APPENDIX G6: 2008 INDIVIDUALS PRELIMINARY SCOPING COMMENTS
Kathy Hunn

From: Amanda Beck [papuzaback@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2008 12:36 PM
To: Kathy Hunn
Subject: Re: ND CARES

Kathy,

I am not sure exactly what I said, but the steering committee should have a record of the comments as they are part of the administrative record for the project. The administrative record should be publically available.

However, my questions surrounded why the habitat restoration was being planned, who owned the land that was being "restored", how the land was being acquired, and whether the land was being planned as mitigation for the planned conveyance system.

Thanks and take care,
Amanda

On 5/27/08, Kathy Hunn <phunn@frontiernet.net> wrote:

Hello Interested Citizens,

Recently I sent you an email requesting a printed copy of the statements you made at the Scoping meeting in Clarksburg on Wednesday, April 30th. We have a deadline this week to send any and all comments to the Scoping Committee and we are trying to reconstruct in writing all the statements that were made that night. Would you be willing to email me a copy of your statements as closely as possible to what you presented that evening by today, May 27th, or tomorrow at the latest? Thank you for your time and effort on this.

Kathy Hunn
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My name is Andy Wallace and I live here in Clarksburg. I am the third generation and my kids are the 4th generation of Wallaces to live in Clarksburg. By Clarksburg standards, that makes us newcomers.

Procedural Comments

1. It is important to the people of Clarksburg, and the people who are interested in the project from around the state, to keep our comments in the record in their entirety, and not reduce our individual comments into general or combined comments.

2. The documented and undocumented impacts of this plan directly and indirectly affect the people of Clarksburg, yet the people of Clarksburg carry the burdens, but get none of the benefits of this project.

3. This admirable goal or "fixing the delta" is meaningless if, at the end of the day, it ends up creating just enough smelt to keep transferring more water to Southern California. There is nothing "co-equal" in California water politics, the delta and ITS people are always going to come last.

4. The nature and character of the delta today is recognized as valuable in this document, yet our re-development interests are specifically rejected by this document, replaced with the unbridled growth of Southern California. This is an arbitrary and capricious attempt to shift the burden of development on the very people who are themselves not able to develop.

Technical Issues

1. Tidal marsh wetlands have significant odor problems, as anyone who has driven by one knows, which create objectionable and nuisance odors for the community. How will these be mitigated?

2. By improving habitat for delta smelt, other listed species could begin using the area, and potentially be creating new legal issues for the community, further reducing our ability to exercise our property rights. How will the community be protected from the consequences of this likely impact? Consider this a request for a Clarksburg Safe Harbor Agreement.
3. If West Nile Virus increases in this area, it is expected to have significant impacts on native birds. How are these impacts analyzed and mitigated for?

4. Water transfer should be delinked from this process and the health of the watershed should be the primary focus of these efforts. Let’s prove that the species that use the delta can be managed sustainably, over droughts, before we begin discussing water transfer.

5. Converting freshwater habitat to brackish water habitat will have negative influences on the ecosystems that have adapted to the upper delta, leaving this area as one of the last reservoirs of species, such as listed turtles and birds. Now the state wants to reduce their habitat for a fish that is largely limited by Southern California’s water intakes? The sole purpose of this document is an attempt to commingle the issues of habitat restoration and water supply.

6. Loss of farmland in the delta will have ripple effects with ag equipment suppliers, truck dealers, seed suppliers, etc., where good paying stable jobs will be directly impacted and lost. How will this plan mitigate for the losses of those jobs?

Andrew S. Wallace
52652 Clarksburg Road
Clarksburg, CA 95612
916-744-1225
Your input on the BDCP EIR/EIS is greatly appreciated. Please write your comments below, including comments on the extent of the action, range of alternatives, methodologies for impact analysis, types of impacts to evaluate, and possible mitigation concepts. Comments will be accepted until close of business on May 30, 2008.

My vineyard and home is located at 42494 Waukeena Road, Clarksburg, CA 95612. My family homesteaded this land before the levees were developed and, through four Kuhagen generations, have kept our land alive with crops, grapes and wildlife.

Flooding our Clarksburg land will be devastating to both us and the environment:

- Down the cotton tails/jack rabbits which are finally making a come back from extinction, thus playing a domino eliminating the food supply of other rodents for the red tail, white tail and Swainson’s hawks, barn owls and horned owls.
- Harm or even possibly killing humans due to the West Nile and other mosquito infestations.
- Killing our very, very old oak trees which have been homes to the owls and hawks for years.
- Killing our prime grape vineyard which is our only income for survival.
- Destroying our over 100 year old home.
- Creating job losses for our field personnel and family members.

