funds that go through the economy of our
17 smaller communities out of circulation, the
18 unemployment goes up. And I do urge you to please
19 be cautious.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. BODOVITZ: Shirley Batchman, Bob
22 Keenum, Alene Taylor.

23 MS. BATCHMAN: Good evening. California
24 Citrus -- Mutual Citrus Trade Association. It's
25 been well stated tonight all stake holders are

1 looking for one common goal. We all want access
2 to affordable long-term water supplies.

3 Let me speak specifically to this
4 valley, though, the four citrus producing counties
5 in this valley are expected to have one million
6 new residences in the next 20 years. The existing
7 water supplies do not address our current needs.
8 So how does this plan address the growth from our
9 perspective? It doesn't.

10 With the Okhoe system restoration
11 given to billing, urban needs will be met,
12 although we do here quality suspect. Only things
13 left open for withdrawals is the agricultural
14 bank, but, you know, unfortunately the fish are
15 going to be the only ones filling out the
16 withdrawal slips. And once again the farmer is
17 going to be asked to do more with less. New
18 storage facilities is the answer. You're going to
19 hear that all night.

20 My only question to you is, why has
21 the CALFED omitted detail plans for the
22 development of additional storages? I only hope
23 that your answer is not that the political fire is
24 too hot to have this topic duly addressed.

25 This draft needs to have a human

1 face put on it. And I would like to introduce you
2 to the affected citrus grower. He is a family
3 farmer. Yes, we have our corporate farmers, but
4 100 acre growing is the cornerstone of our
5 industry and industry is the economic backbone of
6 the communities of this valley. I don't mean to
7 articulate to you, they've been well-documented in
8 the last months, but the freezes of -- the two
9 freezes of the last decade clearly demonstrate the
10 economic havoc which resonates when the citrus
11 industry shuts down completely or harvests
12 one-quarter of its crop in -- a quarter indicator
13 goal of this plan, but you must not forget one
14 fundamental principle, everybody in this room
15 understands, whether you grow food or fiber, good
16 water practices dictate that growers follow the
17 scientific data, those meet the optimum needs of
18 growing their crops.

19 The citrus water formula is three
20 and a half acre feet of feet per acre, no more, no
21 less. There are no benefits derived from
22 additional irrigation and ultimately less money in
23 the grower's pocket if we go to deficit
24 irrigation. Growers have been leaders in water
25 irrigation for decades, successfully shifting from

1 furlough to close volume irrigation.

2 MR. BODOVITZ: Mrs. Batchman --

3 MS. BATCHMAN: I have one more comment,
4 but I'll go with you.

5 MR. BODOVITZ: Bob Keenum, Supervisor
6 Taylor, then Lloyd Fryer.

7 MR. KEENUM: Good evening. I'm here
8 representing the Building Industry Association
9 from Tulare and Kings County. The Building
10 Industry Association recognized in early CALFED
11 process the importance of addressing environmental
12 concerns in the Delta. However, we believe water
13 supply and water quality issues are just as
14 important as CALFED itself. Improvements in those
15 areas to be -- could be equal with the objectives
16 of the overall program.

17 The draft CALFED documents current
18 population growth. The CALFED program must
19 expedite development for the necessary estimates,
20 allow for -- beg your pardon, management water
21 supply and environment conflicts. Unfortunately
22 current side steps every support. Changes needs
23 to be made regarding additional storage and
24 conservation sites.

25 In order for California to regain

1 water resources we must develop those facilities
2 sooner than later. 4.4 billion dollar plan is a
3 directly vague and expensive promise, doesn't
4 provide any -- contribute to California meeting
5 its future or existing water supply or water
6 quality needs. In spite of 20 years of neglect
7 the CALFED proposal makes no credible commitment
8 to improve supply nor quality.

9 This matter may have been
10 life-jacketed December of 1994 by the principal --
11 by Delta Corps December 15, four days later, the
12 19th, the entire Delta was critically declined,
13 Delta smelt was purchased in the federal
14 registry. This means the entire Delta is listed
15 as an industry for Delta smelt. This CALFED if
16 improved any flows from Friant into the Delta
17 redefined as waters that support and maintain the
18 Delta smelts' critical habitat into danger in 1993
19 as amended and quite possibly putting all other
20 water in the Friant under same federal
21 restrictions ultimately limited from both
22 agriculture and urban California is a critical
23 junction. Water quality, water supply needs only
24 grow during next decade must be directed towards
25 implementing a plan that will meet in a timely way

1 both of those needs. We want the CALFED to return
2 to the right and balance course that is the basis
3 of its creation.

4 Our common goal was supposed to have
5 been one that provided for jobs, housing, economy
6 and environmental needs -- needs of the Central
7 Valley and all Californians to be met.

8 CALFED can get back on to target or
9 can be the target.

10 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Keenum.

11 Supervisor Taylor, then Lloyd Fryer,
12 then -- I hope I'm reading -- Marilyn Cothen, Kern
13 County Supervisor.

14 Supervisor Taylor, Kings County.

15 SUPERVISOR TAYLOR: Hello. I bring
16 comments from my fellow board members. And these
17 are direct quotes: Chairman John Ratchford, "More
18 storage." Supervisor Tony Barba, "More storage."
19 On have a rare, "More storage. More storage.
20 More storage." And Supervisor Joe Ness, "More dam
21 storage." He said you could spell "dam" however
22 you pleased, preferred is Northern California.

23 Environmentalists have more weight
24 in deciding the form of the final project
25 perimeters than the other two-thirds of the state

1 environmentalists. Goals are phrased in action
2 items to do. And isolated items are phrased as
3 future goals to be studied. This is not
4 acceptable to the agriculture department. And the
5 people of the Southern and Central San Joaquin
6 Valley.

7 Exactly how dependent was pointed
8 up in Governor Davis' report. No industry
9 dominates regions of California to the extent that
10 agriculture rules the San Joaquin Valley. In the
11 valley agriculture farming and services accounts
12 for over 17 percent of total age and salary
13 employment. And this was done in July of '99.

14 In speaking to a recent journalist
15 in Hanford he called the CALFED offices for
16 information on the CALFED process. He called
17 apparently at noon, he got through -- because
18 there were no bureaucrats there, to a biologist.

19 The biologist during the
20 conversation stated to him that the dual Delta
21 conservation was found in their research to be the
22 best answer to the fish population problems in the
23 Delta, but that somebody at some level made the
24 decision that was not applicable, acceptable or
25 sellable and so it was watered down.

1 And so Senator Costa and I don't
2 always agree, but we do agree on this, that the
3 applicable contamination of this process has made
4 it kind of unreliable. Everything about --
5 everything is about priorities. The priorities
6 are clear in this document, not of growing state
7 population and vital agricultural industry, not
8 even fish priority in that LA, San Joaquin tax
9 moneys on their projects while at the same time
10 blocking, in my opinion, engineered solutions,
11 which are dams and the isolated man-made canal
12 until the moneys have been spent and the need for
13 such facilities arise at a time when they state
14 you have to sacrifice agriculture and industry to
15 meet the needs of people because you can't build
16 anything quickly enough to do any good.

17 MR. BODOVITZ: Supervisor, three minutes
18 are gone, I'm afraid. Thank you very much.

19 Lloyd Fryer, Marilyn Cothen, Stuart
20 Pyle.

21 MR. FRYER: Lloyd Fryer, Kern County
22 Water Agency. You have heard a lot of people
23 tonight talk about need for equipment and balanced
24 CALFED program. I'd like to give you a few
25 examples from PR, I -- examples, concerns from

1 people tonight. For instance, we read in the
2 CALFED ERI basic financing based on principles,
3 beneficiaries paid then ERI Delta defense have a
4 pretty good quote, "Raw based public benefits."

5 So let me see if I got it straight.
6 The public benefits, but the diverse pay even
7 though you can't tie the degree of benefits to
8 diversion paid. No mention in the documents of
9 the federal government paying the diversion fee it
10 takes for current existing regulation nor is water
11 account subject to the fee, so I want to ask,
12 where is the fairness or equity in that?

13 Valerie Holcomb, Public Information
14 Officer for CALFED quoted in the newspaper by
15 saying, "The purpose of the CALFED program is not
16 to increase the water supply, but to improve water
17 management so it's more reliable." When we need
18 EIR it subjects several hundred thousand acre feet
19 additional water up and above base line already
20 there may need to be reallocated from agriculture
21 to environment for the ERP to be acceptable.

22 Apparently the goal of CALFED is to
23 increase environment at the expense of the ag
24 water supplies. And again, where is the balance
25 in this ERI? Storage is definitely part of --

1 apparently come from increasing system flexibility
2 water quality applies for the ecology system and
3 then reached -- pre-exist for widespread
4 demonstrated efficient use by local water
5 suppliers.

6 Other important reasons for storage
7 are held hostage to the water efficiently used
8 project. And again, where is balance equity? Few
9 examples cited -- three minutes -- for equity and
10 in balance that we see in the program.

11 I want you to know Kern County wants
12 CALFED to succeed. We've made a huge amount of
13 commercial, fair and balanced CALFED program.
14 That's not what we see. CALFED needs to go back
15 to the drawing board, meet those simple criteria
16 fair and balanced.

17 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you.

18 MS. COTHEN: It's Mary Lou Cothen.

19 MR. BODOVITZ: Stuart Pyle and then
20 Arthur Unger.

21 MS. COTHEN: Kern County Water Agency
22 will read a statement from Kern County -- Barbara
23 Patrick, Kern County Board of Supervisors
24 resolution expressing their concerns with the
25 CALFED and forwarded that to the CALFED office.

1 "Good evening. I've asked this
2 statement to be read because I'm very concerned
3 adequately addressing crucial water supply facing
4 California and Kern County. As a result the water
5 supply problem is only worse and people of
6 California and Kern County will suffer if you're
7 proposed actions toward economic eco system to be
8 delayed until the future, a future characterized
9 by water storage because we failed to make
10 appropriate decisions.

11 Now, we know California is already
12 critically drought years only a series of wet
13 years during the five years CALFED working have
14 prevented serious damage to California's economy.
15 Your plan creates no improvement in storage or
16 create a seven-year drought to result in massive
17 CALFED needs, specifically storage projects that
18 will be implemented and population levels at which
19 implemented linking conservation targets risks a
20 catastrophe if people in Kern County unable to --
21 simply deprived of water if entry can't meet the
22 targets shutdown in -- and workers placed on
23 welfare. Farms can't meet targets, revert to
24 wastelands. Vague memory in a hungry world. It
25 is appropriate to -- it is neither appropriate nor

1 moral to hold the jobs and homes and health of
2 California hostage to your untested goals.

3 CALFED's staff and consultants
4 studied these problems for five years only real
5 decisions ecology symptoms as representative of
6 the people of Kern County I invite you to make
7 water implements based on clear requirements or
8 future generations will see promise of getting
9 better together. Nothing more than swallow --
10 political swallow again.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. BODOVITZ: Stuart Pyle, Arthur
13 Unger, Adrian Mathews, and then we'll take a very
14 short break.

15 MR. PYLE: Yes, I'm Stuart Pyle, a
16 consultant of Kern County Water Agency, member
17 CALFED Bay-Delta advisory counsel. Comments
18 here.

