

April 9, 1999

To: Lester Snow Fax (916) 654-9780  
From: Alex Hildebrand Fax (209) 825-6180  
Phone (209) 823-4166

*Alex*  
Minority Report by BDAC Member Alex Hildebrand Regarding CALFED's  
"Water Management Strategy" and its "Integrated Storage Investigation"

---

At the conclusion of the March 25 BDAC meeting the BDAC voted to approve the Water Management Strategy and the Integrated Storage Investigation as they were presented at that meeting by CALFED staff. I cast one of two "no" votes because I believed that approval was premature and because I disapprove of some "early implementation actions" that were included under the heading of "Lower San Joaquin River and South Delta Region Bundle".

During extensive BDAC discussion CALFED's staff was unable to answer numerous questions including the following:

- 1) How much increase in water use does the program propose for environmental purposes?
- 2) The program alleges that the CALFED Plan will allocate 1,560,000 fewer acre feet of water for agricultural and urban use in the year 2020 than was proposed in Bulletin 160. How was this figure derived and what are the predicted component reductions in allocations of water for growing food, for residential use, and for industrial use? What would the reductions be on a per capita basis? How would this affect the need for industrial and food imports?
- 3) Curves were presented alleging that water supply would increase steadily as the value of water rises. The presenters could not say how they would address the time lag between a rise in value of water and the increase in water supply which could then result from constructing new facilities for increased water supply that were not started until the price of water rose.
- 4) No quantification was provided of the probable availability of water from willing agricultural sellers for transfers to other purposes of use if transfers were required to comply with the "no-injury" rule in respect to water already being used by third parties.
- 5) The presenters could not say whether the economic analyses of new storage facilities would be based on the current value of water or on the probable value at the time the facility would be ready for operation.

I don't believe either the BDAC or the Policy Committee can make an informed decision on the management strategy until questions such as these are answered.

I also believe that the Actions for "Early Implementation" should be further defined and analyzed for propriety and compatibility before approval.

- a) Implementation of the San Joaquin River agreement (Action 5) as a means of providing pulsed fish flow would not be compatible with resolving other needs including fish protection outside of the pulsed flow period, and would be unnecessarily costly in both water use and dollars. It should not be implemented prior to the proposed evaluation of the alternative of providing the pulsed flow by recirculation (Action 7).
- b) Action item 4 relating to increasing the SWP export rate does not mention the potential effect on reduction of South Delta water depths and the uncertainty of whether the temporary tidal barriers could capture enough water during a reduced high tide level (caused by increased export rates) to get through the subsequent low tide. Nor does it mention the benefit of the tidal barriers in reducing the re-export of San Joaquin River salt and in protecting the smolts that migrate before and after the April 15/May 15 pulsed flow.
- c) Action Item 9 does not address the use of the tidal barriers to maintain the downstream flow to Stockton that is essential to correcting the inadequate dissolved oxygen problem south of Stockton.
- d) Action 52 in the "Sacramento River, San Joaquin River and Tribs Bundle" proposes to increase the "Meander Corridor" in the San Joaquin River by "acquisition" and "implementation". This was stated by the staff to be a flood control measure related to reevaluation of the best method of flood plain management. Reconsideration of the best way to manage the flood plain is appropriate, but that is not what item 52 says. Increased meander is likely to be in conflict with that objective.

The April 8 Bay Delta Issues Update provides an account of the BDAC meeting which does not even mention the discussion of any of these concerns.