

February 23, 2000

TO: CALFED Policy Group

FROM: Mike Madigan, Chair *M.M.*
Bay-Delta Advisory Council

SUBJECT: BDAC Assessment of Strengths/Weaknesses of Preferred Program Alternative
and Identification of Issues to be Addressed Into Implementation

Summary

The Bay-Delta Advisory Council has responsibility to "recommend the best solution alternative for implementation by the appropriate agencies, as part of the NEPA/CEQA environmental documentation process" (BDAC Charter). As part of fulfilling this responsibility, BDAC met on February 17, 2000 and assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the Preferred Program Alternative.

Sunne McPeak, Eric Hasseltine and Alex Hildebrand summarized the assessment with the following proposed motion and proposed amendment to the motion, with the understanding that more discussion was needed before a recommendation could be forwarded to the CALFED Policy Group. A revised motion will be presented to BDAC for discussion and possible endorsement at the April 13, 2000 BDAC meeting.

Proposed motion:

To endorse the preferred alternative as written and recommend aggressive progress on:

- identifying guaranteed funding for ecosystem restoration,
- guaranteeing Delta outflows that support fish populations,
- optimizing water use efficiency and links to other program elements, such as storage,
- decisions regarding storage and conveyance facilities,

Proposed amendment to motion:

Add following bullets:

- optimizing through Delta conveyance,
- accurately identifying water supply increases from actions,
- balancing competing needs within and outside the Delta,

Alex Hildebrand suggested that the Record of Decision/Certification contain a preamble that commits to resolving the issues contained in the bullets.

Description

Provided below is the assessment of the Preferred Program Alternative made by BDAC members. While a few comments focused on the preferred alternative and the EIS/EIR

15. Provide a dedicated, consistent funding source for environmental restoration. (R. Borgonovo/EWC)
16. Provide a dedicated source of water for environmental purposes that is in addition to requirements in the CVPIA, Bay-Delta Accord, Trinity Decision and ESA biological opinions. (R. Borgonovo/EWC)
17. Create a new ecosystem restoration entity. (R. Borgonovo/EWC)
18. Work with local interests to carefully assess options, such as changes in crops, to increase agricultural water use efficiency. (B. Raab, T. Belza)
19. Consider water desalinization as an option for coastal communities (M. Madigan, H. Dunning)
20. The Program needs a strong link between water use efficiency and storage actions. (J. Redmond)

Decision-Making/Governance

21. Specify and integrate all state and federal agreements and permits needed to implement the CALFED plan. (B. Southwick)
22. Avoid a solution for one problem that will undermine solutions for other problems (R. Borgonovo/EWC)
23. Use management strategies that avoid reconciling problems at the expense of specific interest groups. (B. Southwick)
24. Support phased decision-making. (F. Spivy-Weber, P. Parravano)
25. Work on problems on a regional scale. (F. Spivy-Weber)
26. Effective assurances are needed, especially those that will ensure implementation as planned and to keep the public and stakeholders involved. (R. Borgonovo, J. Redmond)

Finance

27. Identify and clarify how the preferred alternative actions will be financed. (R. Izmirian, S. McPeak)
28. Require that beneficiaries of CALFED actions pay the cost of those actions. (R. Borgonovo/EWC)

EIS/EIR Impact Assessment

29. Address the impacts of CALFED actions which propose taking agricultural land out of production on local communities and the different segments of local economies. (H. Frick, M. Guzman)
30. Address positive and negative effects of CALFED actions on marine and land based food production. (P. Parravano)