19 On the June, '99 phase two revised
20 report and the implementation plan on the current
21 EIR, the plan has good points and weaknesses to be
22 moving towards implementation and crux for the
23 public support and financing is a positive step
24 away from the continuing and extensive
25 stonewalling that has gone on for the past 30

1 years.

2 The CALFED programs - program
3 appears to have necessary financial support as
4 indicated by the state water bond bill just passed
5 by Governor's commitment to which I understand has
6 funds for integrated storage program. There needs
7 to be an acceptable government and monitoring
8 entity put into place. An adoptive management
9 process to protest throughout the implementation
10 period, so adjustments along the way to meet the
11 program goals and the public needs which may
12 change as we move into the future.

13 A major positive aspect of the plan
14 is expensive eco system, fish habitats and
15 populations by means other than cutting back on
16 water exported from the Delta. The state and
17 federal major water delivery systems have had
18 their water supplies delivery table reduced in
19 significant amounts in the past three decades
20 losses to numerous fish populations by taking
21 water from those major projects. The corps' 1994
22 planning program removed one million acre feet
23 from the state and federal export projects. If
24 this will continue to have serious economic
25 impacts depends on these supplies for years and

1 years.

2 There is no revision in the CALFED
3 program to restore this water. It is foolish to
4 think water conservation takes place of this
5 source, Delta conservation, which includes south
6 Delta, north Delta and additional conservation to
7 be implemented during phase one. Programs are
8 necessary steps, but they do not go far enough to
9 provide the need for flexibility for the export
10 projects to pump up to their capacity on the water
11 flows and were efficient conditions would permit
12 the plan should have -- should be more specific
13 in deciding the conditions under which the
14 additional water conservation facilities or other
15 water supply reliability improvements, such as
16 storage should be undertaken.

17 More -- most actions, proposed
18 funding phase one implementation program appears
19 reasonable, but two billion dollars estimated for
20 funds needs recycling, seems excessive. Compare
21 one billion dollars each ecology system
22 restriction and water conservation. Those
23 responsible for assigning the funds and
24 implementing the programs must be sure that every
25 program for water conservation and recycling is

1 cost effective.

2 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Pyle.

3 Arthur Unger, Adrienne Mathews.

4 MR. UNGER: Good evening. I'm Arthur
5 Unger of Bakersfield. I'm a property owner for
6 the property in the San Fernando Valley. We water
7 every day. If we're doing something illegal, tell
8 us. I admit we are doing something wrong. If you
9 love California, let your lawn die. I believe
10 that conservation is the way to provide water, but
11 I'm going to talk about groundwater storage this
12 evening.

13 It was storage that allowed the
14 lingering of the Delta smelt at the pumps this
15 spring to be a minor episode rather than a crisis
16 that could have led eventually to extinction of
17 the smelt. I have questions about storage first,
18 some of them have answers.

19 The total evaporated -- well, the
20 total water that falls in California is 200
21 million acre feet. I learned that from EIR. 129
22 are transpired or evaporated right away before any
23 beneficial use can be made of them. I'd hoped to
24 learn that -- if water falls in the national parks
25 and, say, is taken up by a Sequoia or some other

1 plant that attracts people from all the over the
2 world, has that water been efficiently used or
3 just evaporated and transpired?

4 I learned that the Sacramento River
5 area has 40 million acre feet of ground water and
6 the safe yield is 2.4 million acre feet and I
7 thought I'd come on a table that would add that
8 all up for the whole State of California. I don't
9 know how many dams there are in California. I
10 don't know the total capacity of all of them and I
11 don't know how much water is evaporated from all
12 of them every year. The one in mind -- lake is
13 seven acre feet per acre of lake.

14 I see that you want to mitigate
15 ground water use by importing water from other
16 groundwater basins, but I don't know of any basin
17 that ever has any excess water. I don't know how
18 much energy it takes to move the water around.
19 Apparently there's no statewide ground water that
20 exists locally. EB 30 I think allows certain
21 agencies to manage ground water. An example of
22 that that can lead to section 36 which is bounded
23 on the west by the Rosedale Rio Bravo Water
24 Storage District. Local government is thinking of
25 building a highway through that land and some

1 other inappropriate uses.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Unger.

4 Adrienne Mathews.

5 MS. MATHEWS: Good evening. My name is
6 Adienne Mathews. I'm a director of the Kern
7 County Water Agency. I would like to thank you
8 for the opportunity to address you this evening.

9 I would like to be able to
10 congratulate you on the progress you've made, but
11 I do have some major concerns. First, let me
12 preface my remarks by saying that we do want the
13 Delta fixed. We rely on the Delta for our
14 economic livelihood, our water quality and our own
15 habitat and environment. I think we've shown good
16 faith that the state water and Central Valley
17 project contractors have already dedicated one
18 minimum acre feet of water to this cause and have
19 shown a willingness to save additional supplies
20 through various water use efficiency and storage.

21 My concern is one water supply. We
22 need some balance in this process. I cannot
23 believe you haven't given your water supply more
24 attention. CALFED expects 700,000 acre feet will
25 be needed for ecology system flows. This is just

1 for the Delta and its tributaries. What about the
2 rest of the state?

3 Our population is increasing daily.
4 Water projects operating reflect exactly what has
5 been taken over by governmental agencies for
6 environmental programs. Drinking water quality
7 standards are tightening. We need more water.
8 You really can't believe this increased need for
9 water can be addressed by water use efficiency
10 and/or loss of farmland.

11 I represent an urban area in the
12 southern San Joaquin Valley our main economy is
13 based on agriculture and oil, both of which have
14 already been affected by excess environmental
15 regulatory actions. Oil companies are closing
16 down and ag land is being sold resulting in one of
17 the highest employment rate areas in the state.
18 How can the CALFED process measure the economic
19 impact of urban savings on our prime farmland and
20 the increase in water supplies for the environment
21 against the impact of loss of revenue for the
22 state and the loss of livelihood for thousands of
23 families.

24 Oh, I'm running behind. In closing
25 I would like to say I'm here as a representative

1 of water agency, but also as a grandmother. May I
2 remind you the decisions we make today will affect
3 the quality of life of our children and their
4 children. The use of our water supply for
5 environmental restoration of the Delta and other
6 areas of the state is very important. It should
7 be an ongoing process.

8 MR. BODOVITZ: Miss Mathews, I'm sorry,
9 the time.

10 MS. MATHEWS: Thank you.

11 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you all.

12 Our next speaker John Stoveall, followed
13 by Jim Beckfold, by Mary Ann Lockhart.

14 John Stoveall.

15 (Pause in the proceedings.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. STOVALL: Yes, Mr. Bodovitz. My name
2 is John Stovall. I'm a resident of Bakersfield. I've been
3 asked to read a statement from Congressman Bill Thomas.
4 Congressman Thomas is working for us back in Washington. He
5 represents part of Kern, Tulare and Kings County. And he
6 has a statement prepared which is titled, The CALFED Process
7 Requires Change.

8 And these are Congressman Thomas' words. When
9 the CALFED process for working out Bay-Delta water supply
10 questions was announced in 1994, California water users
11 hoped it would lead to a successful strategy for handling
12 California's complex water supply issues. Today water users
13 say the only way the CALFED process can succeed is for the
14 federal and state governments to radically restructure its
15 decision making process.

16 CALFED was suppose to bring water users,
17 government agencies and other stake holders together to
18 agree to a comprehensive Bay-Delta water supply strategy.
19 Everyone recognized that the variety of laws applicable to
20 California water created the potential for chaos.
21 Interested groups could form shop and find agencies or laws
22 most favorable to their view. Even compelled issuance of
23 wildly contradictory rules. The CALFED process was suppose
24 to bring us all together to deal with the issues in a way
25 that would produce a coherent result and opportunity for

1 everyone to get better together. Today we are no nearer
2 that objective. Agencies remain free to take different
3 positions which lead to perpetual impasse.

4 Because the process has been based on requiring
5 contentious agreement every minority interest has the power
6 to veto proposals. The result of this undisciplined process
7 when combined with out of control federal fishery agencies
8 has been to give fish first call on water supplies. It is
9 not clear how the citizens of California are going to be
10 treated. We cannot tell whether water supplies are to be
11 increased or decreased or even how much farm land might be
12 retired. There is little consideration of the cost and
13 benefits of creating new intra-structure for storage.

14 I agree with water users in Kern and Tulare
15 Counties that federal and state executive authorities need
16 to become responsible partners and to provide leadership
17 over this process. Only they can change the negotiation
18 process and in the prospect that a radical minority can veto
19 every proposal at once.

20 Only they can compel all the stake holders to
21 work toward meaningful goals for water quality, water
22 supplies and the governor must lead the CALFED process and
23 assume responsibility for seeing that it works.

24 MR. BODOVITZ: Mr. Stovall, I let you go
25 a little longer because of the rough start (inaudible)

1 MR. STOVALL: Okay. I urge them to do so
2 immediately.

3 MR. BODOVITZ: All right. Thank you. Jim
4 Beck, Mary Ann Lockhart, William Taube.

5 MR. BECK: Good evening. I'm Jim Beck.
6 I'm the manager of Improvement District #4 of the Kern
7 County Water Agency. And our district provides the
8 supplemental water supply using state project to water to
9 over three thousand residence in the metropolitan
10 Bakersfield area.

11 We also operate a treatment plan that provides
12 the drinking water supplied for over ninety thousand
13 residence of Bakersfield. And you've heard many fine
14 comments tonight that dealt with water supply concerns of
15 folks in the valley. I'm going to offer a little bit
16 different tact and present some comments related to our
17 water quality concerns. As manager of our district you can
18 understand why I'd be very concerned about what potential
19 benefits would be provided by the proposed CALFED program,
20 as well as what protection was included in the plan.

21 When I began reviewing the very lengthy
22 document, I was immediately struck by a statement that was
23 included in the executive summary. In the Mission Statement
24 one of the things that was to be the goal of the project was
25 to provide good water qualify for all beneficial uses. This

1 statement to be in conflict with the statement that I read
2 later which said, that the goal of the water quality program
3 was to provide continuous improvement in the quality of
4 waters in the Bay-Delta system. So as I read the rest of
5 the report I wondered what was the real goal of the program
6 as it related to water quality.

7 Was it status quo or improvement. The Bay-Delta
8 solution that we were interested in was one that wouldn't
9 stay with where we were at, but would actually improve the
10 quality of the water. With this concern of mine I read the
11 rest of the report to determine what was CALFED's proposal.
12 Status quo, or improvement. It seemed that after I finished
13 reading the entire document that you really were trying to
14 accomplish both goals. Your program is proposal to
15 continuous improvement of the quality of water, but mainly
16 with the -- of minimizing environmental water quality
17 impacts. It doesn't address much for those of us in the
18 drinking water supply end of things.

19 There are specific actions in the water quality
20 program that provides significant environmental benefits,
21 but again, this program does little to address the two key
22 concerns of those of us in the drinking water supply
23 business. Reduction of the salt loads in the Delta supplies
24 as they are used for drinking water down stream, by down
25 stream users, as well as reducing the TOC in the source

1 waters.

2 Finally, the report states that the isolated
3 facility may be -- would be the preferred alternative to
4 address key technical solute issues related to fisheries and
5 water quality. But immediately after you state that, this
6 report quickly dismisses that reasoning and goes to a very
7 lengthy list of why that's -- we feel that's bowing to some
8 of the pressure instead of dealing with real technical
9 issues. Thank you.

