

Public Hearing Comment Summary

Weeks of April 20-24 and April 27- May 1

Ontario

55 attendees; 9 speakers

focus of presentations

- favor alt. 3 - because of need for improved water quality and additional water.
- need to improve upon water conservation particularly in the agriculture arena.

additional perspectives

- blue ribbon committee of economists to identify most economic efficient program.
- request for more outreach to better educate public. fear that if the Program comes to a vote without the education, voters will be misled by tv spots.
- poem about Ward Valley

Fresno

200 attendees, 25 speakers

focus of presentations

- unacceptability of land retirement as a water conservation measure and need for additional storage/conveyance.

additional perspectives

- need for reliable water on an interim basis while building to ultimate solution. unable to wait 15 years for more reliable water.
- bonds for rural school in Westlands Water District impacted by lack of reliable water; school funding impacted if land retired, students education short changed.
- need to see that there is going to be more water if agriculture is to participate.
- program efforts are biased towards the ecosystem restoration program.
- use market forces to move water south of delta; alt 3 offers greatest flexibility allowing the market to work best.
- water conservation in agriculture arena needs to be improved.

Oakland

140 attendees, 50 speakers

focus of presentations

- water use efficiency program is not acceptable.
- comment period extension needed.
- need 4th alternative which focuses on conservation.
- structural facilities demonstrate CALFED is going down traditional path.
- economic analysis needed to demonstrate practicality of conservation vs facilities

additional perspectives

- BDAC members
 - Roberta Borgonova - extend the comment period to accommodate analysis gaps; use ERP approach to improve other programs; more emphasis needed on "soft approach"; preferred alt. should not be defined until all

- analysis completed.
- Bob Rabb - need permanent water standards for habitat; requested 75-day extension of comment period; a “peripheral canal” is unacceptable.
- ERP needs to include the whole Bay; San Joaquin River needs to be part of the ERP.
- storing water in drought years is a bad idea.
- current barriers in Old River causing siltation.
- CALFED needs to stem tide of introduced species to Delta.
- looking for improved water quality and reliability.
- minority communities have been excluded from participating in process; not taking correct approach to reach them.
- need to reveal costs/benefits of all alternatives.
- need for environmental water rights; cannot depend upon acquisition.
- small risks if conservation is chosen over facilities. if more is needed then go to facilities.
- adaptive management should be part of all programs.
- alt. 2 would improve south delta’s water quality.

Burbank

40 attendees; 13 speakers

focus of presentations

- will not support solution which diminishes agriculture
- water quality improvements are critical
- costs paid by beneficiaries
- seeking a water conservation emphasis alternative
- extend the comment period

additional perspectives

- surface storage is a key element of any solution
- Bulletin 160-98 not adequate basis for Program’s water needs assumptions/impact analysis
- local interests need to have a sense of their costs before they will be able to support
- ERP is full of statements of good intention. Assurances will be incomplete unless the ERP includes measurable standards, i.e., how many salmon or steelhead will there be when the Program is complete.
- EIS/EIR should reflect oversubscription of water
- Recycling is the answer to Souther Cal’s water supplies in dry years. Recharge aquifers with series of retention dams rather than let water follow through the concrete rivers to the ocean.

Bakersfield

90 attendees; 30 speakers

focus of presentations

- do not idle farmland as a means of water conservation
- need improvements to water supplies, supply goals need to be specific
- need current CVP and SWP contract amounts more reliably not less water more reliably

- need to account for past reallocations of agriculture's water
- oppose regulatory driven urban and agricultural water conservation
- willing to pay just for benefits that are received, no longer willing to pay for environmental needs

additional perspectives

- BDAC member
 - Stuart Pyle - water supply goals need to be more specific; need to account for current reallocation of water; oppose regulatory driven water conservation; Alt 1 - out; Alt 3 best for supply and habitat, stage activities; all elements proceed together.
- not enough agricultural water conservation in the plan; folks in Kern County doing considerably better than the 1% noted.
- Water use efficiency impacts to local economy not documented in EIS/EIR. Similarly, salt load problems not discussed in EIS/EIR.
- Environmental uses need to be held to same conservation standards as urban and ag. Speculate that if env. uses could conserve 5%, water enough for all.
- Concern that Water Quality program may supersede current efforts underway with State Board. Don't want another layer of work/interaction.
- Went through a lengthy process to obtain Reclamation's OK re: water conservation plans; do not want to start again with AB3616.

Santa Cruz

30 attendees; 11 speakers

focus of presentation

- emphasis should be on water conservation rather than facilities
- extend the comment period

other perspectives

- lack of specificity in report re: impacts on ag. Lands, relationship to CVPIA and State Board's efforts, benefits to Central Coast and current water usage
- use economic incentives to maximize ag water efficiencies; we can put a man on the moon surely ag can conserve more water; people said Mono Lake would not get any additional water; energy savings were sizable once energy crisis hit, bottom line for most was cost savings; phase in cost increases for ag water to drive conservation.
- Assurances should include water allocation limits
- beneficiaries should pay
- need increased water supply; water conservation will not be enough
- taking farmland out of production will lead to more urban development and loss of habitat
- existing problems due to existing dams and you are proposing to fix the problem with more dams