

145

1 that -- I think that points to the -- to highlight the
 2 fact that land retirement is just only one tool in the
 3 tool box that individual landowners can consider. It's
 4 just -- and I think that that's the proper way that -- to
 5 consider that.

6 I do think that it underscores the
 7 importance of fully carrying out the Central Valley
 8 Project Improvement Act which does have funds
 9 available for willing sellers and -- who want to consider
 10 land retirement, and I think that through the full
 11 implementation of the Central Valley Project Improvement
 12 Act, that would -- will relieve some of the pressure on
 13 the CALFED process to look at that type of mechanism as
 14 both of water quality and a -- for other purposes.

15 I guess finally, I do want to -- feel
 16 compelled to remind the room that the Fish and
 17 Wildlife of the Bay and Delta Environment are really
 18 not making any new demands for water. It's the water
 19 that we are now trying to direct to the natural system is
 20 really all make-up water, from historic natural flows.

21 I heard the term "new environmental water"
 22 today used I think in the same voice as new
 23 residential demands for water and I -- think that
 24 there's a very big distinction between those two types
 25 of use.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

147

1 think, Dennis, that they were in -- you know, the 1950's,
 2 60's engaged in trying to figure out how to regulate salt
 3 flow.

4 So my observation is a pretty dramatic
 5 contrast from my experience growing up to what I heard
 6 today, saw yesterday, see each time that I am out on a
 7 farm.

8 I do think that there has been dramatic
 9 change also since 1980, '81, '82. I then spent a good
 10 deal of my young adulthood in these water battles.
 11 I'm much better at being a lover than a fighter. I
 12 have to be really pushed to get into battles and I
 13 have done that in my life.

14 I think that there's been a real significant
 15 change that's gone on because we have had to engage in
 16 some very fierce battles. We're on the precipice of some
 17 real coming together.

18 The comments made by Mr. Graff and
 19 Ms. Redmond, just responding to the panel, I think are
 20 quite reflective of that. And Laura, you had, I think,
 21 quite eloquently said that a lot of the frustration of
 22 the farmers was masked here today.

23 I thought it was a very emotional
 24 presentation. At least it was to me. And so we thank
 25 you for tolerating the process but also taking the time

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

146

1 VICE CHAIRWOMAN McPEAK: Thank you, Ann. And
 2 if anybody wants a copy of the study and does not have
 3 it, please let the BDAC staff, CALFED staff know.

4 Hap Dunning.

5 COUNCILMEMBER DUNNING: Laura, in your
 6 statement, one of the points you made was that the
 7 cutbacks necessary to meet the CVPIA and environmental
 8 requirements fall on about 25 percent of the CVP
 9 contractors, it's the ag service contractors who have
 10 been hit so hard.

11 Have you given any thought to how the burden
 12 might be spread more throughout the entire universe of
 13 CVP water users?

14 MS. KING: Only in my dreams, Hap. I don't --
 15 you know, I don't -- I don't have an answer to that. I
 16 mean I think that the State Water Board's process is
 17 supposed to answer that.

18 VICE CHAIRWOMAN McPEAK: May I -- this has been
 19 a very productive discussion and -- Mike, and to the
 20 entire panelists, I want to thank you. It's been my
 21 privilege to sit here and introduce the subject.

22 I think that the exchange has had an air of
 23 real engagement here. I -- just want to comment that
 24 having grown up on a farm where, you know, the most
 25 powerful person in your life is a ditch tender, I don't

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

148

1 to be here and to enlighten us.

2 Thank you, very much.

3 MS. KING: Thank you very much.

4 COUNCILMEMBER HALL: I just want to echo the
 5 comments of Stu and Howard.

6 COUNCILMEMBER STEARNS: You want to go to
 7 Bakersfield too?

8 COUNCILMEMBER HALL: Encourage CALFED to
 9 give Sunne a paid vacation in Bakersfield.

10 Thank you again.

11 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Well, good morning. Thank
 12 you again, Mike, for the presentation. We are going to
 13 move on to an item that was originally scheduled for 9:20
 14 this morning, comments on the basin efficiency concept
 15 from Tom Goring of USBR. Tom, good morning, welcome.
 16 Thanks for joining us.