10 MR. BODOVITZ: Mary Ann Lockhart, William
11 Taube, J. Steven Worthley, Tulare County Board of
12 Supervisors.

13 MS. LOCKHART: My name is Mary Ann
14 Lockhart and I'm a resident of the Frasher Park area, just
15 on the end of the bottom part of Kern County -- into Los
16 Angeles County.

17 And I'm hearing more and more about we want more
18 water and I think that in just listening to a different
19 speaker saying I had a few questions I'd like to ask. I'm
20 wondering for example why farmers are still growing very
21 water needy crops like cotton and rice? If we were to
22 change our crop source and our crop ideas maybe not save --
23 and that would be a way of water conservation. In light of
24 this area we are looking to find out what our water supply
25 actually is and we can't find out what the extent of our

1 aquifer is. Where, how big it is. How much water it
2 contain. And I suppose our problem is the same as all over
3 the state, do we really know how much ground storage we can
4 have? And really utilize well.

5 Kern County has a wonderful perm water bank and
6 they have an aquifer there that they have really fully
7 developed. And how many other places in the state would
8 have that same possibility? Do we really know? Yes or no.

9 We -- in our little community we have no way to
10 really recycle the water that we use in our bathtubs and in
11 our kitchen sinks and once we can get technology to that and
12 have that be a requirement in every house in the State of
13 California, how much water would we save that way? That
14 instead of putting a dam up and other water surface storage
15 place, can't we use more technology in every way in order to
16 save and reuse our water?

17 I really came here originally and I just changed
18 my -- statements a little bit to introduce what the National
19 Resource Defence Council has produced in it's study it made
20 in 1998. And it's not only water saving -- their immediate
21 aim was pesticide control and water quality control. But
22 they came up with all these water savings things when they
23 tried to install and to inform people how to do this in
24 their -- techniques and I wonder how many farmers are really
25 including that as a way of conserving water. Reducing the

1 costs of their fertilizers, and the cost of all the
2 materials they need to produce. And so, then the other
3 thing I wondered too, does everybody in this room have a low
4 flow toilet? Does everybody in this room have water
5 efficient machines? One really wonders. That has to be all
6 over the state before we have to put any other water
7 conservation things in. Do we have tiered pricing
8 everywhere? You know how it is with people with water. If
9 you have to pay more for it you are not going to use as much
10 and you are going to find ways to conserve yourself. And I
11 don't see why we have to have lawns everywhere. We're in
12 the west, we're not in the east and we shouldn't try to look
13 like the east, with lawns, lawns, lawns. We should do more
14 like Tucson does. They have strict requirements on what
15 plants you can do and lawns are extremely limited there.
16 You can't -- you can hardly find them anywhere. We don't
17 need to have all our water going into lawns. And then how
18 we got this whole idea of going in and really talking to
19 people to about conserving water individually and farmers
20 really doing it and really instructing people in the
21 technology of water conservation. Those to me are just some
22 sources of water conservation that we could explore first
23 before building dams.

24 MR. BODOVITZ: William Taube, Steven
25 Worthley, Ed Yamamoto.

1 MR. TAUBE: Good evening. My name is
2 William Taube and I'm the engineer manager for the Wheeler
3 Ridge Maricopa Water Storage District.

4 My district relies on water from the state water
5 project as it's primary source of water supply. I am
6 concerned that the plan that you've provided fails to
7 replace the water supplies voluntarily given up pursuant to
8 the 1994 Bay-Delta accord and further fails to protect our
9 water supplies from the kind of regulatory robbery that we
10 have witnessed in the past.

11 When we agreed to the terms of the Bay-Delta
12 accord in 1994 and voluntarily gave up three hundred
13 thousand to four hundred thousand acre feet of state water
14 project yield as part of that agreement we were promised
15 that this yield would promptly be replaced as part of the
16 CALFED solution process.

17 When the CALFED study process is completed with
18 our without additional yield we expect this water to be
19 return. In addition your program needs to provide some real
20 protection from regulatory agencies acting outside of any
21 agreement in order for California to have any real hope of
22 a stable water supply. The reason Delta smelt crisis is a
23 good example of this. Water users reached an agreement with
24 you folks in the Bay-Delta accord which call for us to give
25 large quantities of water to help the Delta Eco system in

1 exchange for protection from regulatory take limits. It
2 worked well for you. The Eco system of the Delta improved
3 nicely with increased populations of Delta smelt. It didn't
4 work to well for us. The pumps provided water for users
5 south of the Delta were severely restricted because a small
6 portion of the increased population wanted to hang out near
7 the pumps.

8 You have also suggested in your report that
9 salmon won't be recovered under any circumstances do to
10 unexplained, unidentified and uncontrollable factors. If
11 that's the case, why are we going through this exercise? If
12 we're not going to get recovery because some foreign country
13 is over fishing, why should we sacrifice our economy in
14 pursuit of the un-achievable?

15 Water users can't be put in a dilemma of
16 providing water to increase populations of species without
17 receiving real protection from artificial take limits and un-
18 achievable pipe dreams. They must have confidence that
19 CALFED agencies, particularly federal regulators will live
20 by their agreements and seriously consider the interest of
21 Californians. There are serious concern among water users,
22 that some CALFED agencies just can't be trusted. If federal
23 regulatory agencies really want to help species, they must
24 have the cooperation of Californians. To develop a
25 cooperative relationship with Californians they must show

1 themselves trustworthy.

2 Many of us in this area still live by the
3 handshake. Our word is our bond. The federal government
4 just isn't there anymore, if they ever were. As a result we
5 want to see firm binding commitments on every single point
6 of consequence. Those commitments need to be ratified by
7 both state and federal statute to insure they won't be
8 trumped by a subsequent bureaucrats interpretation of the
9 regulations involved.

10 MR. BODOVITZ: (Inaudible)

11 MR. TAUBE: Thank you.

12 MR. BODOVITZ: Mr. Worthley, Ed Yamamoto,
13 Russ Waymire.

14 MR. WORTHLEY: First, I would like to say
15 that on behalf of the Tulare County Board of Supervisors,
16 welcome to Tulare County. I do have a few comments to make.
17 Relative to Tulare County, it's been stated before, I just
18 want to repeat it. Our county is a net user of water. We
19 are dependent upon a reliable and I must underline
20 affordable supply of waters. It is one thing to say it's
21 reliable. It's quite another thing to make it so expensive,
22 that it's not affordable for our purposes.

23 I want to focus a moment here on the matter of
24 implementation -- the -- and the process that was talked
25 about by Senator Costa. The focus being upon implementation

1 vs. process. If you look at the implementation plan
2 overview, under Eco system restoration, you find some very
3 specific goals and objectives. Stage one will restore two
4 thousand acres of title perennial aquatic habitat. Eight
5 thousand to twelve thousand acres of fresh and emergent
6 title wetlands. Four thousand acres of fresh and emergent
7 non-title wetlands.

8 You have specific goals and objectives set forth
9 there. This is implementation not process oriented. If you
10 skip over to watershed program, however, find it's very
11 process oriented. You find nothing of this nature that
12 talks about how many acres were going to treat. What we are
13 going to do improve the water quality in watersheds. It's
14 all process oriented. What this does is to stake out a
15 position early on for the environmental concerns which puts
16 the people and the agencies in charge of production in a
17 catchup position which is a secondary position, one which is
18 difficult to overcome.

19 I think this is also a violation of the solution
20 principles I refer to 1.2.2 which says that one of the
21 principles is to result in no significant redirected impact.
22 Solutions will not solve problems in the bay area system by
23 redirecting significant negative impacts when viewed in
24 their entirety within the Bay-Delta or other regions of
25 California.

1 We are of the other regions of California. We
2 are quite dependent upon this water. Without this water,
3 especially in our citrus area and many of our cities, we
4 will suffer severe consequences. Thank you very much.

5 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you very much. Ed
6 Yamamoto, Russ Waymire, Carl Eggman-Garrett.

7 MR. YAMAMOTO: Good evening people. I'm
8 Ed Yamamoto. I'm really not anyone special. But all I've
9 heard tonight is gripe and complaints about the CALFED
10 program.

11 The problem is why don't we have a solution?
12 Okay. Why don't we build these desalination plants on the
13 coast to supply the Southern California with their drinking
14 water, The San Francisco bay area, Monterey and if we build
15 these desalination plants, we free up roughly three, 3.4
16 million acre feet of water, -- take it away from the cities,
17 it's still here in the valley. Why can't we just do that?

18 Five billion dollars in the first phase of the
19 program goes a long way to build these desalination plant.
20 So why don't we look at that as a long-term solution, rather
21 than trying to make the CALFED program be the long-term
22 solution? It will not cure the long-term. That's all I've
23 got. Thank you.

24 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you. Russ Waymire,
25 then Carla Eggman-Garrett, then Richard Harrison.

1 MR. WAYMIRE: Before you start my time, I
2 noticed when the camera's left, most of the politicians left
3 too.

4 Anyway, in 1992 the George Miller and Bill
5 Bradley, CVP reform legislation removed eight hundred
6 thousand plus feet of water from the valley. This is going
7 to dry up about five hundred thousand acres of land. If
8 this water is not restored in the contracts for field that
9 was suppose to. Concurrent with that CVPIA hearings also
10 indicate under CVP reform that the federal government would
11 like to see another million acres under their program
12 retired to increase environmental water flow objectives.
13 Without additional storage as separate, and I repeat
14 separate, CALFED plan indicates the potential to retire an
15 additional million acres or more to satisfy the CALFED
16 environmental objectives.

17 The public has the right to be fully be informed
18 of what's at risk and we should demand a full environmental
19 and economic evaluation for the central valley.

20 When you talk about accumulating, retiring over
21 two million acres of farm land, it's is going to be
22 catatropic for the valley. I was at hearings when
23 environmentalist of the bay area spokesman Barry Nelson
24 stated their opposition to any new storage. He also
25 advocated western statewide water marketing of California

1 water and contrary, I heard tonight, that the
2 environmentalist would suggest that we get away from the
3 rhetoric, us farmers sure haven't testified at hearings to
4 encourage government agents to violate the environmentalist
5 private property rights. As has Arthur Unger at a hearing
6 where he spoke and encouraged federal agents to violate
7 private property rights to satisfy the environmentalist
8 agenda.

9 If the bay area environmentalist hypocrites are
10 really concerned river flows may be they should remove Hetch
11 Hetchy dam in Yosemite Park and let the water flow down
12 stream instead of piping their water direct from a national
13 park to San Francisco.

14 We need increased storage for environmental
15 flows and increased reliability of water for ag, urban users
16 and clean electric generation. The central valley has the
17 highest unemployment rate in the nation. And the ultimate
18 water solution cannot solve California's long-term water
19 problems by making unemployment worse here.

20 Is your city ready for water rationing? Or
21 ground water rationing? In 1994 Orange Co. in a CVP service
22 area was rationed to one and one-half gallons per day per
23 house.

24 The CALFED summary report states that the CALFED
25 action would have a disproportionate impact on minorities

1 and low income families in the valley.

2 Governor Davis, Senator Costa, Assembly members
3 Flores, and Reeve (phonetic) if you care about the central
4 valley we need action. Action speaks louder than words when
5 the central valley loses water, we lose jobs.

