98-A19

Date: Wed, 25 Feb 1998 15:37:04 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: marc@mailhost.ceres.ca.gov
To: rsoehren@water.ca.gov
From: marc@ceres.ca.gov (Marc Luesebrink)
Subject: Phase II Document

Rick,

Below are my comments on the Phase II Summary Report. I think the document is well written and does a good job of laying out the key issues. I did have two general comments. First, I think when you read through the document again, you should think about whether the average person would understand the terminology and explanation. In some places, the document reads a bit technical or "inside baseball." The other is that in some places it isn't clear how much consensus there is around an element of the plan.

Sorry for late submittal of comments.

Marc

Comments on Phase II Summary Report

Page iii, first paragraph-- The SF Bay and the Sac-SJ Delta "form" the largest estuary rather than represent.

Page iv, second paragraph-- Reference is made to "implementation strategies". Why is this plural? I understood that we would be developing a single implementation strategy.

Page 5, side bar-- Should Food and Ag. be included with the State Agencies?

Page 8, second paragraph-- Another reference is made to "implementation strategies."

Page 9-- What is the ethnic media?

Page 11, second paragraph-- Second sentence reads, "We cannot even ..." You might consider substituting "effectively" or some other word for "even."

Page 15, second paragraph-- In the second sentence, which describes "actions," should "financing" be included on this list?

Page 30, Conjunctive Management Regional Concerns-- Should some reference be made to the importance of existing groundwater management plans (e.g. under AB3030) as a criteria for selecting appopriate conjunctive use projects?

Page 32-- I thought the climate change section was well done and support keeping it in the document.

Page 34, first paragraph-- The last sentence says, "The Program is investigating the concept of preserving the overall state-wide level of agricultural production to offset Delta regional agricultural losses due to land conversion." I think this is too strong and might be rephrased to something like, "In order ot offset Delta regional ag. production losses, the Program is investigating the concept of supporting efforts to preserve agricultural production on a regional or statewide basis."

Page 36, Water Quality Program bullet-- You might add "and the Bay-Delta ecosystem" to reiterate the fact that water quality improvements are not only for water users.

Pages 42 and 43, Ecosystem Restoration Program-- Should some reference be

made to the fact that the water for flow measures would come from new storage and acquisition from willing sellers? Also, you might add something to reflect the fact that water purchase on this scale is unprecedented.

Page 47, first full paragraph-- Is the linkage between efficiency and other program actions part of the existing water use efficiency program? It is unclear from this paragraph what level of consensus/support there is for this linkage.

Page 49, second bullet-- The term "paper water" is used. Would this term be understood by the general public?

Page 58, Alternative 1C-- The "combines and integrates" sentence was mistakenly omitted from this description.

Page 64, table-- Should some reference be made to the fact the the "storage" listed represents the maximum of the range?

Page 67, first paragraph-- The doc. states that, "However, since the solution principles have been used throughout the program development, it is unlikely at this point that alternatives will violate the solution principles." I don't necessarily agree with this statement since the solution principles may be contingent on what the financing and assurances packages look like.

Page 68, first paragraph-- The doc. says the "This conflict can be reduced in three basic ways" and then lists four bullets. You should either say "four basic ways" or find a way to further distinguish the fourth bullet.

Page 71-- The term "more well" is used twice. You might substitute "better."

Page 76, first paragraph-- You might spell out TC since the general public may not know that this refers to "Tehama Colusa" (although I suppose the general public has no idea what Tehama Colusa means either).

Page 93, Total Cost-- What are the assumptions here, I find this hard to believe (not to minimize the difference of a billion dollars)? Also, you might mention the importance of storage in whatever alternative as a major factor in cost.

Page 96-- Reference is made to the fact that biological impacts of the shift in X2 would not be measurable. Even if this is true, you might consider qualifying this statement a little more since it would probably depend on the scale that you were measuring.

Page 104, first bullet-- Reference is made to the "San Joaquin Delta". Was this a mistake? I don't think this term is used elsewhere in the document.

Page 107-- It is difficult to distinguish between "no action" and "existing condition" bars.

Page 118, second paragraph-- The impact on steelhead is referred to as being "virtually nil." You might consider another term such as "minimal." "Virtually nil" sounded odd.

Page 125 second paragraph-- This paragraph was a bit confusing to me. You might state the issue in terms of the larger that the isolated facility is (rather than "small vs. large" as though they were distinct), the more difficult stakeholders feel it would be to provide assurances.

Page 127, User Benefits paragraph-- I'm a little concerned about the last sentence which talks about recreational facilities. I wouldn't want readers to get the impression that we were considering paying for a significant part of ERP through user fees (put another way, I wouldn't want readers to be confused about the difference between ecosystem restoration actions/costs and recreation actions/costs).

****
Marc Luesebrink
Special Assistant
California Resources Agency
marc@resources.ca.gov
(916) 653-5656
Visit California's Natural Resources Web Site at: http://ceres.ca.gov