17 MR. GOHRING: Thank you. So it occurred to
 18 me that if I talk louder and then slower, do I mess with
 19 the mind of this?

20 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Yeah, you do.

21 MR. GOHRING: Well, I have a confession to make
 22 and my confession is I'm really not sure why I'm here.
 23 I'm an agricultural engineer, I work for the Bureau of
 24 Reclamation and --

25 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: That doesn't make you
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 unique, you know.
 2 MR. GOHRING: Thanks. And I'm currently
 3 working on contract renewal studies for Sac Valley
 4 Settlement Contractors. And Mary Selkirk and Rick
 5 Soehren asked me to give my opinion about whether or not
 6 a focus on basin efficiency is helpful to meeting the
 7 goals of the CALFED process.
 8 And therein lies my discomfort. I'm
 9 accustomed to rendering a technical opinion but I think
 10 this opinion really borders on philosophy.
 11 So I'm in some unknown territory here so I'd
 12 like to -- to ask some -- ask you to bear with me if I
 13 should stray into strange waters.
 14 So -- I only have really a few minutes.
 15 Rick asked me to limit my comments to about 10 or 15
 16 minutes and, you know, in that time, it's really tough
 17 to really -- to do justice to a complex topic which is
 18 what this is.
 19 So just to preface that, let me say that
 20 my comments probably won't seem unique, they may seem
 21 simplistic and -- and I'd just like to let you know that
 22 I do understand that these issues are much deeper than
 23 I may make them seem.
 24 I understand that there's a lot at stake,
 25 ecosystems are in the balance, farmers' lives and ways
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 of life are in the balance, and I do understand that.
 2 So does a focus on basin efficiency help
 3 the CALFED process? Yes and no. Yes, it does because
 4 it's -- it's useful information. And just let me talk
 5 about, you know, what is efficiency, first of all.
 6 Efficiency is just a number. It's a -- it's
 7 an index, usually it's a unitless index and at its basic
 8 form, efficiency is a description of benefits divided by
 9 costs.
 10 In the world of irrigation, we often talk
 11 about benefits as the amount of water consumptively used
 12 by beneficial crops, crops where we want it to be used.
 13 And the costs we often denote by the amount of water
 14 that's delivered to an area.
 15 In the case of basin efficiency, we usually
 16 look at beneficial ET divided by the net diversion for a
 17 basin. And, you know, by its definition, a basin where
 18 there are very few irrecoverable losses by definition
 19 will have -- will tend to have a high efficiency.
 20 I'd also like to just define water usage --
 21 my definition of water use efficiency programs, water
 22 conservation programs, water management programs.
 23 In my view, all of those programs define the
 24 investment in activities, hardware, or techniques, that
 25 can make some change in the farming practice, some change
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 in the way water is used.
 2 So yes, the -- the basin efficiency focus
 3 is helpful because it gives us information.
 4 But I'm going to suggest that it's time to
 5 move beyond that, that information, and move into other
 6 areas of information.
 7 And in -- to help us focus towards that,
 8 let's first talk about what -- what are some of the
 9 potential benefits of water use efficiency practices or
 10 techniques.
 11 Some of the potential benefits are well, if
 12 you're in an area where there are significant
 13 irrecoverable losses, water use efficiency practices
 14 could give you more water.
 15 An idea that folks have talked about for
 16 literally as long as there's been irrigation and
 17 irrigation engineers is the idea of hey, even if we've
 18 got a closed basin like the Sac Valley or the east side
 19 of the San Joaquin Valley, is it possible to reduce the
 20 evaporation component of ET?
 21 And I think that's an important question to
 22 ask. I think we should ask it, I think the time has come
 23 to ask it. And to ask it in a meaningful way.
 24 Water use efficiency programs can also
 25 improve water quality, potentially improve water quality
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 by reducing the amount of constituent laden tailwater
 2 that is returned to the system.
 3 In some areas such as the Sac Valley, water
 4 is hungry for constituents. Sac Valley water is so pure
 5 that when it comes into contact with soils and with
 6 rocks, it grabs constituents. And many technical experts
 7 now say that by reducing application, we may be able to
 8 reduce the overall loading of constituents that go back
 9 to the river.
 10 I think water use efficiency improvements
 11 can also help acceptability. And I think that was
 12 largely the focus of many of the speakers here today.
 13 They were here to tell you about the significant
 14 investments that they've made over the years, because I
 15 think that it helps us all accept a lot of what's going
 16 on right now.
 17 I think water use efficiency practices
 18 can help us maintain a higher -- a higher level of
 19 control of our water resource. If we divert less water,
 20 in theory we could hold more water higher in the system
 21 and thereby be able to put -- make use of opportunities
 22 at different times that we may not be able to make
 23 opportunities from now.
 24 For example, we may be able to reduce the
 25 depletion of certain stream reaches by reducing impacts.
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 Water use efficiency practices may also
2 improve farm profitability. For instance, if an over
3 application of water is damaging crops, water use
4 efficiency measures may reduce the damage and improve the
5 yield or quality of the crop.

