

3939 Walnut Ave. #144  
Carmichael CA 95608  
August 16, 2000

Mr. Steve Ritchie, Acting Executive Director  
CalFed Bay Delta Program  
1416 - 9th Street, Suite 1155  
Sacramento CA 95814

Subject: July, 2000, EIS/EIR

Dear Mr. Ritchie,

My ancestors, I, and my descendants (5 generations) have owned and operated a farm, entirely dependent on irrigation, since 1917. We have grown most kinds of domestic meat animals, several kinds of fiber, oil seed, vegetable, forage, sugar and citrus crops on our property. It has also produced, but not for market, burrowing owls, gophers and kangaroo rats, (owls have to eat, too), pheasants, egrets, buzzards, black crested night herons, dove, blackbirds, hawks, orioles, sea gulls, and in the early days, many rattlesnakes.

The purpose of our farm is not to raise wildlife, but to make a profit. However, we greatly enjoy the always fluctuating populations of non-market animals that are supported by our farm.

I have read a great portion of CalFed's voluminous EIR/S. Much of what it proposes is great, but the things most important to me and my family are way off the mark of good, long-range planning. The plan proposes reducing farm water to serve cities and wildlife. I grant you that growing cities and restoring wildlife habitat requires more water, but increased population needs more food, and that takes more farm water. Otherwise, our farm produce exports will decline, and the U.S. will be more dependent on other countries for a greater part in satisfying our food and fiber needs.

I am sensitive to that prospect, because I was a participant in WWII and am aware that the United States was always able to feed its own people. Its allies were partially dependent on U.S. grown supplies, and after the war we fed our former enemies for a while until they got back on their land and seas.

Nobody wants another war, and the best way to avoid one is to be thoroughly prepared. The U.S. is not going to be as well prepared if California takes part of its already inadequate supply of farm water and dedicates it to new wetlands. Farmers are not having an easy time now, competing against imported food grown and processed with cheaper labor, less stringent chemical regulations, and NAFTA.

A specific example of my concern is illustrated on Page 1-4 of the Water Transfers Program Plan where CalFed states there "may" be a shortage of storage in the state. Later on this page it states that transfers will work optimally only when the amount of storage is substantially increased. (CalFed's words, my emphasis). In spite of that, CalFed just cannot seem to bring itself to the admission that the last several editions of Bulletin 160 were correct when they warned the public and its government that the state is going to be dreadfully short of water in dry years unless considerable new storage and yield is constructed.

CalFed's solution seems to build not enough new water yield to take care of the new wetlands, additional in-stream desires and the growth in cities, but to take water away from the already water-short farms.

No one should have to wonder why farmers can't endorse this plan, so herewith, I render my objection to the plan and my plea for CalFed to hold hearings on this plan, in agricultural areas. We are not one of the groups that are "getting better together".

Sincerely,



William I. DuBois