6 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Waymire.
7 Carla Eggman-Garrett, Richard Harrison, Bill Maze of Tulare
8 County Board of Supervisors.

9 MS. EGGMAN-GARRETT: Hello, my name is
10 Carla Eggman-Garrett. I'm going to talk to these people
11 because these are my people.

12 I have a face. This is my face. I am a farmer.
13 I have been a farmer all of my life, along with my family.
14 We have a very small little farmer -- farm that we have
15 eaked out a living. But this year our farm froze. I am a
16 citrus farmer and if I did not have a job outside my family,
17 outside my farm, I would not be able to pay for my water.
18 And our water district is afraid to give us any water,
19 because if we use it over a month we might not pay for it.
20 So I have a catch twenty-two. If I don't work to pay for my
21 water, I do not get my water and if I do not get my water,
22 I do not have a crop.

23 So, as a farmer, I am in a bind. My farmer, my
24 farm has not been able to support my family. I've had to
25 work outside my family -- to be able to support my family

1 and feed my family, or we would starve to death. But that
2 does that mean anybody up in the bay area cares about how I
3 feel or about my farm goes and how my family eats? No.

4 Yes, the federal government helped for the crop
5 disaster this year of everything being frozen. By the time
6 the federal government get through with paying, it comes out
7 to about one fourth to one eighth of our farm production.
8 And I found out tonight that I'm not the only one on this
9 band wagon.

10 That by the time the federal government paid for
11 other peoples frozen farms and damaged crops that only one
12 fourth to one eighth, maybe even less than that, was paid by
13 the federal government. It didn't even cover the cost of
14 what we had to put into the farm.

15 Oh, after seeing that wonderful film that showed
16 us, and after I saw that about the wonderful glittering
17 generalities of how many things they can do with our water,
18 not once did I hear about farmers. I mean we're kind of low
19 on the totem pole. Well, we're not even on the totem pole
20 with that film. And if that is the case with this CALFED
21 agency, I don't see any water in the future of our farmers.
22 All I can hear, and hear that film loud and clear, is how
23 they are going to take our water from us anyway they can.
24 We're barely able to hang on. And we're going belly up.
25 That's what I have to say tonight.

1 MR. BODOVITZ: Richard Harrison, Bill
2 Maze, Tulare County Board of Supervisor, followed by Council
3 Member Don Landers of Visalia and Sean Geivet.

4 MR. MAZE: Good evening panel members.
5 It's a pleasure to be on the behalf of the County of Board
6 of Supervisors along with my fellow supervisor, Mr.
7 Worthley, who was here earlier.

8 We had put down the point that we felt very
9 critical that the Governor of California, along with the
10 President and Secretary, Interior Secretary Babbitt, ought
11 to be, very much be involved in this process and we needed
12 to elevate this to a higher level.

13 Recognizing the fact that we are a partner in
14 this whole issue, the senator made on dependence and
15 interdependence, the area that we are here in the central
16 part of California with the Sierra Nevada's, with the
17 timbering industry, what the water sheds off of this area,
18 it is not a net producer of excess water capacity. We
19 believe it absolutely essential that we look at the
20 interrelationship of the CALFED, with the Sierra's up here,
21 with controlled burning, with State -- Agency, these folks
22 need to be at the table dealing with what will be additional
23 quantities of water coming out of the Sierra Nevada's. So
24 that's an essential part of this.

25 In difference to the Senator, I don't believe

1 that we need to be moving to the implementation at this
2 point and that we recognize the fact of all these comments
3 tonight, we still need to deal with the process to come to
4 a conscientious of how we are going to proceed with here
5 effort.

6 Water storage of course was the number one issue
7 from the County Board. We do believe that there is
8 additional storage needed in the area. We are doing
9 something about that in our county along with our
10 neighboring counties by increasing the capacity at two of
11 the existing facilities that we have.

12 Again, abodes, when will people and their
13 livelihoods be addressed as the issue rather than seemingly
14 the critters, the fish and the birds? And that was --
15 constituents messages that continue to come to our desk on
16 a continued basis. Again, thank you very much. We see this
17 process going forward and the opportunity to participate.

18 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, supervisor. Our
19 reporter unfortunately is going to have to leave. But we
20 will be recording everything that is said from this point on
21 and that will be transcribed as well as the comments that
22 she took down.

23 Mr. Landers and -- Sean Geivet and Blake
24 Sanders.

25 MR. LANDERS: Good evening. My name is

1 Don Landers. I'm Vice-Mayor for the City of Visalia. On
2 behalf of Visalia City Council we would like to welcome you
3 to this beautiful facility. I hope it was adequate and met
4 your needs. It was paid for by farmer income indirectly.
5 But the City of Visalia benefits from about a three billion
6 dollar farming economy here in Tulare County and without
7 that income, and that economy this facility probably would
8 not exist, along with a lot of the other amenities here in
9 our community. So we would like to recognize that first and
10 foremost.

11 One of the things that our colleagues to the
12 west in Kings County emphasized is more dam storage. I
13 would also like to echo that comment. I think it's
14 appropriate. And the City Council and the City of Visalia
15 has participated in partnership with the County of Tulare,
16 along with several other entities, the federal and state
17 government, with the Core of Engineers, the lead agencies on
18 basically what amounts to a flood control project. But it
19 increases the capacity of the Quea (phonetic) Lake up to the
20 east here by forty-three thousand acre feet, that's about a
21 thirty percent increase in our total capacity to about a
22 hundred and eighty-six thousand. The -- all be it that that
23 is not the answer to the storage, it is somewhat of a
24 commitment to a flood project that does provide for
25 additional storage up there for a lot of different uses.

1 We would also like to see that the commitment to
2 additional storage at your level is enhanced and emphasized
3 and I guess I leave you with the parting comment that the
4 endangered species seem to have a heightened level of
5 priority and we don't want our farmers to become one of
6 those, so they enjoy that same right. We'd like you to
7 place them ahead of the others at the start. So, thank you.

8 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Vice Mayor
9 Landers. Sean Geivet, I'm at the mercy of handwriting on
10 this as all the others. I'm sure I'm not getting close.
11 Followed by Blake Sanden and Tom Chamberlain.

12 MR. GEIVET: Hello, my name is Sean
13 Geivet. I'm the manager for the Terra Bella Irrigation
14 District and I'm also representing the Fire and Water Users
15 Authority this evening.

16 We're disappointed to say the least that CALFED
17 has not gone farther in surface storage. We believe more
18 emphasis and resources need to be committed to the
19 developing additional, reliable water supply using new
20 surface storage. The problem is simple. We expect the
21 California population to grow by fifteen million, twenty
22 million in the next twenty years. This additional
23 population will create the need to develop an estimated 1.875
24 million acre feet of reliable, clean water supply.

25 Water storage studies have been done in the

1 past. We know what the answers are. We looked at CALFED to
2 provide the leadership that is required to move this program
3 along rapidly. We must immediately start the process to
4 develop additional water supply. This is especially true
5 for the upper San Joaquin River. If restoration act
6 actions are to be successfully pursued in the future.

7 CALFED should continue to develop pliable ground
8 water storage and conjunctive use programs that will
9 increase the available water supply. This give us the
10 ability to store wet water in the underground for use in a
11 dry year. This is particular critical for the Frient
12 (phonetic) division because our ground water basin is
13 chronically overdraft. There have been projects that were
14 planned to solve this problem in the past. The mid-valley
15 canal was to serve an area that encompassed the Frient
16 (phonetic) division and beyond. Water supplies for the mid-
17 valley service area over were some of the first waters
18 sacrificed for environmental restoration lost to the CVPIA
19 and biological opinions.

20 The area is still water short and in need of
21 additional imports in order to arrest the existing ground
22 water overdraft. Water conservation in free market forces
23 will not do enough to quench California's thirst for water.

24 The reallocation of the existing water supply is
25 not a sustainable solution and it is not good for the people

1 of California. Therefore, everyone in California needs to
2 recognize that any successful long-term solution to the
3 Delta's problems must include immediate development of new
4 reliable and clean water supply. Thank you.

5 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you. Blake Sanden,
6 Tom Chamberlain, J. Allen Akkerman.

7 MR. SANDEN: Thank you for the opportunity
8 to speak this evening.. I'm Blake Sanden. The irrigation
9 management and the ground -- advisor with the University of
10 California, Cooperative Extension in Kern County.

11 I'm here basically this evening to comment on
12 some of the problems I see with the assumptions in the water
13 use efficiency program in the CALFED process at this point.

14 Basically put, the CALFED assumes that there is
15 5.7 to 6.4 million acre feet that is conservable water from
16 our current agricultural applications. This is a huge
17 amount. You know, this is another Oroville Dam two times
18 over. This concept right here is one of the main reasons
19 that CALFED has been able to side step a more direct
20 approach to looking at storage options with regards to
21 future increased water supplies. And I am here to say that
22 there are serious problems with the validity of the water use
23 efficiency assumptions that have gone into that document.

24 I have no time today to go into the detail that
25 has been presented in the paper you have before you. I

1 submit that to go forward to the appropriate people that
2 will be looking at this issue. I know Tom Goering is one of
3 them, over here. But I would like to say basically, the
4 snap shot distribution uniformities that have been developed
5 through the different mobile labs that we have around
6 California for the Department of Water Resources bulletin,
7 California Water Plan Update, are severely underestimating
8 our seasonal long distribution uniformities.

9 I have data of long-term experience in Kern
10 County that shows that these seasonal uniformities can be
11 anywhere from five to twelve percent higher than are usual
12 snapshot estimates. Some of that detail you have in front
13 you.

14 The other assumption that is shown in the Water
15 Bulletin is that the surface irrigation usually run about
16 sixty-five percent. In California -- in our Kern County --
17 Mobile Irrigation Lab, out of seven hundred and ten
18 evaluations, from 1988 to present, our service irrigation
19 for -- on border strip runs eighty to eighty-two percent on
20 the average, which is almost identical with our uniformity
21 for micro sprinklers and drip. The current assumption in
22 the water use efficiency program is that 1.2 to 1.4 million
23 acre feet alone can be saved from the Tulare Lake Basin. If
24 you pencil out the figure that is used for current ET and
25 current supply from that document itself, that works out to

1 be, our current use is eighty percent water use efficiency.
2 If you take out that 1.4 million acre feet that is going to
3 be conserved, it says that the entire Tulare Lake Basin is
4 going to irrigation at ninety-five percent water use
5 efficiency. You won't get a single irrigation engineer in
6 the world to agree that that is achievable for an entire
7 region. Thank you.

8 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Sanden. Tom
9 Chamberlain. Tom Chamberlain. J. Allen Akkerman, followed
10 by Bill Carlisle, followed by Roger Reynolds.

11 MR. AKKERMAN: Well thank you very much
12 for this opportunity to provide some public comments.
13 Otherwise you folks and others are charged with a
14 significant responsibility to ensure an equitable and a
15 balanced approach to meeting the water needs of an extremely
16 important industry to this state as well as to the cities,
17 including environment.

18 Having said that, I believe that one of the
19 reasons for this large crowd being here tonight, is because
20 not all is black and white. In what we hear and what we
21 read, especially, as one tries to understand the impact of
22 the preferred CALFED alternative will have on farming and
23 urban populations.