6 And the last thing on my list -- and I
7 think this list is by no means exclusive but the last
8 thing on my list is that water use efficiency measures
9 may reduce -- diversion specific impacts such as fish
10 entrainment.

11 I think many of the things, if not all the
12 things on those list, overlap with CALFED objectives.
13 But unfortunately, the basin efficiency focus is not
14 getting to that list. It's stopping us.

15 And so being a -- a young man who's not
16 accustomed to speaking to a body like this about
17 philosophy, I'm going to take the impertinent step and
18 provide some challenges or pose some challenges for both
19 the agricultural and the environmental community
20 regarding basin efficiency.

21 First the environmental community. I
22 think it's time for the environmental community to
23 acknowledge that basin efficiencies are high. I think
24 it's time to consider that it's possible that some
25 practices may not yield any new water.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 aside and really engage in other discussions.
2 And I think the -- one of the major
3 reasons why it's time to set the basin argument aside
4 is that folks, it's not a credible argument.

5 Now, don't get me wrong. I'm not saying it's
6 an incorrect computation. It's correct. I've made some
7 of those computations myself. I'm not suggesting that
8 anyone has cooked the numbers or come up with an
9 inappropriate computation.

10 What I'm saying is that the basin efficiency
11 argument is not credible for a couple of reasons. One
12 reason it's not credible is that it's counterintuitive to
13 the average person on the street. Most people walking
14 around the City of Fresno or the City of Sacramento or
15 Los Angeles, their experience tells them that if they
16 drive slower, their car will use less gas. If they turn
17 their thermostat down in the winter, their utility bill
18 will go down.

19 And so when they hear agricultural
20 representatives say efficiency measures don't get you
21 anything, they just don't believe it.

22 The message is also not credible because
23 those people who do have a technical background
24 realize that a basin efficiency argument is only part
25 of the story. There's a lot more to the story.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 More importantly, I would like to urge
2 the environmental community to be more direct. I
3 think the term "improving efficiency" is code. I
4 think it's code for "give us some more water."

5 And I support -- I support the discussion
6 of where water should be used, where it's appropriate to
7 be used, and I -- and I especially support the discussion
8 of my list of potential water use efficiency benefits.

9 But if we continue to focus on what is
10 your efficiency, how can you improve your efficiency,
11 somehow the list is getting lost. And so I would like to
12 urge us all to be more direct.

13 And lastly, I would like to urge the
14 environmental representatives to consider economics.
15 And realize that changes don't get made in farming
16 systems or in an irrigation district unless there is a
17 perceived benefit or an incentive.