If you want to eliminate all of the negative results listed above, then flood the Yolo Bypass where it is designed to handle the overflow of water during heavy rains and high river/slough waters. And, once you have flooded it, you will find out as a result from your other flooded conservation areas, the birds, fish, and wildlife will not go/survive there and will end up like another half partially dried swamp.

You can help the Clarksburg people and the environment by stop taking over land that you cannot even legally prove or even have proven in the past will benefit the area environment. Northern California is in a drought situation. The water level in our slough is becoming very low which is beginning to affect our irrigation pumps for sand/mud is getting sucked up along with the river water for field irrigation. The Sacramento River’s low water table also affects our ground water. Please don’t waste what little water we have on menial environmental issues.

Please submit your comments at station 6 at this scoping meeting, or fill this form in half, seal with tape and mail to:
Ms. Deanna Brown, Chief of Environmental Compliance, Department of Water Resources, P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236.
You may also e-mail your comments to BDCP@water.ca.gov. Comments must be received by May 30, 2008.
Good evening and thank you for allowing us this opportunity to speak this evening.

My name is DJ Andriessen and I have lived in Clarksburg for the last 20 years.

I am a survivor of West Nile Virus. Although I still suffer some of the lingering effects of the illness, I consider myself fortunate because I survived. I understand that one in four victims doesn’t. It’s a devastating disease, for which we have no cure and we don’t even have a handle on controlling it. Raptor birds are still dying, our chickens are contracting it, and people are still getting sick.

Creating a shallow water refuge in our area would be tantamount to creating a West Nile Virus incubator, affecting the entire Sacramento Valley, not just Clarksburg.

If you propose to eradicate the anticipated mosquito population with ‘Evergreen Crop Protection EC 60-6’, the current broad spectrum pesticide being used by the vector control agencies, then you will be killing all of the insects in the ‘refuge,’ beneficial or otherwise; and that would eliminate the food source of the purported reason for the project, the Smelt.

These plans need to go back to the drawing board and more workable plans developed.
Submitted by Don Fenocchio

Good evening---------- My name is Don Fenocchio. I have lived in Clarksburg for over 55 years. My mother’s family came to Clarksburg long before that. She was born in our area over a hundred years ago. Her family farmed, fished and hunted in the area. I came back to work in the school system here because I felt a dedication to the Delta. A dedication to the small towns and to the people who inhabit them. I served as an educator for almost 40 years right here in the Delta; from Clarksburg to Rio Vista.

This Delta is more than a watershed; more than a delivery system to areas south of us. It is home to a large number of people who have made their homes here----have made their living here----have raised their children here and who have worked hard to make the Delta a wonderful place to live----a wonderful place to raise their children. It is the location of a number of small historical towns. Towns that have survived the difficulties of being in a flood plain. All of the citizens of the Delta have contributed to the preservation of a way of life that has developed into a strong society.

The plan to change this historic place----these historic towns appalls me. This kind of plan stops any kind of growth and progress that is necessary to maintain the character of these small towns. The plan that I see being presented will destroy the character of these Delta towns.

YOUR EIR SHOULD----AND MUST----STUDY PLANS TO PROTECT THESE EXISTING COMMUNITIES. THE EIR MUST STUDY THE IMPACTS ON A MYRIAD OF COMMUNITY ISSUES----INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO----SUCH ISSUES AS DECLINING POPULATION----THE EFFECT OF SUCH A PLAN ON SCHOOLS, THE EXISTING COMMUNITY HABITATS, HEALTH, THE EXISTING ENVIRONMENT, SOCIAL ACTIVITIES----INCLUDING CHURCHES, SCOUTING, FIRE SERVICES, LIBRARIES, POLICE PROTECTION AS WELL AS COMMUNITY SOCIAL ACTIVITIES.

THESE EXISTING DELTA COMMUNITIES CANNOT BE DISCOUNTED. THEY ARE AN IMPORTANT ASSET TO THE STATE. YOUR EIR MUST ADDRESS THESE AND OTHER COMMUNITY CONCERNS. HOW WILL YOU PROTECT THE PEOPLE OF OUR IMPORTANT COMMUNITIES???????
Submitted by Father Dan Madigan
May 26, 2008

I would like to address my remarks not to the presenting panel from whom we received vague generalities nor to the local politicians who spoke to us but to the Clarksburg farmer/landowners.

First, I would like to say how much I admired our farming people who just addressed us. They spoke with clarity, integrity and total honesty.

A number of speakers said they were second, third and even fourth Delta farming people. I, too, come from farming stock. My people in Ireland have operated the same land for generations. However some years ago, the local government there destroyed our pristine countryside by inflicting on my family and their neighbors a huge polluting factory.

