

From: Pete/Lydia Chadwick <chadwick@sonnet.com>
To: DFG_HQ.HQ1(RBRODDRI)
Date: 12/10/97 8:51am
Subject: CALFED Mgt Meeting

Ryan,

The IDT group reached a consensus yesterday to recommend a version of Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative for consideration by the Management Team. While I had been skeptical right up to the last minute that such a consensus would be achieved, I do not think it is a big step towards CALFED success.

My perception is the wheels are still close to coming off. Environmental interests are not ready to buy into any preferred alternative. They are directly lobbying the FWS and EPA against adoption of a preferred alternative at this time. Some of their concerns are legitimate but others reflect misperceptions. Some delay in the decision might allow for correcting the misperceptions and move the program along in a more positive vein, but the most essential element in bringing them along is developing an assurance program they have faith in. That would be difficult and time consuming. The best chance of a successful outcome within the time schedule is releasing a draft EIR which covers a broad range of alternatives, and at the same time putting forth a plan to negotiate an assurance package for inclusion in the final EIR.

Delta farm interests will continue their complete opposition to any size of an isolated component. I have not had recent discussions with the CUA-Ag folks.

While the federal folks on the IDT signed off on the consensus yesterday, the federal agencies are far from being united and supportive. ClubFed staff has just sent a memo to their policy group describing many concerns about the CALFED Program. I do not know whether they plan to introduce that into the Management meeting tomorrow.

On another subject, Dick Daniel tells me that policy issues related to the ERPP have been identified. He did not have a copy to share with me but said the list had been presented at a meeting you participated in. One issue is management for striped bass. Another issue relates to the amount of ag land to be taken out of production in the Delta. I pointed out to Lester some time ago that a major chunk of such land is for non-tidal wetlands. Those wetlands would produce substantial wildlife benefits but not contribute to the resolution of conflicts between aquatic resources and water supply. Thus that component of the ERPP could be sacrificed without interfering with the most essential purpose of CALFED. Such a step might also sacrifice the opportunity to control subsidence, as I suspect that conversion to wetlands is the only viable way to stop subsidence in peat soils.

I'll see you tomorrow.

Pete