24 My name is Joe Akkerman. I serve as a joint
25 present for two farm lending organizations, collectively

1 referred to as Valley Farm Credit. These charters are to
2 serve the sound and constructive credit needs of farmers and
3 ranchers. We are part of the nationwide farm credit system
4 and there are other system institutions around the State of
5 California, who share equally in the concerns about the
6 impact CALFED decisions will have on the future of this
7 State's agriculture.

8 As cooperative lending institutions are only
9 controlled by our member customers. We have more than a
10 passing interest in what result from any change in the
11 priority usage of water. Resource in question here is one
12 that farmers in good faith, and at a cost, have done to
13 historically rely upon for their livelihoods for the
14 contributions that they are making to society.

15 On a combined basis the organizations that I
16 represent have loan assets totaling almost three quarters of
17 a billion dollars to some two thousand customers, primary
18 located in Kings, Tulare, and King County, in Kern County,
19 excuse me. Statewide that investment is significantly
20 greater.

21 Now over half of this loan volume is long-term
22 real estate loans. Some of extending out to twenty-five
23 years into the future. You can quickly realize that if you
24 had to a portfolio of this size, the ag-loan portfolio of
25 other lenders, there is a tremendous investment in

1 California agriculture by the banking institutions. All at
2 some level of risk depending on the final results of the
3 CALFED decision making process.

4 By recognizing that some of that investment
5 actually belongs to lenders, most of it comes from various
6 public, private and even government investment sources.
7 These investments are subject to risk of loss should a
8 viable agriculture economy not continue because of a
9 reduced, or in some case, full elimination of surface water
10 supplies on farms related to those investments. That risk,
11 should it materialize, would be born to a large degree by
12 those investment sources that are far removed the farming
13 communities. Long-term access irrigation waters are a major
14 stabilizing influence on production of agriculture.
15 Reduction in the assurance of a stable and adequate water
16 supply adds new risks to farming and that definitely will
17 effect the terms, the conditions and in many cases the
18 willingness of banking institutions to provide a needed and
19 continuous stream of capital necessary to the viable
20 industry.

21 MR. BODOVITZ: Mr. Akkerman your time is
22 gone.

23 MR. AKKERMAN: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. BODOVITZ: Sorry sir. Bill Carlisle,
25 Roger Reynolds, Barbara Ferguson.

1 MR. CARLISLE: My name is Bill Carlisle.
2 I'm the general manager of Souther/San Joaquin Municipal
3 Utility District. Member of the Frient Water Users
4 Authority and the Central Valley Project Contractor. I'm
5 here at the request of Board of Directors who represents the
6 land owners and growers in the Delano and McFarland areas in
7 north Kern County.

8 We are concerned with the massive cost increases
9 per federal contract water and the uncertainty of the supply
10 that has developed as a result of priority given to proceed
11 in environmental needs. In less then ten years we have
12 experienced the effect the hammer clause (phonetic) and an
13 eight hundred percent cost of service increase in two
14 environmental restoration fees. During this period the cost
15 of class I water increased from \$3.50 an acre foot to \$32.00
16 an acre foot. We've been saddled with the federal law that
17 the Central Valley Improvement Act which can only be
18 described as punitive. We've lost our long-term contract as
19 a result of sixteen environmental organization suing the
20 United States over procedural error.

21 Lastly, it should be noted that it takes more
22 acreage than ever to make a living at farming and our
23 federal government response, by imposing acreage
24 limitations.

25 Our water supply is under constant attack,

1 planned environmental interest, and now to various
2 politicians. The crime, producing food for not only for
3 people in the valley to consume, but also people in the
4 state, the country, and in some cases the world. The
5 southern and San Joaquin Valley is well know for chronic
6 overdraft ground water. The Frient unit is a supplemental
7 surface water supply to the primary ground water and thus we
8 have the term, conjunctive use. The delicate mix of these
9 two sources of supply is critical not only to farms, but
10 also to most of the cities that rely exclusively on ground
11 water. When we experience a cost increase, such as the
12 \$2.12 per acre foot, environmental adder that we will be hit
13 within two weeks, the mix changes.

14 When ag water is redirected for environmental
15 purposes, the mix changes and when the Tracy pumps are off,
16 well I think you get the picture. Thus far, during 1999,
17 water supply has experience numerous hits in quantity and
18 reliable. The pumps in Tracy were turned off at the
19 beginning of the peach season in order to protect Delta
20 smelt. The Trinity River flow reduction plan was
21 introduced, the water was released down the San Joaquin
22 River to sprout willow trees. At the same time, San Joaquin
23 River tributary districts banded together in order to
24 release pulse flow water for salmon.

25 Now before you is a draft preferred plan to

1 restore the Delta and to provide better reliability. We
2 feel any plans to be considered by CALFED must include water
3 storage and (inaudible) projected today, not several years
4 from now. I encourage you to put politics aside and do what
5 is best for California. We ask that you strongly support
6 the true stake holder, those that produce something for the
7 people and the economy and also have everything to loose.
8 And lastly we urge you to reverse the current -- half a
9 sentence to go -- reverse the current regulate and destroy
10 philosophy and adopt a new direction of protecting and
11 enhance. Thank you.

12 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you. Roger Reynolds,
13 Barbara Ferguson, Jim Sullen (phonetic).

14 MR. REYNOLDS: Good Evening. My name is
15 Roger Reynolds. I work for Summers Engineering in Hanford
16 and my comments this evening are on behalf of the Westside
17 Irrigation District, the State Water Contractor in Kings
18 County.

19 The CALFED goal to develop and implement a long-
20 term comprehensive plan will restore ecological help and
21 improve water management for beneficial uses of the Bay-
22 Delta system is laudable. Much of the data and information
23 CALFED has produced and obtained in the last few years has
24 been beneficial.

25 However, state water project users in the Empire

1 West Side Irrigation District, and Kings County have a
2 difficult time understanding what benefits they will
3 received from the proposed program. As mentioned endangered
4 species regulatory actions in the Delta over the last few
5 years have created an apparently, and will continue to
6 create a very real potential for water supply shortages in
7 the state water project deliveries.

8 Farmers are fearful, the long-term future of
9 farming and their own livelihoods will be significantly
10 impacted if the CALFED program does not address and make
11 some type of guarantee regarding water supply reliability to
12 the future. Water supply reliability is mentioned often as
13 one of the goals of the CALFED program, but details or
14 guarantees on how the water management goal will be
15 implemented are missing. This is one of the primary
16 concerns of San Joaquin Valley Water Users, dependent on the
17 Delta.

18 The executive summary, Overview of the Preferred
19 Program Alternative, clearly indicates that primary emphasis
20 in the program is Eco System restoration. Water quality
21 improvement and the reduction of adverse environmental
22 affects. Not the improvement of water supply reliability
23 for ag water users.

24 The next to last item in my list of multiple
25 benefits which will be provided in the Executive Summary,

1 indicates the program will develop, appropriate ground water
2 and surface storage in conjunction with specified water
3 conservation, recycling and water transfer programs to
4 provide water for the environment at times when it is most
5 needed and improve water supply reliability. We need to
6 emphasize and develop the concept of water supply
7 reliability restoration. The emphasis appears to be on
8 constructing appropriate storage facilities to improve or
9 provide water for the environment and then it mentions the
10 program also might help water supply reliability.

11 Why are not specifics given? This emphasis does
12 not give a lot of comfort to the ag water users. Much in
13 the State is moving forward on growth and with the increased
14 population. Cal-Trans is building new facilities. Prisons
15 are being built. Studies for a high speed rail from Southern
16 California have been made and are moving forward and even
17 the Governor put together a recent agreement with an Indian
18 tribe which will allow the number of slot machines to almost
19 double.

20 MR. BODOVITZ: Mr. Reynolds your three
21 minutes are up.

22 MR. REYNOLDS: CALFED needs to move
23 forward.

24 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you. Barbara
25 Ferguson, Jim Sullen (phonetic), Mike George.

1 MS. FERGUSON: Good evening. My name is
2 Barbara Ferguson. I'm with the SAMS Coalition Steering
3 Committee. And I would like to express my concern about the
4 poultry amount of monies, -- for more water storage. The
5 estimated budget for the next seven years is 5.1 billion
6 dollars. Yet only 370 million has been ear marked to study
7 additional water storage. This program has been a work in
8 process since 1995, and propose at this point, seven more
9 years to study storage issues and time storage to
10 demonstrate it progress in water use efficiency is not
11 addressing the most pressing needs of the state, which are
12 reliable water deliveries and most importantly more water.

13 The population growth of California is expected
14 to increase by 20 million people in the next quarter
15 century. We now have a mismatch between current water
16 supplies. The needs of water users and the Eco System needs
17 of the Bay-Delta System. The water management strategy
18 lists as one of it's goals, improve access to existing or
19 new water supplies. I would like to present to you some
20 information that has been ignored in the CALFED process. We
21 saw that absolutely beautiful film you produced with the
22 Sierra Nevada's, which reach from Kern all the way up to the
23 Oregon border, 50% of California's run off originates from
24 the national forest, along those Sierra Nevada ranges. The
25 west side of the Sierra Nevada range produces over 19.6

1 million acre feet of water per year. And vegetated
2 management can increase water run off by as much as 20% and
3 can delay it's release for several weeks. Active management
4 in the Sierra Nevada National Forest could yield as much as
5 3.9 million acre feet a year of more water.

6 Conservative estimates indicate that just
7 decreasing the vegetated build-up in the National Forest due
8 to 100 years of fire suppression would increase the water
9 yield by 10% or 1.9 million acre feet of water.

10 The CALFED process needs to look at all the
11 upstream watersheds that feed the Delta and determine what
12 steps can be taken to increase water yield.

13 I want to remind all of you that the Organic Act
14 of 1897, which established the national forest, states, and
15 I quote, no national forest shall be established excess for
16 the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flows.

17
18 MR. BODOVITZ: Ms. Ferguson your time is
19 up.

20 MS. FERGUSON: One sentence. The State of
21 California needs to exercise it's rights and demand that it
22 co-federal agency, the U.S. Forest Service, evaluate the
23 potential increase of water flows from the Sierra Nevada to
24 an active vegetative management program. Thank you very
25 much.

1 MR. BODOVITZ: Jim Sullan (Phonetic), Mike
2 George, Bill Ferry. Jim Sullen? Mike George, Bill Ferry,
3 Greg De Roulhac.

4 MR. GEORGE: My name is Mike George and
5 I'm a citrus grower. As a farmer I recognize that there are
6 serious environmental issues related to water in California.

7
8 It also seems to project the demographics over
9 the next twenty to forty years in our state and I have some
10 understand of how much this growth will need.

11 I believe the State of California federal
12 government use to have a long-term water strategy realizing
13 the important of agriculture to California and the United
14 States. In the last few years, I see it's commitment to
15 water evaporate. How do we solve the problems in and around
16 the Bay-Delta as well as on the San Joaquin River and the
17 Sacramento River? Obviously, we need more water in the
18 river. Where will this water come from? Certainly, we all
19 need to do our best to conserve at home and on the farm and
20 everywhere else, -- in sense tells me we need greater
21 surface storage. All three of the original CALFED
22 alternatives had provision for storage. Where is the
23 storage now and why has it been back burnered?