Sure their government officials gave notice of community meetings, but they did so in the same manner as our presenters did this evening. They advertised in abstract papers, not read by the local community. And so before my family and their neighbors woke up to what was going on, the abomination with which they now live with was imposed upon them.

I appeal to you my neighbors to not let this happen here in our Delta area. Send a clear message to the staff sitting here before us tonight, one they can take back to their bosses and that is – we will in no way tolerate any underhanded shenanigans by way of hidden agendas.

Tell them we are a very close knit community which is very much evident from our attendance here tonight. After all most of us had only 10 or so hours notice of this meeting.

~THANK YOU MY NEIGHBORS.
Dear Mr. Marshall

I have read your website about the BDCP and am wondering how it is related to the Governor's Delta Vision Task Force. The task force seems to be recommending progress on all fronts, with a final report due later this year. Does the BDCP address the conservation part of the Governor's Task Force? Are they related in any way? Would they be funded as part of the same whole moneys, or is the BDCP entirely separate, and would be looking for separate funding.

I would appreciate if you could clarify these points. Thank you for any help you can give.

Frances Mathews
Gary Merwin  
3rd Generation Clarksburg Farmer  
Trustee Reclamation District 999  

This panel in front of us is here to listen to comments from the public on their possible plans to save a sick Delta. Let's go to the Sacramento Bee and look at some facts available to us every day. The snow pack in the Sierra's is at approximately 66% of average. The Dams for water transfer are at 50% to 66% of where they need to be for water exporters to fulfill their contracts. There is more water flowing out of these dams right now than is flowing in and this should be the peak of the runoff season! The Central Valley Project and DWR have never upheld their part of the contract with North Delta to provide an extra 5 million acre feet of water to help restore and keep the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta healthy. So now without ever upholding their end of the contract you want to turn our area into a tidal wetland under the false assumption that is the natural way this area was centuries ago. The historical fact is this was never a tidal wetland. This area was seasonal swamp and overflow land that only flooded during the wettest of years. Even on wet years This area dried up at the end of Spring.  

Now after never fulfilling the contract with North Delta to provide an extra 5 million acre feet of water for a healthy Delta you are going to try to fix the Delta by creating a tidal wetland. That is trying to fix a problem by attacking a symptom. Your ideas are like Nyquil. Instead of working on the symptom, You should be attacking the problem of an ailing Delta. The problem is staring you in the face! 6.5 million Acre Feet of water is contracted to export from the Delta with a Water Shed that will not support it.

Get trade secrets for amazing burgers. Watch "Cooking with Tyler Florence" on AOL Food.
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Comment Card

Date: 5/29/08

Name: Herbert F. Heffner

Telephone: (916) 744-1093

Address: P.O. Box 448

City: Clarksburg

Date: 5/29/08

Yes, I would like to be added to your e-mail list.

Your input on the BDCP EIR/EIS is greatly appreciated. Please write your comments below, including comments on the extent of the action, range of alternatives, methodologies for impact analysis, types of impacts to evaluate, and mitigation concepts. Comments will be accepted until close of business on May 30, 2008.

The range of the alternatives seems limited to variations on a single theme. To better meet legal and regulatory requirements for an EIS/EIR, these alternatives should be expanded to include other actions to meet the same goals. There should include at a minimum the regulation of land use in Southern Cal. Basin and the greater regulation of water usage, including establishment of water markets, metering, monitoring and adjustment of both fines and denial for overuse; naturally there would be impact from potential conservation and rewards for less (non. use) of water in homes, industry and agriculture.
Since a stated result of the proposed action is to create "tidal" wetlands where there were none, the potential impact on present flood zones and flood protection measures (levees, drainage, bypass basins, etc.) is significant. The shifts of tidal waters upstream to where there were none would be expected to significantly raise the risk of flooding. For such communities as Davis, West Sacramento, Sacramento and Suisun plus a host of smaller rural communities.

The analysis of the above should include sea water levels under current scientific review due to climate change over next 50-250 years; the worst case scenario should be used to assure public safety as much as feasible to ensure future

Please submit your comments at station 6 at this scoping meeting, or fold this form in half, seal with tape and mail to:
Ms. Delores Brown, Chief, Office of Environmental Compliance, Department of Water Resources, P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236.
You may also e-mail your comments to BDCPcomments@water.ca.gov. Comments must be received by May 30, 2008.
Your Public Participation process appears limited to the point of not meeting legal and regulatory communities. While the Public Notice was appropriate in media placement, it was less than informative as to the extent (and nature) of the proposed action. Nor did it seem much attention was paid to the communities involved being rural with little mass media penetration and even less sophistication with federal and state environmental public policy citizens. I strongly urge an assessment of the communities involved by a recognized professional (member of IPPP) and the creation of a truly informative and collaborative public communications plan with measurable actions.