18 Now, for the ag community, and this is kind
19 of like speaking to my own choir. I'm a farm boy, I grew
20 up on a walnut farm up near Modesto, and I've worked
21 primarily in the ag industry my whole career, short
22 though it may be.

23 I think it's time for the ag industry to
24 engage the environmental community on this list. I
25 think it's time to set the basin efficiency focus

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 For instance, efficiency can be computed in
2 many different ways. Not just a basin efficiency
3 argument. Another expression of farm efficiency would
4 be the number of calories in that can of almonds divided
5 by the amount of energy it took to produce it. And I
6 think most technocrats in the room would realize that
7 gee, that number would probably be pretty small. So
8 there's both technical reasons and lay persons reasons
9 why the argument isn't credible.

10 And the last reason it's not credible is
11 because there are people in the ag industry who have
12 stated that they -- that although they are in a closed
13 basin, they have conserved water that they are ready to
14 transfer on a water market. And so the credibility is
15 basically blown.

16 And that concludes my comments. Can I
17 field any questions?

18 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Okay, anybody who hasn't
19 been offended here, raise your hand. Hap first, go
20 ahead. Go ahead, you're up.

21 COUNCILMEMBER DUNNING: I found that very
22 insightful and I wonder if there's any chance of getting
23 it in writing. You got a statement or anything -- could
24 you prepare one and give it to us?

25 MR. GOHRING: I would be happy to, sir.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

157

1 COUNCILMEMBER DUNNING: Because, you know,
 2 you're talking about things that have been debated for
 3 decades and I thought you -- add it to the discussion.
 4 MR. GOHRING: Thank you.
 5 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Yeah, I agree, I thought
 6 it was very helpful.
 7 COUNCILMEMBER HALL: Why don't we just ask
 8 that a transcript --
 9 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: That we could do. We'll do
 10 that. Thank you. Good idea. Martha.
 11 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: I'm going to join the
 12 chorus here and say that I thought it was excellent.
 13 And I think that it is very useful right now as we're
 14 looking at the water efficiency element because there was
 15 an economic analysis there that I was puzzled by that
 16 looked at what -- if you looked at the cost of
 17 conservation and -- and what you would get under an
 18 applied water versus a net water scenario, and I didn't
 19 see how the numbers correlated up to all of these other
 20 benefits that would clearly accrue to the community, to
 21 the basin, to the state, if you went ahead and made the
 22 investments.
 23 And I see your head nodding up and down
 24 so I assume that's part of the point here of making
 25 sure that when we talk about the economic evaluation
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

158

1 of some of these investments that we want to make,
 2 improvement of water management to really capture the
 3 true economic value to California doing these things.
 4 MR. GOHRING: You bet. In fact, you could take
 5 that thought even further and say, you know, have we ever
 6 computed the cost of the CVP, the cost of the
 7 environment. And I think that those discussions are real
 8 useful because they put things in perspective.
 9 I also think that they can be somewhat of a
 10 trap because many of those benefits and costs are
 11 virtually impossible to quantify.
 12 And so I guess I -- I see a the benefit in
 13 looking at economics with two different lenses. One lens
 14 is from the viewpoint of the folks who may be expected to
 15 make the investment and whether or not that -- their
 16 economic picture pencils out. Because if it doesn't, you
 17 can expect that changes won't happen.
 18 And the second lens is more of the macro
 19 view or the societal view.
 20 COUNCILMEMBER DAVIS: Okay.
 21 MR. GOHRING: I think Mr. Frick had a
 22 question.
 23 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Howard.
 24 COUNCILMEMBER FRICK: I think it's no question
 25 as to -- as farmers we have got to do everything we can
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