24 In my opinion we are wasting our time discussion
25 a solution to our states water problem without additional

1 water storage being first on the list. This may not be
2 politically correct, but it is reality. If fish, the
3 environment, water quality are truly important to
4 Californians, I believe they are, then Californians must
5 make a financial commitment to water storage. If the
6 taxpayer will not support water for storage as was spoken
7 earlier, the first speaker, then I submit fish, etc., are
8 not as important to Californians as they may be, we may be
9 lead to believe.

10 Why is storage so important? From the
11 perspective of an east side citrus farmer, I have no more
12 water left to give. The citrus industry and agriculture in
13 general have done what we have been asked to do in our
14 industry, we are 100% on drip, fan jet and micro sprinklers.
15 We have very high irrigation efficiency. I'd invite anybody
16 from the committee or anybody that's interested to come out
17 and take a look at what we are doing. We've donated,
18 agricultural has donated as has been pointed out tonight, a
19 tremendous amount of water, over a million acre feet. There
20 just isn't another seven hundred thousand acre feet to give.

21

22 I'd love to see enough water on the San Joaquin
23 River to establish a fishery again. It appears CALFED is
24 committed to fish. Are we as a society committed to the
25 livelihood of the fourteen thousand workers in the citrus

1 industry? Do we want a viable ag industry thirty years from
2 now? If we do, we need to focus on storage. Thank you very
3 much.

4 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. George.
5 Bill Ferry, Greg de Roulhac, Lloyd Carter.

6 MR. FERRY: Good evening. My name is Bill
7 Ferry, and I'm a third generation citrus farmer here in
8 Tulare County.

9 I just -- I'm here tonight to insure that my
10 forefathers hard work, sweat and blood is not put to waste.
11 It is not in vain. They worked very hard to get what they
12 got and they were invited here by the government. Here make
13 this desert into an oasis. Come to the land of milk and
14 honey. Come and make your livelihood and they did. They
15 worked hard. And I'm not going to drop the ball here in the
16 court now.

17 I'm here to insure that future generations are
18 also going to be able to farm. All of like to have clean
19 water, clean air. I want to make sure that our generations
20 in the future do have that. And we want to insure that. We
21 all want that. Everybody in this room, I'm sure, wants
22 that.

23 We also want -- in the last ten years, we have
24 great water efficiencies that have improved on our ranches
25 and time -- we were increasing our efficiency by 20 and

1 sometimes 25%.

2 Your plan has already taken one million acre
3 feet of water and you're asking for another seven hundred
4 thousand acre feet, what's going to be left in draught
5 years? We got to have water left in order to continue to
6 farm. You cannot take this water. We can negotiate new
7 contracts before February of 2000, and in the CVPIA I
8 understand the EIR isn't even completed yet. You know, we
9 have got to use some sound science and some good -- just
10 thoughts what we can do in order to keep everybody in water
11 and make sure that we have future generations of farmers.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Ferry. Greg
14 De Roulhac, Lloyd Carter, Walter Shuman.

15 MR. DeROULHAC: Thank you for the
16 opportunity to address you this evening. My name is Greg De
17 Roulhac, and I have a citrus in Porterville, California.

18 And I guess you are probably tired of hearing
19 that, I'm glad we have a machine taking down these thoughts.

20 About twelve thousand years ago an agricultural
21 revolution took place. Human beings discovered that growing
22 crops provided a greater degree of security than hunting and
23 gathering. The great civilizations of the past, upon which
24 are heritage is based, were all products of this revolution
25 and agriculture.

1 First came agriculture. Then came the
2 civilizations of the near east, Greece, Rome, and Islam. The
3 key component to this success of these agricultural based
4 societies was water. A reliable and dependable supply of
5 water. Now we find ourselves at the end of the twentieth
6 century, when because of a second agricultural revolution in
7 the eighteenth century, and because of the bounty of nature,
8 and because of the labor of farmers, we are able to feed the
9 entire population of this country, through the efforts of
10 about 5% of the population.

11 In this post industrial society, it is often
12 times easier to forget that we human beings are dependent on
13 our very existence, upon the verges of nature and the labor
14 of this 5% of the population.

15 Tonight we are here to address water problems
16 which are by no means new in the course of human history.
17 Must of California is blessed with extraordinary fertile
18 soils and a climate which provides a long growing season.
19 It's weather, however, especially respective to rain fall,
20 is particularly erratic. Periods of adequate and more than
21 adequate rainfall alternative with seven to ten year periods
22 of drought and minimal rainfall.

23 The need to provide a dependable supply of water
24 for it's citizens and economy has been a primary task for
25 the governments of California. And it is only because of

1 the planning for water storage and the development, which
2 was carried out earlier in this century, that California is
3 able to support today an economy which is among the largest
4 in the world, industrially and agriculturally.

5 We are concerned about the state of the
6 environment, however, in planning for the future of htis
7 state it is important to seek the balance of the needs of
8 the citizens, both urban and rural, and the needs of the
9 environment, in order to arrive at a solution that works for
10 all of us as well as for future generations.

11 Given fundamental population statistics we will
12 need more food, not less. More land, not less, more water,
13 not less to provide adequately for future generations.
14 Planning water storage facilities is not rocket science,
15 people have been doing it for thousands of years. Nor is it
16 necessarily environmentally destructive. Given the choice,
17 I would much rather have a lake in my backyard then urban
18 sprawl or a twelve lane freeway.

19 I respectfully urge the CALFED committee,
20 despite it's already significant efforts, to look again
21 carefully, openly and with respect to the concerns voiced
22 here tonight and to develop a plan that will service all
23 Californians. Thank you.

24 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you. Lloyd Carter.
25 Lloyd Carter. Walter Shuman. Walter Shuman. Harold

1 Brockman. Harold Brockman. Steve Dalke. Steve Dalke.
2 Okay, followed by Brent Graham, followed by D.A. Tuma.

3 MR. DALKE: Better hang onto it. I'm
4 Steve Dalke. General Manager for Kern-Tulare and Rag Gulch
5 Water District.

6 My comments are being presented on behalf of all
7 of the cross valley contractors.

8 The cross valley contractors export water from
9 the Delta under contract with the United States of America.

10 This year northern California experienced above
11 normal participation for the fifth consecutive year.
12 Despite ample participation and full reservoirs, we were
13 only allocated 70% of our contract water supply. After the
14 allocation was made, Delta pumping was reduced to Delta
15 smelt considerations. As a result, we were notified in June
16 that we might not receive any of our water this year. ~~After~~
17 nearly two months of uncertainty, we were finally notified
18 that we would received our water this year, but not until
19 after the peak irrigation season.

20 CALFED as it has currently proposed, fails to
21 address situations like this from reoccurring in the future.

22 The cross valley contractors have serious
23 concerns regarding the environmental water account. The
24 environmental water account appears to provide assurances
25 that additional water will not be taken from agricultural.

1 This is the same assurance that we have with the Bay-Delta
2 accord. However, this years experiences clearly demonstrate
3 that these assurances have no value.

4 The cross valley contractors support
5 implementation of increased storage and construction of --
6 Delta facilities. If after five consecutive wet years we
7 are not receiving our full contract water supply, the need
8 for new facilities is obvious.

9 An additional seven years is not required to
10 study the need for new facilities. That determination has
11 already been made. Thank you.

12 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Dalke.
13 Brent Graham. Brent Graham. So did a lot of people that we
14 have yet to hear from. Oh, no. Brent Graham, D.A. Tuma,
15 Martha Guzman & Viane Torres.

16 MR. GRAHAM: Good evening. At least I
17 don't have to say good morning. Finish this up. I'm Brent
18 Graham representing the Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage
19 District.

20 I also represent, as chairman of the Association
21 of California Water Agency, Region Seven, which is Tulare
22 and Kings County.

23 Tulare, Kings and Kern County make up about 100%
24 of the ag water from the state water project. Little over
25 a million acre feet.

1 I don't have a prepared statement tonight. But
2 just some observations to put on the record. I was there
3 when they signed the Delta Accord. I was also there when
4 the CALFED lured out their first public, I guess,
5 presentation. And in that presentation was such things as
6 Eco System Restoration, water quality, levy protection and
7 there was a group of us sitting in the back of the room and
8 they were also urban people and ag people, and the question
9 was where is water supply. And it's -- the answer was, it's
10 there.

11 We still don't see water supply and I think
12 Senator Costa was looking over my shoulder because CALFED
13 has a real credibility problem. And let me, let me, lay
14 just two things on you.

15 First of all, we have got a delay of seven years
16 in this phase one, before we are going to do anything on
17 facilities. And I'd like to know what the difference
18 between what everybody is talking about grid-lock, that we
19 had in the water wars, and the process that we're going to
20 wait for seven years for any facilities and during that
21 seven years, you're going to have a change in the federal
22 administration. You're going to have change in personnel.
23 And no insurance that you are even going to turn one stone
24 or pour one bucket of concrete after seven years.

25 The other item is, and I was totally surprised

1 on this because I go back a ways and I was there when they
2 were looking at the peripheral canal back in the early
3 seventies and at that time you had fishery people sounding
4 on the benefits of the peripheral canal for the fisheries,
5 as to the problem the fish have with the pumps in the south
6 Delta.

7 And also now we have the bromite problem in the
8 Delta. A water quality problem to the urban users, which the
9 isolated channel would also solve.

10 And then CALFED dares to come out and say for
11 seven years we're going to continue with the through Delta,
12 just to see if that won't work. And it doesn't work and
13 that's why I say CALFED has a real credibility.

14 The issue I would like to also mention is water
15 supply reliability. Maybe that's what CALFED looks at, a
16 water supply, but you can have water supply reliability if
17 a reduced exports from the Delta down to 10%. And I think
18 that you can assure all the exporters that they will always
19 have reliability of 10%. Reliability in my book doesn't
20 equate to water supply.

21 So I think at this point we are still cautiously
22 optimistic on CALFED. But CALFED has to correct a lot of
23 credibility to continue.

24 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Graham.
25 D.A. Tuma, Martha Guzman and Viane Torres, Bob Brister.

1 MR. TUMA: My name is D.A. Tuma. I'm a
2 libertarian candidate in Congressional District 3.
3 Congressional District 3, covers most of the Sacramento
4 Valley, from the Delta to Red Bluff and Tahama County. So
5 why am I here in Visalia? More than one hundred miles up to
6 San Joaquin Valley from the Delta.

7 Because I'm dogging CALFED public hearings to
8 tear off its pretence as a benevolent protector of Bay-Delta
9 and expose it as the latest incarnation of fascist
10 communism. My run after this out of control environmental
11 protection racket began before the formation of CALFED.
12 Before my retirement from the Department of Interior.
13 Before the passage of CVPIA. On September 30, '92, I gave
14 notice to the preparers of an EIS for CVP contract renewal
15 that breaking the congressional promise to renew CVP -- Kern
16 water supply contracts dissipate the whims of federal
17 wildlife refuge managers, while tropical rain forest are
18 cleared for farms, it is a crime against humanity. I didn't
19 say why. I thought it was self-evident.

20 It's because it denies opportunities for
21 individual reason to prevail in sorting out the best use of
22 all resources in a free market. It is reason numbing
23 communism. And it is immoral. It is the immorality of the
24 federal government using its sovereign power to renege on
25 its promise as its failure to renew CVP contracts leaves

1 us no hope of getting better together as long as the feds
2 meddle in our markets.