Please submit your comments at station 6 at this scoping meeting, or fold this form in half, seal with tape and mail to:
Ms. Delores Brown, Chief, Office of Environmental Compliance, Department of Water Resources, P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236.
You may also e-mail your comments to BDCPcomments@water.ca.gov. Comments must be received by May 30, 2008.
Your input on the BDCP EIR/EIS is greatly appreciated. Please write your comments below, including comments on the extent of the action, range of alternatives, methodologies for impact analysis, types of impacts to evaluate, and possible mitigation concepts. Comments will be accepted until close of business on May 30, 2008.

The extent of the action seems limited; it fails to include technological alternatives that could achieve the same end perhaps at lower cost in the long-run. These alternatives to be included should include desalination using the variety of methods currently existing and proposed—those which have reached the point of sufficient maturation to allow cost and price for existing in use or units that could be compared to existing methods and usage. Since this project will take a relatively long period to accomplish, the technological and scientific inputs should include those now in their infancy but sufficiently mature to allow economic assessment. All sources, individual wastewater treatment, sewage treatment and reuse, and the establishment of dual water systems should be included.
Please submit your comments at station 6 at this scoping meeting, or fold this form in half, seal with tape and mail to:
Ms. Delores Brown, Chief, Office of Environmental Compliance, Department of Water Resources, P.O. Box 942836, Sacramento, CA 94236.
You may also e-mail your comments to BDCPcomments@water.ca.gov. **Comments must be received by May 30, 2008.**
On April 30, 2008, in Clarksburg, I spoke before the Scoping Committee with regard to the BDCP plan.

I related to the committee that when Home Depot and the Klotz Family were developing properties at the corners of Freeport Blvd and Pocket Roads, a requirement was made to pay for the relocation of any Swainson Hawks or Burrowing Owls that might be found on the property designated for development; The cost of such relocation to be $3,000.00 per bird. No permits would be issued for any project without the property first being inspected for bird count and the relocation fees paid. This was required by the City of Sacramento to be in compliance with state and federal regulations because these birds were on the endangered species list; To my knowledge they still are.

My questions to the Committee:

1. What happens to these birds when the hawk loses its forage and the owl is flooded from its home?
2. If relocated, who will pay the cost?

Jane Klotz
Hi Kathy, Here's my best recall as to what I said at the meeting. Feel free to get your red pen and modify as necessary. Jayne

My name is Jayne Alchorn. I live on River Rd in Courtland, CA. Being in a wheelchair and unable to reach your podium makes it overwhelmingly evident that I am physically challenged. I am a victim of one of the more rare forms of West Nile Virus-I have polio as a result of being bitten by a very sick mosquito. Five weeks in the hospital- several CAT scans, several MRI's and finally, a spinal tap brought forth the diagnosis and the fact that never again will I walk unaided. My life changed literally overnight.

As a spokesperson for the Sacramento-Yolo Vector Control District I am all too aware of the dangers lurking in standing water and flooded areas. The idea that limitless acres would deliberately be made breeding grounds for disease is unthinkable. Also, the impact on our agro business would be devastating. Clearly, the individuals who are putting forth these ideas have no knowledge of our area, our way of life or the intelligence and fortitude of the people they purpose to impact. Thank you.
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Ms. Delores Brown  
Chief, Office of Environmental Compliance  
Department of Water Resources  
P. O. Box 942836  
Sacramento, CA 94236

Dear Ms. Brown:

I first learned about the Bay Delta Conservation Plan only three weeks ago. Although I own land on Merritt Island, I was never notified of any plan that might so radically impact my land and our family. Had I known, I certainly would have attended public meetings.

It is my understanding from reading the proposal, that Merritt Island could be flooded, and returned to a wetland. The project is now at the Environmental Impact Report stage. We have until May 30th to submit EIR Scoping Comments. The Scope of the Environmental Impact Report should include:

Under eminent domain:

- Cost of buying land planted in vineyard and other permanent crops
- Cost of buying long-term contracts with wineries, some for as many as twenty years

Decreased habitat for the Swainson's Hawk, an endangered species

Livelihood of residents:

- Bogle Winery, internationally known, first winery in Yolo County
- Vineyards are only means of making a living for many residents - thousands of dollars invested in grapes and drip irrigation

Unique micro-climate for growing grapes:

- Fertile land
- Access to water
- Western breeze that cools grapes

History of Merritt Island:

- Land bought from state as early as 1859 (I'm fifth generation to own my land)
- Some family homes well over a hundred years old

Impact on town of Clarksburg:

- If also flooded, there would be more eminent domain implications
- If not flooded, economic impact of neighboring area under water - a ghost town?
- Impact on local school district – where would students need to be transported?
Please submit the above comments for inclusion in the Environmental Impact Report.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Turner
jtturner215@comcast.net
831-373-7671
Jerry Spain
Bullet Point Comments
BDCP April 30, 2008, meeting
Clarksburg

1. If it were not for one alert Clarksburg citizen, we would not have known about this meeting.

2. The report fails to address or mention the "human inhabitants" of the Delta.

3. The study cites the DWR model for potential sea level elevations. There are multiple models each stating different levels.