159

1 to improve our efficient use of water. Both districts I
 2 am involved in have signed on to 3616. But I don't know
 3 what we really expect to accomplish from this.
 4 You look at bulletin 160, what is
 5 recoverable, and the figures I see, you don't -- you
 6 don't recover anything in the Sacramento Valley, if I
 7 understand it correctly. If you eliminate the
 8 South Coast, 10,000 acre feet could be recovered;
 9 Colorado River, 210,000; south (inaudible) 10,000.
 10 When you turn to the San Joaquin Valley
 11 where you have a direct impact on the bay, Bay Delta,
 12 it's some 2300 feet that could be recovered. With water
 13 use efficiency. But we're talking about nothing.
 14 You know, we're -- we're expecting to
 15 generate new water with water use efficiency. I don't
 16 see where that water is. Now, our own CALFED
 17 EIR/EIS says there may be 20 to 30 thousand acre feet of
 18 water that could be recovered. This is nothing. You're
 19 talking about millions in need. We're chasing a
 20 non-existent supply.
 21 Would you comment on that, Mr. Goehring?
 22 MR. GOHRING: Yes, sir. I'll do my best to
 23 comment on that.
 24 I guess I would -- default back to the list
 25 of potential benefits from water use efficiency measures.
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

160

1 And that list includes not only water supply augmentation
 2 but also improved water quality, improved public
 3 acceptability, improved control of supply, improved farm
 4 profitability, and a reduction in direct diversion
 5 impacts.
 6 I think that by stopping the conversation at
 7 bulletin 160 -- and I'm not criticizing that wonderful
 8 piece of work -- but by stopping the discussion there,
 9 we're foregoing the discussion of those other benefits.
 10 COUNCILMEMBER FRICK: Where do these
 11 activities generate new water?
 12 MR. GOHRING: Some of these activities may
 13 not generate new water, sir. But they may generate
 14 other benefits which -- which potentially support the
 15 CALFED goals.
 16 COUNCILMEMBER FRICK: Well, I certainly
 17 agree with you there, we need to do that. My point is
 18 these are all improvements that are necessary, water
 19 quality and better farming practices and dealing with the
 20 high cost of water. But I just don't see it generating
 21 water and I think the public feels that if farmers would
 22 quit wasting 10 percent of the water, it would solve the
 23 problem. I don't see that it even heads that direction
 24 at all.
 25 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Steve.
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

161

1 COUNCILMEMBER HALL. Well, I want to -- tell
 2 you as well, I found your comments provocative and
 3 insightful and -- there are a couple of caveats.
 4 I mean you said something about farmers'
 5 improving on farm practices and thereby freeing up their
 6 water for transfer.
 7 But as you undoubtedly know, and based on
 8 such high efficiencies, it's probably not their water
 9 that they are transferring if it's conserved.
 10 That's the problem. And that goes to
 11 Howard's comment that good farm practices, even if spread
 12 throughout the valley, will not produce substantially
 13 greater quantities of water for use elsewhere.
 14 And I think that's what you are getting to
 15 with your challenge to the environmental community that
 16 they acknowledge that basin efficiencies are already high
 17 and we will not solve the problem by farmers conserving
 18 water. That will not substantially reduce the conflicts
 19 in the system.
 20 I also want to agree, though, with your
 21 comment and challenge to the agricultural community that
 22 the argument is not credible. As one who has spent a lot
 23 of his career trying to make the argument, I can tell you
 24 it isn't credible.
 25 I have found no way to somehow convince
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

