

96-84  
APR 16 1996

April 14, 1996

To: Lester Snow (916) 654-9780  
From: Alex Hildebrand Fax (209) 825-6180  
Phone (209) 823-4166

Dear Lester:

I offer the following comments on the Workshop 6 packet.

### Strategy

- 1) p. 9 - Include demand management by better multiple use, e.g., drainage control to take advantage of available dilution; recirculation of DMC water.
- 2) Explain p. 5 - "allowing high flood peaks to continue". Who gets damaged?
- 3) p. 9 - Add risk of losing Delta configuration.
- 4) p. 9 - Descriptions should include downsides. e.g., isolated proposals include less assurance that Delta configuration will be protected.

### Definitions

- 1) What is meant by "marginal" land if it is financially viable?
- 2) Water yield rather than storage is significant (e.g., alt A, p. 1).
- 3) It should be clear that "obtaining" San Joaquin water means reallocating from one use to another, not new water.
- 4) The term "pollution" is being used for very different constituents with different effects, causes, and potential controls; salinity, natural toxins, trihalomethane precursors, man made chemicals, oil, etc. This is too broad to be lumped together.

### Specific Comments

- 1) Why fallow only farm land and not residential gardens and golf courses? They consume a great deal of water, and they don't produce food.
- 2) Retiring land for salinity control is not the only solution (p. 3, Alt C), discuss alternatives.

- 3) P. 3 Alt C - Isolated facilities provide quality benefit for some and impact for others. Explain both sides.
- 4) Some habitat proposals seem to have been made without looking at the terrain.
- 5) The chain of lakes proposal will evaporate a lot more water than is used to farm the same islands. This must be acknowledged.

#### General Comment

The components that have been assembled for each alternative are to a significant degree arbitrarily assembled. I believe many of us would prefer that they be combined in different ways. We should first examine the viability and pros and cons of each component. (They almost all have both benefits and impacts). We should then see why a given component is compatible or incompatible with other components. At that point each of us could suggest different ways of combining the components. If we do not go through that process the BDAC will be asked to accept combinations of components that may be proposed without adequate examination of pros and cons, and which inevitably reflect the level of knowledge and the biases of those largely anonymous parties who propose the alternatives. This process would reduce the likelihood that a final alternative can be criticized because it contains components that have not been adequately assessed but which may not be essential to the basic thrust of the alternative.