4. The list of stakeholders, in the information handed out by BDCP, shows the lack of local participation/representation. The stakeholders list is also devoid of elected officials. Who is accountable to the citizens of the affected areas?

5. I am concerned with any plan that has a time line of 50 to 100 years. No one knows the future. When I was in high school I had a teacher that felt the best thing we could do for mankind was to find ways for humanity to cope with global cooling (the impending "little ice age").

6. I am concerned with the; Taking of Species, the Taking of Land and the Taking of a way of Life.
May 29, 2008

Ms. Delores Brown
Chief, Office of Environmental Compliance
Department of Water Resources
P.O. Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236

Dear Ms. Brown,

I am a resident of Clarksburg. My husband of 34 years is a third generation farmer in the area. He farms with his brother and cousin. Currently, they farm approximately 3,500 acres located in three different counties, Yolo, Sacramento, and Solano. The number of acres they farm fluctuates from year to year depending upon the leases they are able to negotiate over time. Their operation employs around thirty five people, all of whom live year round in various homes around the area. This scenario repeats itself all throughout the north Delta region. Farmers, ranchers, and many other people live in rural areas around the districts as well.

My comments center on the environmental impact of moving all of these people out of their homes. It has been stated by members of your committee and in writing that a ring levee would be built around the towns up and down the Delta. By doing so, you create a situation where the towns will eventually die. The schools, which in many cases are the centerpiece of these Delta towns, will be fatally impacted by such a move. As you well know, schools receive money based on Average Daily Attendance (ADA), and with a drastic cut in students, the schools would cease to exist.

Many of the residents in the Delta towns are school teachers, aides, custodians, secretaries, and other employees of the schools. They would need to move away from the towns in order to make a living. Many of the residents are also employed by various farming related businesses throughout the region. From an environmental standpoint, you are causing yet another area in these currently thriving towns to dry up and cease to exist. Homes would be vacated with no one desiring to purchase them under such circumstances. Blight and crime, which is currently minimal to non-existent, would increase.

Thank you for taking my comments under consideration. Please recognize that the American farmer and its related agro-economic and human impact is important to protect.

Sincerely,
Kathy Hunn
P.O. Box 382
Clarksburg, CA 95612
(916) 744-1609
phunn@frontiernet.net
Dear Ms. Brown:

The following items should be addressed by those persons undertaking a study of the impact of the BDCP on the environment.

1. How would this "tidal marsh wetland" be managed to avoid the encroachment of non-native weed species? What would be the cost in terms of personnel and materials, and to the environment, to keep such weeds under control?

2. It has been advised that grocery stores buy locally to avoid the added expense of trucking in produce. The extremely fertile northern delta farm land is well situated to provide food crops to the Sacramento Metro area. Would permanently removing this land from agricultural production impact the future availability of locally grown produce for the people of Sacramento?

3. How would the "tidal marsh wetland" function to assure that the species of endangered fish would thrive? Would not the river otters, beaver, and birds (particularly the pelicans) feast upon the fish and would not these animals become too numerous and then have to be controlled? What assurances are there that the creation of this "tidal marsh wetland" would have the intended outcome?

4. How would the climate change by creating a vast marsh near the Sacramento area? Would the air become more humid? What would happen to the "delta breeze"?

5. What would happen to the mosquito population if this gigantic marsh was created? Would there be enough fish to eat the mosquito larvae? Would the incidence of West Nile Virus increase in the Sacramento area? What threshold of the incidence of West Nile Virus must be met before spraying the marsh would begin? What impact would such spraying have on the environment and the people still living in the delta?

6. If adopted, literally thousands of acres of prime farm land would be flooded. What would be the impact to those families currently farming this land? Of what strategic importance is this farm land to the security of the United States and this country's ability to feed its citizens?

7. The area to be flooded is referred to as a "tidal marsh wetland." In the northern delta, near Sacramento, would the tide action be sufficient to create the intended effect, or would the marsh become a gigantic pool of stagnant water?

Thank you for reading my comments. I grew up on my parents' farm one mile north of Clarksburg in the Lisbon District. I visit often to help maintain their property.

Sincerely,

Laura Schneider
Questions:

1) Is the BDCD consistent with the Delta Protection Act legislation and management plan in all respects?

2) How much water will this plan consume month-by-month on an annual basis?