163

1 transcript.
 2 COUNCILMEMBER HALL: Which is coming
 3 shortly. Good.
 4 MR. GOHRING: You know, you talked, Mr. Hall,
 5 about convincing the average man on the street. I can't
 6 even convince my mother-in-law.
 7 COUNCILMEMBER HALL. I can't even convince my
 8 mother. And she's married to a farmer.
 9 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Alex. And then Byron.
 10 COUNCILMEMBER HILDEBRAND: I'm puzzled by
 11 the item on your list about how this is going to improve
 12 water quality.
 13 Actually, as we discussed earlier, what's
 14 happening to water quality is a result of the lack of
 15 adequate water, the west side of the valley, is that we
 16 are making water quality a lot worse. We are making
 17 ground water quality a whole lot worse, we are making the
 18 river water quality a lot worse when the drainage ends up
 19 in the river instead of in the ground water.
 20 I don't see any benefit to water quality.
 21 It's quite the contrary. The more -- the less leech
 22 water they have, the higher the salinity is of that
 23 leech water.
 24 MR. GOHRING: Let me see if I can respond to
 25 that, Alex. First of all, I think that every one of
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

162

1 the average person on the street to accept the notion
 2 that as they drive by that farmer's field being
 3 sprinkled in the middle of the day, that if they
 4 sprinkled it at night instead of the middle of the
 5 day, it would somehow not produce more water because
 6 they have learned from sprinkling their own lawn that it
 7 matters. And I mean it just doesn't fly so -- I'm sorry
 8 if I'm offending my farmer friends but it don't fly.
 9 So I want to modify your challenge a
 10 little. I basically agree with your list of the
 11 benefits. I note that it does not include as a benefit
 12 there's a lot of new water here and I think you have made
 13 your point there.
 14 Modify your challenge and challenge my
 15 environmental friends. There's a famous Delbert cartoon
 16 that says, "Change is good, you go first."
 17 Let me challenge my environmental friends
 18 that neither one of us go first, that we go first
 19 together. If you will stop talking about if farmers
 20 would just conserve a little, the problem would be
 21 solved, I will do my best to get my community to stop
 22 harping about basin efficiencies, therefore there's no
 23 benefit to farm practices changing. And if you want to
 24 make that deal with me, just see me with at the break.
 25 MR. GOHRING: And you have got that in the
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

164

1 the items on the list was -- was preceded by the word
 2 "potential benefit." And so I recognize that -- that
 3 less isn't always better. Less application isn't
 4 always better.
 5 I also think that whether or not there
 6 are water quality benefits kind of depends on your focus.
 7 I think if your focus -- right now I'm focussed primarily
 8 on the area around the Colusa Basin. And if my focus
 9 were the Colusa Basin drain, less application would mean
 10 higher concentrations in the drain and therefore a
 11 degradation in water quality in the drain.
 12 But if you take your focus further
 13 downstream to the Sacramento River downstream of where
 14 the Colusa drain discharges into the river, less
 15 application may -- and it's a big question mark still --
 16 but less application may result in better quality at the
 17 river.
 18 It definitely will result in better
 19 thermal quality. Thermal quality, temperature
 20 problems is one of the big -- one of the biggest
 21 controlling factors in the Sac, above Sacramento at this
 22 time.
 23 COUNCILMEMBER HILDEBRAND: Well, I would agree
 24 that a statement that we should look at both pluses
 25 and minuses that may result. But the way you have it
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

165

167

1 phrased, it seems to imply that it's always a plus. And
2 that I don't agree with.

3 MR. GOHRING: But I'll think of -- should I
4 ever be asked to speak to anyone again, I will think of a
5 better way to rephrase that. And I agree with you, Alex.

6 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Byron.

7 COUNCILMEMBER BUCK: Yeah, a quick question
8 for Rick Soehren. I see he is hiding in the back. Wake
9 up, Rick.

10 CALFED's linkage on the ag side is AB-3616
11 program and -- in my understanding, that is a net benefit
12 test, not a real water basin-wide efficiency test for
13 whether you would pursue a conservation improvement;
14 correct?

15 MR. SOEHREN: Correct.

16 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Well, I wanted to
17 provide a "however" on that and particularly the way Tom
18 has characterized this issue and that is that
19 3616 is a cost effectiveness test at the local level,
20 not the broader regional benefits that Tom was talking
21 about.