3 Libertarians offer an alternative to big
4 government immorality. We are a rich state. Water users can
5 build all the water supply and drainage facilities they
6 want. It's government property released to private
7 ownership. If somebody wants ducks or fish on their land,
8 they can buy their own water. All we have to do is turn
9 away from tax funding government programs. Privatize
10 existing government facility and environmental assets, so we
11 can learn their true market value. It's easy. Just vote
12 for libertarian. Eventually, we can get libertarian
13 majorities in our legislatures and be free of much of our
14 current government oppression. Let's get prosperous
15 together by retiring government.

16 Our founding fathers gave a limited government
17 for good reasons. Let's relearn them. Government solutions
18 are handicap of central planning myopia. Let's live the
19 life of freedom. Our founding fathers met for us to live.
20 Let's live with peaceful market trades among willing sellers
21 and buyers of private property. Let's fill our legislatures
22 with libertarians. Let's kill CALFED.

23 MR. BODOVITZ: Martha Guzman & Viane
24 Torres, Bob Brister and it looks -- Peter Brend (phonetic)
25 of the Hanford Chamber. I'm sorry, I can't read that

1 terribly well.

2 MS. GUZMAN: Thanks. We finally made it
3 up. I'm going to be translating for Viane Torres. She's a
4 farm worker at (inaudible).

5 MR. BODOVITZ: Okay.

6 MS. TORRES: Via translator. As you must
7 know, most of our growers depend on contracted water and
8 short term water transfers.

9 Short term water transfers have become and
10 increasing reality in sustaining agriculture in the central
11 valley. Water and water transfers in the central valley
12 comes large through the Delta, so that when the contracted
13 is limited, so to is the ability to transfer.

14 In addition, farm labor and rule communities
15 need to be key participants in the decision making of the
16 water transfer process, because we are the ones who received
17 the adverse impacts of these transfers.

18 For these reasons, transfers should be looked
19 upon as a tool, just as conservation should. But not as an
20 encompassing solution.

21 The CALFED EIR is great at pointing the adverse
22 affects that will arise from water transfers and the
23 irreversible changes that will arise as a result of
24 agricultural land conversion, but the potential solutions
25 and the options remained undefined.

1 We urge the BEDAC and the CALFED agencies
2 representatives to remember me and call upon me when you are
3 deciding which third party impacts you will be addressing.

4 Farmer workers along with most people in this
5 room, and the others who left, have a long-term interest in
6 sustaining the viability of agricultural industry.
7 Preserving an adequate supply of water is necessary to
8 maintaining a healthy agricultural industry and to
9 protecting farm worker jobs.

10 To the extent that a diminishing viable water
11 supply affects agriculture, it will also affect the demand
12 for farm labor. The net impact on farm workers employment
13 and living conditions, and the long-term health of the
14 agricultural industry must be a primary concern in
15 considering any water supply alternative. Be it within the
16 Delta or coming from it. Thank you, again, for coming to
17 the valley and providing me an us the opportunity to raise
18 these concerns.

19 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you Ms. Guzman and
20 Ms. Torres. Bob Brister, Peter Brind, Larry Yokum.

21 MR. BRISTER: My name is Bob Brister. I'm
22 from Madera County.

23 We have a great opportunity here to do some real
24 good in terms of environmental restoration. In terms of
25 restoring salmon runs, improving water quality. Restoring

1 the San Francisco Bay estuary and reducing toxics,
2 pesticides and other pollution in our water.

3 I strongly opposed new dams and reservoirs. I
4 believe we need to go with conservation and recycling and
5 ground water storage and watershed restoration. The words
6 ecology and economy come from the same root words. It is
7 important to remember that. There are no jobs on a dead
8 planet.

9 There has been a lot of dismissal of endangered
10 species concerns tonight. Whether you believe in creationism
11 or evolution, or some combination of the two, extinction of
12 a species is a tragedy and I think that is something we
13 should never dismiss.

14 Extinction is forever. Thank you.

15 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Brister.
16 Peter Brind, Hanford Chamber, sorry, I can't read the
17 writing better. Larry Yokum. Dan Vink. Okay. Followed by
18 Antone Karatan (phonetic) if I'm reading it correctly.

19 MR. VINK: My name is Dan Vink. I'm the
20 general manager of Lower Tulare River Irrigation District.

21 I'm going to start out first by telling you that
22 I resent the fact that I have to speak to a half empty room
23 and have to be away from my wife and kids at this time of
24 night. Because you gave unlimited to a bunch of blow hard
25 politicians to stump the votes. At any rate, I thought that

1 might get your attention.

2 I'm here representing the cross valley canal
3 contractors. The cross valley canal contractors are federal
4 water service contractors, who export CVP water from the
5 Delta. The cross valley group contracts for approximately
6 120,000 acre feet of cross valley water from the bureau,
7 relying on third party contracts with DWR to wheel that
8 water. The cross valley facilities are financed and
9 constructed by the cross valley canal contractors in order
10 to bring westside water for exchange to eastside towns and
11 farms.

12 While the term cross valley canal may not be
13 familiar to those on this panel and to some of those in this
14 room, perhaps these names are. The County of Tulare, the
15 County of Fresno, The City of Lindsay, along with lower
16 Tully Pixely, Sausalito, Stone Corral, Kern, Tulare and Rag
17 Gulch Water Districts. These cities and counties and water
18 districts depend on the cross valley water supplies to
19 sustain agriculture and support the long-term growth of
20 industry. In other words jobs, and livelihoods of many of
21 the people in this room, including myself, depend on water
22 from the cross valley canal. That dependence and the
23 overall precarious nature of the cross valley water is never
24 more evident than in 1999.

25 When the Delta smelt decided to park themselves

1 in front of the state and federal pumps in the Delta,
2 questionable ESA regulations led to the shutdown of direct
3 delivery south of -- of the south Delta water supply. When
4 the dusk settled and the scramble began to makeup the
5 devastation affects of the ESA actions, cross valley canal
6 contractors were left fighting for their water lives. While
7 state and federal contractors went to work repairing the
8 damage, cross valley contractors were told sorry, no water
9 for you.

10 It was only after much cajoling and cooperation
11 that the cross valley canal contractors were given a forty-
12 five day window to deliver their supplies in October. The
13 cross valley contractors support CALFED's efforts to move
14 towards south Delta improvements. However, cross valley
15 canal contractors along with other believe that CALFED has
16 an obligation to more seriously consider through facilities
17 as part of it's overall -- program. Call it what you want,
18 but a canal that delivers water through the Delta is a vital
19 link to our future.

20 CALFED is obligated to lead this effort and
21 raise it to a higher level of priority. In addition, CALFED
22 must be active in their support and more active and vocal in
23 their support for joint pumping. If the most useless of
24 fish can dictate how the water users operative their
25 facilities, then we must be given the ability to maximize

1 those facilities when the opportunity presents itself.

2 MR. BODOVITZ: Mr. Vink, the time is gone.

3 MR. VINK: Thank you.

4 MR. BODOVITZ: Antone Karatan, Jim Phene,
5 Phil Nixon. Antone Karatan. Jim Phene.

6 MR. PHENE: Phe-ne.

7 MR. BODOVITZ: Phe-ne, sorry.

8 MR. PHENE: My name is Jim Phene and I
9 need a step stool here. I'm an irrigation engineer. I'm
10 also on the Board of Directors for the California Irrigation
11 Institute. I've been in involved in irrigation since 1982.

12 The California Irrigation Institute is the
13 oldest, nonprofit institution focus on irrigated agriculture
14 in California. One of the primary missions of that
15 organization is to educate. So educate, I intend to do
16 tonight.

17 We are discussing an issue that creates strong
18 emotions, so I asked all that are present, the few there
19 are, that they suspend their emotions temporarily and listen
20 to what I have to say logically.

21 As we remember in class, a teacher use to stomp
22 before the test and remind us that was very important
23 information. California is drought prone period. As an
24 irrigation professional I encourage solutions which include
25 all forms of storage are a necessity and represent a

1 strategic solution to the ever present threat of an extended
2 drought and I reiterate that.

3 Drainage at some level, commiserate with jointly
4 agreed on Delta water quality constraints should be
5 implemented. Drainage during wet periods could easily be
6 accomplished using dilution.

7 Conveyance is a necessity to move water south
8 and bow at the state water systems and requirements.

9 Improving water use efficiency via source
10 control is the first and easiest solution to adopt. But let
11 me quickly state, that there are two obstacles which concern
12 growers in this room, on the implementation of this type of
13 solution.

14 First, there is a significant capital investment
15 required. And second, water conserve will be lost to the ag
16 sector and to the individual grower.

17 Let me offer up the following, capital
18 investment could easily be offset by federal and state tax
19 credits. There was a bill, HR461 in the 1997 Congress that
20 didn't make it out of subcommittee, it offered a five
21 hundred per acre tax credit and I would recommend that you,
22 or urge that you call your congressman or write him and try
23 to get that recessitated.

24 Water conserved by ag should remain in the ag
25 sector and either be banked, transferred or sold with the

1 growers capturing the income stream.

2 On going tax credits relief from state tax sales
3 and sales taxes should be considered as part of that
4 involvement. How much water could we say, since I'm running
5 out of time, I have documented proof that shows one to three
6 acre feet per acre. If we look at three to five million
7 acres, of traditionally irrigated acres, could benefit from
8 this type, via drip or mechanized. There is enough water to
9 provide three and fifteen million acre feet of water. This
10 is more than enough to address all the beneficial needs and
11 projective population growth. It addresses drainage, it
12 addresses salt loads. It addresses a number of issues in
13 terms chemical applications and I appreciate your time.

14 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Phene. Phil
15 Nixon. Kevin Hall, Kevin Johnson. Kevin Hall. Kevin
16 Johnson and Steve Offemueller.

17 MR. HALL: Good evening. Thanks for
18 staying so late. My name is Kevin Hall. I'm a life long
19 resident of Fresno County and I represent a very special
20 interest, my wife Ann, and our eight year old son, Joey.

21 I'm going to out on a limb here and I'm glad
22 there is a few people here to see me do it, but I feel it's
23 important that I say what I have to say.

24 I agree completely with Senator Costa that new
25 storage facilities must be put on the front burner in order

1 to guarantee our water supply in the next century.

2 Why? Because I also agree with the national
3 leadership of the environmental defense fund. The Natural
4 Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, the Union of
5 Concerned Scientist, the World Wildlife Fund and authors
6 like Roscal (inaudible), Bill McKiven (Phonetic) and Vice-
7 President, Al Gore. I agree with them when they say that
8 the next fifty years are the most important in the history
9 of human kind. And the reason for this is global climate
10 change, also know as global warming or the greenhouse
11 effect.

12 I do believe that the findings of the more than
13 2,000 climatologist working worldwide since 1989, under the
14 auspices of United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on
15 Climate Change, when they describe global climate change as
16 our foremost environmental concern. They forecast the
17 following effects. More intense rainfalls, snow storms and
18 freezes. Stronger hurricanes, unseasonable and prolonged
19 droughts. Crop failures. Devastating forest fires. Killer
20 heat waves and record -- all within frequency.

21 In California we will see wide spread loss of
22 coastal wetlands. Much smaller snow packs in the Sierra.
23 Our largest reservoir. Salt water intrusion into the Delta.
24 High water flows which will cause massive destruction to
25 everything and everyone in it's path. We must plan to

1 contain these floods and store the water with an extremely
2 enhanced system of water system and storage conveyance,
3 including the peripheral canal.