3) How will public health and nuisances from increased insect populations be dealt with, especially considering prevailing wind patterns and proximity to small and large population centers?

4) How will invasive species be reliably excluded from new tidal wetlands and shallow water habitat?

5) What mitigation measures will be taken for each of the known invasive species that already inhabit the Delta if they become established in any new tidal wetlands or shallow water habitat?

6) Considering the increase in the amount of habitat recommended and the desired connectivity of the various habitat types, how will invasive species be reliably excluded from the tributaries to the Delta?

7) What mitigation measures will be taken for each of the known invasive species that already inhabit the Delta if they become established in any of the tributaries of the Delta?

8) How will the increase in number and concentration of tunneling and burrowing animal species that will derive from the increased available habitat effect infrastructure in and around the edges of the Delta?

9) What are the projected labor requirements and projected costs, with and without overhead costs included, for the management of the new habitat that is proposed? What formulas and assumptions will be used in calculating these costs?

10) What is the financing structure going to be for all phases of the proposed physical and management changes for the BCDC plan?

Mark Wilson  
50404 Gaffney Road  
Clarksburg, CA 95612
From: mary mctaggart [cavelanding@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 10:48 AM
To: Kathy Hunn
Subject: April 30 BDCP Scoping Meeting comments

BDCP Scoping Meeting - April 30, 2008

Comments submitted by Mary McTaggart, local resident, representing 90+ year-old parents having small farm holdings in the Lisbon and Pierson Districts of the Delta.

To quote the November 2007 draft of the Delta Vision Report, "When levees were built, most celebrated the new farmland, and few thought of what might be lost"(p.3). The big danger I see in the BDCP process is that once again, in our zeal to, in this case, return large areas of the Delta to their former state, people will lose sight of what will now be lost - some of the richest, most productive farmland anywhere. To further emphasize the point, consider a news item appearing in today's Sacramento Bee ("Biofuel divides grocers, growers") quoting three international food scientists who said that countries need to rethink diverting farmland to non-food uses because we are in the midst of a world-wide food crisis. They were referring to ethanol production, but the same could be said of the present project proposing to flood farmland.

Another issue concerns me, which is the promotion of wildlife-friendly farming practices. I'm skeptical whether economically viable agriculture results from such arrangements. The instituting of conservation easements on farmland requires the farmer to take on another, perhaps not-so-silent, partner in his farming, with the result that decisions regarding that farming will no longer focus primarily on production. If you had driven around this area two years ago, you would have seen hardly a field of wheat anywhere. Today, there are wheat-fields all over the place because of the great need on the world market for this commodity. If a farmer has as his partner in a conservation easement a government entity, how quickly will he be able to make such decisions, given that government has the reputation of taking years to get things done?
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May 27, 2008

Ms. Delores Brown  
Chief, Office of Environmental Compliance  
Department of Water Resources  
P.O. Box 942836  
Sacramento, CA 94236

Dear Ms. Brown:

I am a resident of the Lisbon District (RD 307) and represent as well my parents, who own small farm parcels in this district as well as the Pierson District (RD 551). Below are summarized some of my concerns and suggestions regarding the scope of the EIR/EIS process. However I would like to state at the outset that I feel that the bulk of most Delta planning and research to date, including this process, has been marked by unaccountable lacks of interest in and input from those who are closest to the actual land and waters of the Delta and who potentially have the most to lose: Delta residents, communities, landowners, growers, and water users. To ensure that the BDCP has the best chance of succeeding in its stated goals, these lacks should be remedied ASAP.

1) To quote from the BRTF Delta Vision report (November 2007 draft), "When the levees were built, most celebrated the new farmland, and few thought of what might be lost." [emphasis mine] Please assure that the EIR/EIS process study in depth and breadth impacts to existing and future agricultural activities and economies, and the impacts on the Delta riverfront farming communities - their existing and continued economic vitality and historical/cultural/social/recreational value to those who live in the Delta and to urban dwellers in the State at large.

2) A close reading of many documents produced to date by Delta planners yields the strong impression that Delta farmers will be asked to do many things with/on their land alongside or instead of producing crops (i.e. protecting wildlife, reducing subsidence, sequestering greenhouse gasses, and providing recreation and "scenic green open space" for the urban population, etc.). The EIR/EIS must examine the extent to which these "working landscape" requirements could inhibit the optimum production of agricultural product, any diminishing of which might in this era of global food shortages be considered a national security issue as well as detrimental to the agricultural economy of the State. (see Sacramento Bee, April 30, 2008 - "Bio fuel divides grocers, growers" for discussion of whether it is a good idea to divert farmland to the production of ethanol, another non-food product. See also Sacramento Bee, Commentary - May 20, 2008 - "Future of farming: Local, organic, home-delivered" - "We're a business...All of my beliefs about how farming should be done don't mean a thing if we are out of business." - Thaddeus Barsotti, Capay Valley farmer.)

