

## **Summary of Key Recurring Comments**

### **Agriculture**

#### **Water Conservation/Water Use Efficiency**

Agriculture has been and is working very hard at water conservation and efficiency measures. This is demonstrated by a reduction in water over recent years while achieving additional outputs from the same land. Agriculture can not make up all the water needs through more conservation.

#### **Ecosystem Restoration Efforts**

While agriculture supported ecosystem restoration, it was generally qualified by no loss of agricultural lands or water delivery.

#### **Surface Water Storage**

A general feeling from the agricultural community that additional storage is already needed to make up for what has been lost for environmental reasons in the past few years and the increasing demand for urban use. A deep concern that projected population growth in California was only going to make matters worse and that the plan was not realizing the need for additional storage now to meet future growth needs.

#### **Groundwater**

There is support from all sectors for developing additional groundwater storage. There is a concern from people in the upper watersheds, especially the agricultural community, over protection of water rights/area of origin. There was a general feeling that groundwater projects should move forward now, not wasting time for additional studies.

#### **Finance/Who pays?**

These comments focused on the fact that agricultural should not be responsible for all the costs as the environmental and wildlife, etc were also benefitting, so costs should be equitably distributed. The following are recurring themes:

Agriculture supplies the food based on low water costs.

Environmentalists should pay for their water too.

#### **Loss of Agricultural Land**

The potential loss of agricultural land, especially the high numbers shown in the documents, is unacceptable. These losses have repercussions across local, regional, national, and world economies. Substantial social impacts among the local agricultural dependent communities would result from implementation. Expressed a need for a "more ag friendly alternative" which has less impacts on agriculture and clearly defined mitigation measures to offset any impacts that do occur.

### **Water Quality and Water Reliability**

Comments identified a need for better water quality for maximizing production on agricultural lands. Some mention that deteriorating water quality is resulting in reduction of crops. Couple with this has been the statement that reliable delivery in the amounts needed is essential. A feeling that the plan is not providing for reliable water delivery.

## **Environmental**

### **Water Conservation/Water Use Efficiency\***

Comments focused on the belief that the program does not go far enough in requirements for the use of conservation measures and water use efficiency. A general belief that more conservation and efficiency can solve the problems and therefore additional storage is not needed. The following are some of the recurring themes:

- Conservation is only way.
- Conservation before new facilities.
- Better conservation on farms and in cities, including evapotranspiration rates for agricultural water use.
- Ensure strong conservation programs and economic incentives.
- Water meters should be required.
- Agriculture uses too much water.
- Agriculture should shift from high water use crops.

### **Ecosystem Restoration Efforts\***

There was a lot of support for the ecosystem restoration effort from all sides, but primarily from the environmental stance. The following are some of the recurring themes:

- Support restoration goals.
- Support removing barriers.
- Support removing existing dams (Englebright singled out a lot of the times).
- Goals don't go far enough to preserve ecosystem.

### **Surface Water Storage\***

This is the number one item in all the comment letters/documents. There is either a strong stance for or against additional storage. Those against storage generally felt that the conservation and efficiency measures needed to be tried first before any storage was even considered. They felt that the current conservation and efficiency measures in the plan do not go far enough and thus contribute to the potential need for more surface storage. There was also a key feeling that more surface storage would simply make matters worse by removing more water from the already troubled system. This would result in even greater effects on already

imperiled species, especially fisheries.

#### **Groundwater\***

There is support from all sectors for developing additional groundwater storage. This was definitely preferred by environmental interests over developing additional surface storage. There is a concern from people in the upper watersheds over protection of water rights/area of origin.

#### **Finance/Who pays?**

These comments affirm the idea of beneficiary should pay, but emphasize that they felt the general taxpayers should not have to pay. The following are recurring themes:

- Stop subsidizing corporate agriculture
- Environmentalists should pay for their water too

#### **Water Quality and Water Reliability\***

Identified a need for better water quality and reliable flows to meet environmental needs, especially fish and aquatic ecosystems. A belief that agricultural is the primary source of poor water quality and that the plan is more focused on sending additional water to southern California than meeting environmental needs.

### **Urban**

#### **Water Conservation/Water Use Efficiency**

Urban areas have been practicing water conservation and using efficiency measures. This is alone can not meet future water needs.

#### **Surface Water Storage**

A general feeling of a lack of commitment to increase the water supply. A deep concern that projected population growth in California was only going to make matters worse and that the plan was not realizing the need for additional storage now to meet future growth needs.

#### **Water Quality and Water Reliability**

A general feeling that there was no commitment to improve water quality and reliability. Identified a need for "verifiable increases in supply and quality" if southern California is going to support the program. Looking for specific schedules with targets for improvement in quality and supply, along with performance milestones to measure the success of the program. A need for "assurances", especially regarding Endangered Species, to insure against further erosion of water supplies.

## **Comments From All Sectors**

### **Isolated Facility/Peripheral Canal**

Comments seem to focus on the area of the state, with individuals south of the Delta expressing a need for the peripheral canal to be built now in order to meet water quality and reliability. Those north of the Delta and environmental campaigns were opposed to a peripheral canal and not only saw no need, but felt further degradation of the Delta would result. A common statement of those opposed was "no more water to Southern California." Several comments have noted that they believe the isolated facility at Hood is simply the first stage of the peripheral canal and it is pre-disposing the program to eventually going that route.

### **Growth Planning/Restriction**

There have been comments focusing on the belief that there is no more water that can be taken from existing needs and therefore the only real solution is planning that restricts future growth in California.

### **Desalinization**

Individuals felt that the program was lacking because of a failure to aggressively pursue desalinization to meet the needs of urban areas, especially in southern California. These individuals felt another alternative is needed that focuses on meeting both part of the present needs and future needs through desalinization.

### **Programmatic Nature of the Document**

Comments were either focused on a lack of specific detail in portions of the documents or on providing specific projects that they felt should be included. In general they were requesting site specific project analysis as part of the programmatic document.

\* - Those items marked with an asterick were also contained in the large campaign mailings.