

MEMORANDUM

To: Water Management Development Team Co-Chairs: Mike Spear and Steve Macaulay

From: Ag and Urban Development Team Members:

Wally Bishop	Tom Clark
David Guy	Dan Nelson
Tim Quinn	Jason Peltier
Allen Short	Steve Hall

Date: October 25, 1999

Re: Water Management Development Team Process Issues

We are disturbed about how decisions are being made in the Development Team process. We specifically raised the question of how decisions would be made at the beginning of this process, and were assured that the Development Team's decisions would guide the process.

At our October 12th meeting, the Development Team agreed on three general scenarios for water management actions that the Coordination Team was to evaluate. One scenario was based on the DOI interpretation of b(2), one on an environmental version of b(2), and one on a water user version of b(2). Following that meeting, the agency representatives apparently decided to first delay the environmental and water user scenarios and then on October 15 to eliminate these alternatives, at least for the first four scenarios to be evaluated.

We are very concerned that the Development Team's decisions are being changed by a small number of agency representatives. These same individuals are participating in the Development Team meetings and decisions. This is not how we understood this process would be run. If we are to participate, CALFED must make a commitment that our participation will be meaningful and that the Development Team's decisions will not be changed between meetings.

We have two more basic concerns. We believe that in this process a broad range of alternatives, such as those agreed to at the October 12 meeting, must be evaluated, including scenarios proposed by us and the environmental community. We now have only those that conform to DOI's interpretation of how b(2) water is to be accounted for and are unlikely to provide an adequate level of water supply or water

[1034397 v8.doc]

D - 0 5 5 3 6 2

D-055362

quality. We will be prepared to describe a scenario at our next meeting that addresses our water quality and water supply needs.

We are also concerned about how these scenarios will be evaluated. We support a comprehensive analysis of each scenario that would consist of the following:

- A quantitative evaluation of the fisheries population level effects of proposed actions, using ranges to reflect uncertainty. The evaluation should reflect serious disagreements about the underlying science. Scientific peer review is necessary at least to identify these disagreements and to resolve some of them if possible.
- A comparison of these benefits with the benefits that will result from other, non-water environmental components of the CALFED program.
- An evaluation of the water quality effects, quantified with respect to the parameters of concern to urban water users.
- An evaluation of water supply effects consisting, at a minimum, of the drought period and average year effects.
- An evaluation of the benefits, risks, degree of uncertainty associated with the various scenarios or actions.

In general, we believe that in the development and evaluation of scenarios, we should temporarily set aside our positions regarding b(2) and other baseline issues for the sake of evaluating new approaches. We have a serious gap to bridge, and we must not eliminate any new ideas or innovative approaches that might help us bridge that gap. We believe that an informed discussion which recognizes that there are different perspectives provides the best opportunity for optimizing water supply, water quality and fisheries improvements.

It is time to deal with these issues head on rather than having them finessed. In light of that, we are requesting that the Development Team openly discuss these issues at the next meeting scheduled for October 26

cc: Lester Snow
Steve Ritchie
Water Management Development Team Members
Ag/Urban Policy Group Members