3) The BDCP planners appear to have in mind a fairly extensive transfer of private land to public ownership and/or management. The wisdom of this land transfer alone, regardless of whether the land becomes tidal marshes or is managed to achieve some of the goals in 2) above must be thoroughly studied to determine whether government, State or Federal, has either the financial means or political
will to serve as a successful long-term steward of such a complex and vital resource. (See Sacramento Bee, May 21, 2008 - "State Parks on list of top endangered sites - underfunding threatens the California system, preservation group says"). The EIR/EIS should examine the extent to which the State and Federal governments can actually fund and carry out the Plan in view of examples to the contrary including the failed CAL-FED process, the recent Prospect Island fiasco, the inability of Stone Lakes NWR to successfully control invasive species, and some 10 years of planning (and money spent) on the North Delta Flood Control & Ecosystem Restoration Project with little funding yet in sight to carry it out (DEIR hearing February 21, 2008). Other impacts of private-to-public land transfer, such as those on funding for and operations of local reclamation districts, County services, fire districts, water agencies, State water quality and water rights programs, local school districts, etc. must be carefully looked at both for each individual entity and for the social/economic/cultural impacts on the fabric of Delta community life.

4) BDCP should treat the Delta north of Walnut Grove differently from lands to the south. North Delta lands, for example, are higher, have much less history of flooding, have mineral soils instead of peat, and tend to have a higher population density than lands to the south. Most of the Delta legacy towns are to the north. The building of large "tidal" marshes might eventually depopulate these areas due to health and aesthetic effects as well as physically disrupting existing social interconnections. Farming in the area of these marshes could also be hampered by humidity changes, invasive species, disruption of the essential movement of farm equipment, and new seepage issues. If ring levees were built around these towns, there could also be disruption to traffic circulation, essential public safety services, degradation of air quality, etc., resulting in further depopulation. (If eventual depopulation of the Delta is an unstated goal of the BDCP or any of its parties, that goal should be made public.)

5) What might be the effects of higher humidity caused by manufactured tidal marshes on local weather patterns, including for nearby urban areas? Please see Sacramento Bee, October 7, 2007 "No guarantees on Delta breeze - earthquake, flood could turn off our air conditioner, experts say" for the effect of new large bodies of water in the Delta on cooling breezes in the Sacramento area. This loss of cooling would increase A/C energy costs and have unforeseen impacts on public health, agricultural production, and terrestrial species in and near the Delta.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary McTaggart  
34840 S. River Road  
Clarksburg, CA 95612  
916-744-1945  
cavelanding@yahoo.com
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Paul A. Marshall
Bay Delta Office
California Department of Water Resources
1416 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Scoping comments for Bay Delta Conservation Plan

Dear Mr. Marshall,

I have divided my comments into two categories, conveyance and wetlands/tidal wetlands.

Conveyance:

For options 3 and 4 each of which contain a peripheral aqueduct and alternate aqueduct route and all other options which convey and export water from the Delta, the EIR must answer the following questions

1. How will seepage from the new channel be evaluated and mitigated?
2. What will be the cost for seepage mitigation?
3. How will removal of water from the Delta Common Pool affect water quality downstream from the peripheral aqueduct?
4. Will water quality downstream from the peripheral aqueduct conform with the requirements of the contract between the State of California Department of Water Resources and North Delta Water Agency (for the assurance of a dependable water supply of suitable quality) dated January 28, 1981?
5. Will the State cease all exports from Delta channels when water quality in the North Delta does not meet contractual requirements?
6. Will the aqueduct and any other export from Delta channels be conducted in accordance with recital (g) of the above referenced contract? (i.e. will exports be conducted in a manner to conform with part 4.5 of Division 6 of the California Water Code which affords a first priority to provision of salinity control and maintenance of an adequate water supply in the Delta for reasonable and beneficial uses of water and relegates to lesser priority all exports of water from the Delta to other areas for any purpose?)
7. Will conveyance be conducted consistent with provision number 6 of the above referenced contract? (i.e. will the state mitigate for seepage damage and repair any erosion damage caused by SWP flows?)
8. Will exports of water from Delta Channels be conducted in accordance with the law of the State of California, which requires protection of the areas within which water originates and the watersheds in which water is developed?
9. What is the cost difference between conveying export water through the Delta vs. A peripheral aqueduct?
10. Won’t it be necessary to convey water through the Delta for an extended period of time even if a peripheral aqueduct is considered, so why do both?
11. In order to export water from Delta channels will the State develop new upstream water?
12. If upstream water is not developed, is the supply adequate to meet the area of origin needs to include the ecosystem and continue exporting from Delta channels?
13. How will damages be determined and financed for any breach of the contract between the State of California Department of Water Resources and North Delta Water Agency dated January 28, 1981?
14. What will the damages be and how much will they cost for each of the four options under consideration?
15. How will removing fresh water from the North Delta impact the ecosystem and water supply in the balance of the Delta?