22 So it does consider all those issues and has
23 that perspective but there's no regional consideration.

24 COUNCILMEMBER BUCK: And is the program
25 addressing that lack of regional focus?

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 I just wanted to put together some fairly
2 simple numbers. My friend Tom at the last meeting
3 laid out a list of all the hardware CALFED considered.
4 Well, when you look at on the ground the soft path, at
5 least waste water recycling and urban water conservation,
6 it's very hardware-oriented as well. And in fact, it's
7 quite a bit more expensive than any of the storage
8 options that are on the table.

9 And this is not to say one is better than
10 the other, we should do one rather than the other, we
11 probably need to do both. But just the facts on the
12 ground are -- waste water recycling, the amount that is
13 in the CALFED program, we are talking about a range of
14 between 6 and 16 billion dollars of capital costs to
15 produce the amount that's projected or desired from the
16 CALFED actions. That is no small chunk of change.

17 Right now on the ground, based upon the
18 last three big projects built, they are running 900 to
19 1200 dollars an acre foot delivered. It's very expensive
20 water.

21 The conservation side, the projected range
22 in the costs that are being expended now, \$35 million a
23 year going into BMP's in urban California, that would
24 raise -- serve the cost of raising Shasta dam three and a
25 half times over. So a lot of investment is going on

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

166

168

1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Attempting to,
2 yes.

3 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Alex.

4 COUNCILMEMBER HILDEBRAND: We are back to
5 Rick, I would like to say I thought he made a nice
6 presentation. But in regard to the multiple use of
7 water, I call attention to the linkage of that
8 desirability with the kind of storage you plan.

9 And some kinds of storage will give you only
10 an increased yield, some will give you only an improved
11 water quality, others -- such as raising Friant can give
12 you flood protection, more power, better stream flow,
13 better water quality and yield.

14 And so deciding what's the best kind of
15 storage, you got to look at the amount of multiple
16 benefit you can get out of the yield.

17 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Byron and then Ann.

18 COUNCILMEMBER BUCK: I don't know if this is
19 necessarily the appropriate time to do this but since we
20 are on the topic of efficiency, I have got a one-page
21 hand-out for everybody which stems from the --
22 particularly the environmental community and the
23 things they are saying about the soft path being a
24 full alternative that we can pursue that can solve a lot,
25 if not all of the problems.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1 that.

2 I don't mean to say we're not going to do
3 this kind of thing, we are. But clearly it's expensive
4 water. It's out there. The stuff at the outer end of
5 BMP's or beyond BMP's is getting very high. CALFED's
6 estimates are upwards of \$1600 an acre foot.

7 So the bottom line is for the storage sites
8 that are -- under consideration, the ag urban group's
9 done some estimates; still expensive water by historic
10 standards but contrast that against what is being
11 proposed in CALFED.

12 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Ann.

13 COUNCILMEMBER NOTTHOFF: I think what we
14 have heard is we have heard some important questions
15 being raised about the potential for agricultural water
16 use efficiency and how that can contribute to the
17 ultimate CALFED solution.

18 I think -- and it's -- I wanted to hear it;
19 it's my understanding that CALFED is in the process of
20 trying to get some more specific answers to some of those
21 questions and that I wanted to commend the process --
22 CALFED for getting some more answers to those questions
23 so that we can factor it in to coming up with long-term
24 solutions.

25 Because certainly the -- what we heard today
PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

169

1 was very significant information. I think it still
 2 seems unclear as to what is -- you know, we have
 3 innovators now that are practicing state of the art water
 4 conservation measures, how representative that is of the
 5 total whole, I still do not have a clear handle on.

6 And I don't think that CALFED has had a
 7 chance to quantify what that -- what the potential is
 8 there and I'm -- look forward to seeing those numbers in
 9 the future, brought to the council in the future.

10 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Mary.

