

Date: May 22, 1998
To: Management Team
From: Lester A. Snow
Subject: Public Hearing Comments

Summary

This is an informational item. No action is necessary. As of May 15, 1998, there have been 12 public hearings. Attached are a summary of comments made at each hearing. The comments have been favorable of the Program however, there are particular items/issues that have been raised in each hearing. These are outlined in the following Detailed Discussion section. 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 not move forward with water development actions and focus on a 4th alternative which stresses water use efficiency.

Detailed Discussion

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 “*”

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, 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 4th 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. Strong 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 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 4th 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.

Sacramento Valley (Chico 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 4th alternative which stresses water use efficiency.
- Agriculture supports storage.
- * Both agriculture and urban require maintenance of water rights, compliance with area of origin requirements and adherence to local ordinances as necessary assurances with any groundwater storage or water transfer actions.