

Update on EIS/R Comments and Hearings



M e m o r a n d u m

Date: May 29, 1998
 To: CALFED Policy Group
 From: Lester A. Snow
 Executive Director *H. Hauer for Snow*
 Subject: Public Hearing and Written Comments

Written Comments

As of May 27, 1998, we have received more than 500 comment letters. More than half of the letters are postcards or form letters, primarily from the environmental community. The written comments have echoed the comments we have received during the hearings but have tended to be somewhat more general (i.e., we want more storage, no new dams or canals, more restoration, conservation is the answer). Few (perhaps 10 or 15 percent) of the comment letters have dealt with any specific impact or technical analysis in the environmental documentation. A more detailed summary of some of the issues of concern can be found in Attachment #1.

Public Hearings

As of May 27, there have been 15 public hearings. There are particular items/issues that have been raised in each hearing. These are outlined in Attachment #2 "Public Hearing Comment Summary." Three items are mentioned most often:

- the Program should implement water development actions (storage and/or conveyance);
- agriculture is being asked to pay more than their fair share; and
- the Program should move away from water development actions and focus on a fourth alternative which stresses water use efficiency.

The following presents items/issues offered by the three major stakeholder groups (Urban, Environmental and Agriculture) in each region. Items that were spoken to by the majority of speakers in that region or at a particular meeting in that region are highlighted with an "*".

CALFED Agencies

<p>California</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Resources Agency Department of Fish and Game Department of Water Resources California Environmental Protection Agency State Water Resources Control Board 	<p>Federal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Protection Agency Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service Bureau of Reclamation U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service Department of Commerce National Marine Fisheries Service
--	---	--

Southern California (Ontario, Burbank, Irvine and Encinitas)

- *Urban speakers indicated the work they have been doing to conserve water, that better water quality, as a result of the Program, will allow them to conserve/recycle even more and irrespective of conservation efforts they will need more water and look to the Program for some of that water. They are willing to pay their fair share but not keen on paying for others.
- *Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program.
- Agriculture asked that their water needs not be forgotten and asked that agricultural lands not be taken out of production.

San Joaquin Valley (Fresno and Bakersfield)

- Urban speakers stated opposition to mandated water conservation measures. They also indicated they would need to know project costs if they were to be expected to support the preferred alternative.
- Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program particularly in the agriculture arena.
- *Agriculture has asked that agricultural lands not be taken out of production. Stated opposition to regulatory driven water conservation. They asked the Program to move forward with storage and conveyance to meet the growing need for water. They are willing to pay for benefits they will receive but unwilling to pay for other stakeholders.

Delta (Walnut Grove, Vacaville and Pittsburg)

- Urban water districts asked that the Program select an alternative which improves water quality while keeping the common pool.
- *Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program and pushed for a fourth alternative which stresses water use efficiency.
- *Agriculture is opposed to sending water in a canal around the Delta. Support additional storage and Alternative 2 as it maintains the common pool. Strongly advocates of having the Program comply with existing water rights and local ordinances. Not in favor of taking land out of production.

Bay Area (Oakland, San Jose and Santa Cruz)

- Urban water districts are seeking improved water quality from the Program as well as an increased water supply.
- *Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program, particularly in the agriculture arena, and pushed for a fourth alternative which stresses water use efficiency. They emphasized the need for a clear accounting of the costs and benefits of all alternatives to demonstrate practicality of facilities vs conservation.
- Agriculture noted opposition to taking lands out of production.

Public Hearing and Written Comments
May 29, 1998
Page Three

Sacramento Valley (Chico, Yuba City and Redding)

- Urban concerned about impacts of ERP on infrastructure.
- Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program, particularly in the agriculture arena, and pushed for a fourth alternative which stresses water use efficiency.
- Agriculture supports storage.
- * Both agriculture and urban stressed the need for protection of water, property and area of origin rights and adherence to local ordinances covering groundwater storage or water transfer actions.