

Stakeholder Concerns -- CALFED Water Management Strategy

Urban:

- Concern that CALFED is not being sufficiently proactive on storage, surface storage in particular.
- Want to see early Stage I actions to prepare for construction at conclusion of Stage I, or, if necessary conditions have been met, construction beginning prior to conclusion of Stage I
- Want to see bundled permitting process, to avoid individual project environmental documentation to speed construction
- Conveyance issues were raised yesterday, will be reiterated in this meeting.
- Concerned about how conditions or linkages across program elements are linked: e.g., what constitutes "aggressive" water use efficiency measures, or a "robust" transfers market?

Business:

- Convinced that surface storage needs to be in mix, want progress on issue of "beneficiaries pay," to clarify feasibility of specific projects
- Concerned that CALFED is not working hard enough on water transfers framework
- Want interim rules which facilitate transfers
- Want legislation passed in next session to facilitate transfers

Environmental Community:

- Concerned that CALFED's commitment to water use efficiency is weak.
- Want strong performance standards and measures of effort and of water savings
- Want expanded definition of what constitute "cost-effective" water use efficiency measures, to take into account regional economies of scale
- Concerned that surface storage is presumed rather than contingent.

- Want surface storage conditions the same as those for conveyance.
- Concerned that CALFED has not defined the baseline, or "water budget."
- Object to the use of Bulletin 160 projections of future demand and supply shortfalls
- Concerned that no definition of water supply reliability has been yet agreed to
- Want no new depletions from the Delta

Ag/Delta:

- Want "no dip" in water allocations in Stage I.
- Want recovery of all water lost to environmental regulation
- Concerned that baseline (supply-demand) has not been defined by CALFED
- Concerned that ag water use efficiency is being overestimated.
- Concerned that potential for conjunctive management programs and groundwater storage is overrated, and much more difficult to implement than people realize.
- Concerned that area of origin water rights will be violated.
- Want publicly funded surface storage actions to commence early in Stage I.
- See little benefit for their community if new surface storage not in the mix up front.
- Fear that transfers are really just a re-allocation of water from ag to urban.

Upper Watershed Community:

- Concerned that CALFED is not embracing a true watershed approach to water management
- Concerned about area of origin water rights being violated

All Parties:

- Need for Overall Assurances: Concerned over the possibility of "poison pills," i.e., that one interest group could block implementation of actions favored by

another interest group by holding up some component of Stage I actions. E.g., the water users could argue for the need for surface storage by consistently blocking water transfers legislation in the legislature, or by dragging their feet on conjunctive management projects, claiming they were not feasible.