

DRAFT NO. 1

Date: December 14, 1999

Prepared By: John Pacheco

Reviewed By:            Date:           

~~John R. Pacheco~~ 12-14-99

~~George Barnes~~ *12/14/99*

APPROVED FOR FINAL:

*KF*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Katherine F. Kelly, Chief

Date: 12/14/99

Steven R. Ritchie  
Acting Executive Director  
CALFED

Katherine F. Kelly, Chief  
Office of State Water Project Planning

Review of Agency Administrative Draft - Response to Comments Document for the  
CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR

The Department of Water Resources has reviewed the first Agency  
Administrative Draft - Response to Comments Document for the CALFED Bay-Delta  
Program's June 1999 Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement  
/Environmental Impact Report. The Department is submitting the following comments.

General Comments and Observations

1. It is clear that many stakeholders are seeking more detail about the Preferred Program Alternative than the Program is capable of providing at this point. It is

almost as if the stakeholders refuse to accept or understand the programmatic nature of this PEIR/EIS. I guess the Program's philosophies need to be reiterated over and over. (Kent Nelson 227-7549)

1. Many stakeholders had a difficult time finding information of interest in the volumes of text that comprise the PEIR/EIS and its appendices. ~~I'm sure~~ CALFED's clarification and referencing of the desired material will be helpful to the commenters. (Kent Nelson 227-7549)

2. Unfortunately, comments on various elements of the PEIS/EIR related to the Delta had not been compiled yet. *at the time of this review* For example, Affected Environment; No Action Alternative; Consequences - Program Elements Common to All Alternatives; and Affected Environment - Existing Conditions. Additionally, the RTC is lacking responses to *Comments on* Mitigation Strategies, and Potentially Unavoidable Impacts. *Italics* These are two very important components of the overall Program. (Kent Nelson 227-7549)

*italicize all the element names.*

Volume I

CR 2.2 -- First sentence at top of Page 3 is very confusing and doesn't read well. Somehow the information concept is lost. Sentence starts "New storage....." (Kent Nelson 227-7549)

CR 2.2 -- First sentence of Paragraph 2 would benefit from offering a couple of examples of how new facilities will ensure "a level of water quality that protects....." (Kent Nelson 227-7549)

CR 2.4 -- The concept in Paragraph 2 would be strengthened if it committed to a review of the EFFECTIVENESS of the various existing water use efficiency programs.

(Kent Nelson 227-7549) *lower case*

CR 2.4 -- In Paragraph 3, CALFED promises to provide various forms of assistance through the Water Use Efficiency Program. Will there be some enduring CALFED oversight committee to fulfill this promise? (Kent Nelson 227-7549)

CR 4.1 -- Second page, objectives 1-5: Objective 2 uses the verb "Improve". This is a very generic term. I think the audience would prefer more specific terms such as "Increase". Objective 3 uses the phrase "Increase the adequacy". Again, this is a very nebulous phrase. Be more specific, i.e. "Improve the reliability", or "Increase the quantity and quality." (Kent Nelson 227-7549)

CR 13, 4th <sup>paragraph</sup> ~~par~~ -- SB 970 does not clarify water rights protection, although this may have been the author's intent. Language used in last paragraph of WT003 is more appropriate. It reads as follows: "...Governor Davis has signed legislation (SB 970) that includes additional water rights protection provisions." (Linda Ackley 653-7485)

IA-4.1-1 -- The issue of "mitigation for mitigation" is not adequately responded to here. CALFED needs to come to grips with how it will address this issue without setting an undesirable precedent. Mitigation for mitigation can be an endless endeavor.  
(Kent Nelson 227-7549)

## Volume II

p.117 -- Clearinghouse section needs to be updated. Also, use of the term "will" in

reference to Clearinghouse and other CALFED initiatives is inappropriate since the legislative outcomes are speculative. (Linda Ackley 653-7485)

p.130 -- DWR already posts conveyance capacity on its website.

(Linda Ackley 653-7485)

*John - Double check this by going to the web site & seeing what para meter Linda is referring to*

*Water Transfers*

*WT* 1.2-4, p.9 - Second to the last sentence. SWRCB does not treat all transfer

proposals as "temporary changes." (Linda Ackley 653-7485)

*spell out*

*WT* 2.1-2 -- Last paragraph. Too strong a characterization to refer to the movement

toward a standardized process as a "requirement ... that otherwise might not be required." This conflicts with statements that CALFED does not have any legal or regulatory jurisdiction. The role seems best described with terms such as "facilitate,"

"recommend," "promote..." (Linda Ackley 653-7485)

X  
X

*spell out*

*WT* 4.4.1-3 -- Again, use of the term "will" communicates more conviction than is

justifiable in the legislative context. (Linda Ackley 653-7485)

*spell out*

*WT* 4.5.1-1 -- The response fails to emphasize that the No Injury Rule inherently

involves a fact-driven, case-by-case, analysis to protect other legal users of water and the environment. This means that by its nature, it evades standardization and

templates. (Linda Ackley 653-7485)

*spell out*

*WT* 00-3 -- Last paragraph. Add sentence saying, SB 970 attempted to shorten and streamline the transfer approval process administered by the SWRCB.

(John Pacheco 653-6426)

*WT* 00-4, *WT* 00-5 and *WT* 00-6 -- Partial response. Agency actions are legislatively,

not administratively, driven. Further, there is not agreement on what constitutes unnecessary constraints on transfers. "Make changes to existing rules and procedures"

*Spell out*  
(WT 00-4) conflicts with characterization in *Spell out* WT 1.1-2 that CALFED "does not propose any changes to current legal or regulatory requirements." (Linda Ackley 653-7485)

(WT 4.4-3 -- First sentence not correct, delete "be" as follows, " CALFED agrees that water transfers should not be result in significant, unmitigated impacts to..."

(John Pacheco 653-6426)

(WT 4.4.2-1 -- Modify second sentence to read as follows: "Generally referred to as conjunctive use or groundwater banking, this process allows existing groundwater resources to be managed to allow carryover of existing supplies or to produce additional water supplies - either for use locally to meet growing needs or for temporary transfer." (John Pacheco 653-6426)

(WT 4.5.1-1 -- Second sentence add "to" as follows: "The California Water Code contains several provisions directing agencies with jurisdiction to approve water transfers to only approve a transfer if other legal users of water are not adversely..."

(John Pacheco 653-6426)

If you have any questions regarding these comments or need further information, please ~~call me or~~ John Pacheco of my staff at 653-6426. *on the*

*call the person making the comment directly or call*

Katherine F. Kelly, Chief  
Office of State Water Project Planning  
(916) 653-1099

John Pacheco:Tina Glorioso  
Agency Draft  
Spell Checked: 12-14-99