11 MS. SELKIRK: I just wanted to respond to
 12 Ann. Actually, the next presentation on the agenda,
 13 which I believe is going to be after lunch, is from
 14 Mark Cowin who is going to provide to BDAC a briefing on
 15 the economic equivalency analysis that CALFED is
 16 undertaking that will deal with some of the issues that
 17 you have raised, and I think address some of the
 18 questions of relative costs of certain efficiency
 19 measures and other alternatives to deal with some of
 20 the problems facing CALFED.

21 So Mark is going to start up right after
 22 lunch.

23 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right, thank you. All
 24 right. Thank you, very much. Thank you, sir. That was
 25 a most interesting and provocative presentation and I
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

171

1 improve their output and their cost.

2 But I have got a little different slant
 3 today. And my Dutch, Holland-Dutch side of the family in
 4 southern Indiana -- and they had a nice place there.
 5 They had the glaciers bring all that good soil down and
 6 they cut the trees out and they knew enough to raise one
 7 crop that they could depend on (unintelligible). So they
 8 made it pretty good and I enjoyed that.

9 Anyhow, let's get back to what I wanted
 10 to say today. I represent the following organizations
 11 concerned with California's limited water supplies. I'm
 12 a member of the Federation of Fly Fishers, as
 13 Mr. Izmerian is, and I have been an officer in the Fresno
 14 Fly Club, I have been a director to the Northern
 15 California Council (sic) Federation and I still maintain
 16 active participation in those things and monetarily
 17 support Sierra Club, Earth Justice Legal Fund, other
 18 environmental organizations I feel attempt to stop
 19 further decline of recreational opportunities in
 20 California because of these water battles.

21 In the past meetings that I have attended,
 22 it seems that many users of available water feel it's not
 23 necessary to protect fish. The only thing I have got to
 24 say is they were here a lot longer than human beings.

25 Apparently many of the water users feel they
 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

170

1 appreciate it.

2 We are going to take public comment now,
 3 then go to lunch. We will try to be as brief as possible
 4 at lunch and come back -- let's see here. It's 12:26, we
 5 can come back maybe around 1:15 would be nice, because we
 6 have definite time frames fixed around the 2:30
 7 presentation. So we will need to be done with our other
 8 activities by 2:30.

9 I have four cards of public speakers who
 10 have asked to be heard. The first is Alan Benger
 11 (phonetic), City Manager of the City of Mendota.

12 Sir? Not here. Okay. Moves us along.

13 Okay, Dennis Fox. Mr. Fox?

14 Okay. I'm doing well here.

15 Laurence Naney, Federation of Fly Fishers.

16 Good morning. Good afternoon, sir. Thank you for your
 17 patience.

18 MR. NANEY: Well, I have been to these
 19 things before.

20 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Well, that explains a
 21 lot...

22 MR. NANEY: That's an understatement.

23 Now, first of all, I want to thank the panel
 24 and everybody here today. I have not always believed the
 25 farmers were working with scientific information to

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

172

1 are not of any value or importance to millions of the
 2 state's residents, completely disregarding the human need
 3 for relaxing from the every day rat race.

4 I personally do not wish any more water
 5 diverted from flowing naturally through the Delta. It's
 6 a life source for humans in the form of potable water and
 7 major highway for many species of fish who reside as
 8 adults in the ocean but spawn in the fresh water. Plus
 9 in the delta, plus many others who pass through to spawn
 10 many miles up the major streams that feed the Delta.

11 Many of these are already on endangered
 12 species list and diverting more water from the delta
 13 may place them on the extinct list created by human
 14 greed and/or ignorance.

15 The proliferation of dams have reduced
 16 Northern and Central California rivers and stream flows
 17 eventually and in some cases, such as the San Joaquin
 18 River and all of its tributaries from the Kern County
 19 north, have actually dried up a major flow from the south
 20 of the San Joaquin River to dry sand for miles. And if
 21 any of you live out there, you know what I'm talking
 22 about.

23 Before the Merced and Tulare and Stanislaus
 24 Rivers again water it, dam is built containing the
 25 natural flows of every stream/river of consequence from

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377