4 These escalating climate extremes are already
5 occurring. The strongest (inaudible) of the century
6 occurred in 1982 and 1997. The longest (inaudible) we know
7 in two thousand years ended in 1995. After five years and
8 eight months. These more frequent extreme will result in
9 more -- drops in water supply.

10 If we want to meet environmental needs we need
11 more storage. If we want to give drinking water to people
12 we need more storage. If we want all Californians to live
13 in a sustainable society, if we want a sustainable future,
14 then we need agriculture. An agriculture needs water and if
15 the environmentalist believe their leaders and if what I've
16 been reading is accurate, we also need industries that
17 absorb more carbon dioxide, the leading greenhouse gas.

18 More carbon dioxide than they produce. Again,
19 that means the annual plant production cycle of agriculture
20 is essential to our survival.

21 Lastly, our environmental friends must bear in
22 mind that farm land lost in California moves overseas. When
23 environmental regulation pales in comparison to
24 California's. Let's preserve the safest food supply in the
25 world for all Californians, let's preserve the very fabric

1 of our society and environment.

2 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

3 MR. HALL: Thank you.

4 MR. BODOVITZ: Kevin Johnson, Steve
5 Offenmueller, Mary Anna Mckinley. Kevin Johansen, I guess
6 is it. I'm sorry.

7 MR. JOHANSEN: My name is Kevin Johansen,
8 representing Dudley Ridge Water District.

9 Dudley Ridge Water District is a 37,000 acre
10 agriculture water district in western Kings County that has
11 only one source of water. The water supplied with contract
12 with the State Water Project.

13 The District or it's land owners has no local
14 surface water or ground water supplies. We are dependent
15 solely on imported water. Growers in the district have
16 focused on farming high value permanent crops, such as
17 pistachios, almonds, stone fruit, pomegranates and grapes.
18 The scarcity and value of water to district growers has
19 resulted in major capital investments in high efficient on
20 farm irrigations sytem and district conveyance systems.
21 Farmers in the district are extremely concerned that for
22 water uses relying on Delta exports CALFED has not made good
23 on their promise for all factions and regions to get better
24 together.

25 The CALFED program provided the guaranteed

1 improvements for the environment and fish. But only further
2 promises for water users. In the past decade water user
3 south of the Delta have lost more than one million acre feet
4 of water supplied from the Delta. The CALFED program was
5 committed to not only recover these lost water supplies, but
6 increase the water supply to meet the states growing water
7 needs.

8 One of our questions is, what is happened to
9 that commitment. We do not feel that all parties are getting
10 better together. The program presented in the draft
11 pragmatic EIS/EIR indicates that Delta exports could be
12 reduced by an additional seven hundred thousand acre feet.
13 To say the least, not only farms in Dudley Ridge Water
14 District, but all surface water and ground water users, that
15 have built economies based on contracted projected water
16 supplies from the Delta are being short changed by the
17 CALFED program.

18 Other non-project urban and agriculture water
19 users that overly grounds water basins are also victims. As
20 water reductions from the Delta will increase ground water
21 pumping for many already overdrafted ground water basins.

22 In summary, Dudley Ridge Water District urges
23 CALFED to restore the equity in your program that was
24 initially promised. A reliable water supply does not mean
25 much if the quantity being delivered to the water user keeps

1 diminishing. Thank you.

2 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Mr. Johansen.
3 Steve Oftenmueller, I'm sorry I'm mispronouncing that, I'm
4 sure. Mary Anna McKinley, Bob Ludekens. We're down to our
5 last few cards so if you wish to speak and haven't yet
6 filled out a yellow card, please do so right away. This is
7 the last call for yellow cards. Go ahead, sir.

8 MR. OFTENMUELLER: Thank you. My name is
9 Steve Oftenmueller. I'm the general manager of the Madera
10 Irrigation District. Madera is a member of the Frient unit
11 and has part of the tag team for Frient. I'm talking about
12 water use efficiency program.

13 A couple of things on the negative side that I
14 would like to touch on in the water use efficiency program
15 plan.

16 It seems a little odd to me that CALFED would
17 look to a mythical and unknown increase in the ability of
18 farmers to improve their distribution uniformity. CALFED
19 proposes that they can go from eighty to ninety percent, but
20 they say that the way that they are going to do that, is
21 that there will somehow be this improvement in technology.
22 It seems to be pretty well accepted that an eighty percent
23 distribution informity is about as good as you can get right
24 now.

25 Then in using that assumption they go onto come

1 up with some numbers. Now here is where I would like CALFED
2 to believe their own numbers in terms of what they really
3 have to do before you can get to the point of saying we need
4 storage.

5 If you look at the Sacramento River region, the
6 amount of water that can be actually created, the new water,
7 what they call the potential recovery of currently
8 irrecoverable losses, from zero to twenty-seven thousand
9 acre feet, is the CALFED increment. That's less than .4%.
10 If you look at the amount of water they think can be
11 rerouted, that's more than in the 9%. I'm talking the
12 percent of the total applied agricultural water. Most of
13 that is water that can be rerouted to streams.

14 If you look at the west side of the San Joaquin
15 Valley, .6% is the incremental CALFED component of the new
16 water that could be created by ag use efficiency programs
17 and about 1% in total if you count the existing, or the, I'm
18 sorry, the no action, plus the CALFED increment.

19 If you look at the east side of the San Joaquin,
20 now there you do have some potential for rerouting of flows.
21 But the new water again, zero to four thousand acre feet,
22 that .1-3%. If you look at the potential rerouting flows
23 less than 10% only 8%.

24 Now the biggest area that realize on Delta
25 exports, which is really is what you are trying to solve.

1 The total incremental CALFED amount that could be conserved
2 in new water created by water conservation, that everybody
3 says is going to solve these problems, is .2 to 9% of the
4 total applied water. There is no water out there that can be
5 gained in terms of the total picture that you are trying to
6 solve. You're talking about rearranging the deck chairs on
7 the titanic, if you think the water use efficiency is going
8 to solve your water supply problems and your CALFED
9 solutions.

10 Now for the good news. I think CALFED is
11 engaged in a very important and necessary process in your ag
12 water use efficiency program. I happen to be a part of it.
13 I think it is very key that you proceed with the program as
14 your developing it. The essential elements be ag water use,
15 or the ag water management committee, incentive base
16 programs and measurable objectives.

17 It's incredibly important that you continue that
18 program and put the resources into it.

19 MR. BODOVITZ: Mary Anna McKinley,
20 followed by Bob Ludekens, followed by Mel Tano.

21 MS. MCKINLEY: Hello. I'm Mary Anne
22 McKinley and I live in Madera County which is eighty miles
23 north of here.

24 I'm concerned about water though because I grew
25 up in this valley and I've had a longtime living here and

1 seen the situation.

2 And I realize that there are forty-two million
3 acre feet of water behind fourteen hundred dams in
4 California and everyone of those dams is suppose to solve a
5 water problem. Yet, we are here tonight, filling this room
6 to talk about water problems. Those dams haven't answered
7 anything. All they've done is continue to encourage us to
8 think that we've got this vast store of water that's always
9 infinitely going to be there and that's not going to work
10 any longer.

11 I'd like to point out that fifty miles north of
12 here, there is a major city and they have tens of thousands
13 of lawns. They have acres of decorative lakes and they have
14 no water meters. They don't want to give up their water.
15 Agriculture doesn't want to give up the water. The salmon
16 fishery in the state has already been nearly destroyed, so
17 it's clear the rivers of this state have already given up
18 more water than is healthy.

19 So if CALFED encourages people in this state to
20 think that we are just one dam or a few dams, or a dozen
21 dams away from water sufficiency, I think it does the future
22 a disservice. The answer lies in educating the people of
23 this state that we must value and conserve our most precious
24 resource water.

25 And that should be phase one of CALFED's

1 efforts. Not to continue trying what has failed. The
2 ultimate answer is not more surface store, it is better
3 using what we have and I don't mean just, you know, saving
4 drops here and there, I mean looking at the way we landscape
5 and the way we live. This is a dry state and we have to
6 come to terms with that. Thank you.

7 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you, Ms. McKinley.
8 Bob Ludekens and Mel Tano.

9 MR. LUDEKENS: Bob Ludekens, past
10 president of the Nursery Association for the State of
11 California and owner of the L.E. (inaudible) Company which
12 produces about two million trees and plants every year.

13 We have to use some logic. We've already heard
14 tonight about twenty million more people coming to this
15 state, they are going to use water. They are going to need
16 food. Food is going to come from this valley. We need to
17 have more storage. It's a must and it is the only way we
18 can go.

19 We spend a lot of money on the environmental
20 areas and we could take ten percent of it and put it in the
21 nursery industry and you could produce all those plants and
22 trees that you are loosing, that you are trying to protect,
23 with about 10% of, with about 5% of the water use, I can
24 produce you a lot of willows with a little bit of water that
25 you send down that river. You could have more willows then

1 you could ever handle and I think we have to do some logic.

2 We are going to need more water. That's without
3 any question. I hear about the environmental issue. But we
4 can't, we talk, Tucson was brought up tonight. Tucson has
5 had to go back to having trees. Their area became so hot,
6 the people couldn't live there, they have to have something
7 to clean the air, to produce the oxygen that settles the
8 dusk to live in that area.

9 We cannot go back to the desert that we started
10 with. If we want to live by Indian and not do very well,
11 we're not going to live the way we do today.

12 I grew up in Southern California. I produce
13 products for the urban area. I look at both areas, the
14 farming in which we are in now and so on. We need to save
15 our water. To put it back the aquifers that we're in that
16 are in an overdraft. Our wells during our draught went from
17 eighteen feet to one-hundred twenty feet for pumping. That
18 water as it goes down in these aquifers drain, compress the
19 area, that we can't put it back. We can put some back, but
20 not the amount that we have in there.

21 We must keep putting the water back in this
22 ground. We can't keep overdrafting this area. We need
23 these reserves up here. We need these dams to put the water
24 back here to save for the draught times or we will not the
25 have the fruit of the future.

1 I'd hate to be in your position to come to
2 another draught and we have spent millions of dollars on
3 studies and so on and have no more reserve and we run out of
4 water in Southern California, San Francisco and the food
5 area, I think that I would hate to be in your position as
6 you are today. Thank you for letting us be here.

7 MR. BODOVITZ: Thank you. Mel Tano.

8 MR. TANO: I'd like to -- the Board for
9 not being able to take a bathroom break. You know, talking
10 about water all of this time.

11 I'm not a farmer but I believe that the American
12 farmer is the unsung hero. I wasn't born in California, but
13 for the amount of time I've spent here I can see where the
14 farmers don't realize how valuable to the American economy.

15 I speak from a standpoint where, of a former
16 United State diplomat. I've lived in the rain forest of
17 South America, Central America, and impacted areas such as
18 Amsterdam and Japan. And you have to realize that America,
19 America's image is a greatly sought after and one of the
20 products that America's, one of the useful products, sought
21 after products is the agricultural products.

22 So, I don't know these farmers, but I have to
23 say that I think you have to do something to protect them.
24 Not your own welfare, but for the welfare of the citizens.
25 You (tape ends)