**Wetlands/Tidal Wetlands:**

1. How will flood control and drainage be impacted within Reclamation Districts where wetlands are created?
2. Is it feasible to create wetlands within the borders of reclamation districts where water is the common enemy?
3. Who will pay for reconfiguration of Reclamation Districts and how much will it cost for levee and drainage infrastructure?
4. What will be the seepage impacts where wetlands are created and what will it cost for mitigation?
5. How will the BDCP mitigate for loss of very productive farmland in the North Delta to include negative impacts on the wine and Bartlett pear industries and what will it cost?
6. What will be the indirect cost of wetland conversion to the Delta economy, Delta employment and Delta communities?
7. Will the BDCP mitigate for loss of Swainson’s hawk habitat and what will it cost?
8. What other terrestrial and avian species will be adversely affected, will the BDCP mitigate and what will it cost?
9. How will the BDCP acquire property for conversion to wetlands and how much will it cost to include permanent crops such as grapes, pears, and cherries?
10. Is it appropriate to establish wetland and tidal wetland zones for the four options under consideration without input from the areas being considered for conversion?
11. Is it appropriate to establish wetland and tidal wetland zones based on elevation and not consider how the land is presently being used?

Finally, rather than spending billions of dollars on water conveyance and associated impacts, wouldn’t it be more productive to develop and finance projects which help create regional self sufficiency? The water supply for millions of Californians will be more secure and reliable not by circumventing the Delta, but by reducing dependence on the Delta.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Russell E. van Loben Sels
Good Evening Committee Members

I'm Stephen F. Heringer, 5th of 6 generations of the Heringer family to farm Clarksburg soils. Many families in the Delta have farmed for multiple generations and over the years have grown a large variety of field and row crops. We have had to evolve and adapt our operations in order to maintain economic viability to insure the sustainability of the family farm for future generations.

During the last four decades, growers have planted over 17,000 acres of our upper Delta region into premium wine grapes. Our crops have proliferated in quality and yield and the Clarksburg Delta has earned the reputation of being the “Banana Belt” for premium wine grapes among California's wineries. We have invested heavily in vineyards which have a life expectancy of 25 to 30 years and can stay economically viable for up to a century.

In 2005 the UC Cooperative Extension published costs to establish and produce wine grapes in our region. The study documents the requirement of in excess of $16,000 per acre to develop a vineyard. During the past 3 years of dramatically increasing steel, vine, labor, and fuel costs, that investment will easily be in excess of $20,000 per acre today. That equates to a total investment in vineyards and infrastructure alone exceeding $340 Million dollars in District 17, the Upper Delta region.

The California Association of Winegrape Growers completed an economic impact study last year of California wine and grape grower’s contribution to the State and US economy. Extrapolating those economic impacts to just our 17,000 acres of wine grapes, we create in excess of 11,000 full time equivalent jobs in California and an additional 13,500 jobs nationwide. This generates $357 million in California wages and almost $900 million in wages throughout the USA. Taxes generated from our winegrape acres exceed $107 million to the State of California and an additional $64 million nationally. In excess of 700,000 visitors with tourism expenditures exceeding $71 million are attributable to our 17,000 acres of grapes.

Our Yolo County Supervisors have partnered with us to keep our unique upper Delta area agricultural. We adapted sustainability generations ago to assure the farming and enjoyment of our Delta region for the benefit of all of the people of our Great State. We will not now, stand by idly, as the objects of an environmental experiment based on presumptions. We will, however, stand with you to fully utilize existing flood control infrastructure such as the Yolo Bypass to assure better flood protection for the Sacramento area.

Stephen F. Heringer
916-744-1094
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“Epiphany”
Notes: Wilkerson, landfill, fallow, (in summer-fill). One parcel, (“Island”). Fill with water allowing free flow of fresh water, dam preventing back flow from tide, in late winter, after no chance of flood. To be used as a flood control if needed. Let water stand for one year. Repeat the same with another parcel. Must do much work, research and investigation, (land-fill). These are my notes. + Electric, money/ greed-I just learned that up to 20% of electricity used here in the valley goes to water pumps. I had forgotten that “farmers” hate to irrigate, not because of the saving of water, but that it cost money to operate the pumps, not to mention the pumps that are used to ship our Delta water south! (You can always tell where there is a water pump out in the country, just look for electric poles with three wires. You see, they all use three phase motors).

Mr. Wilkerson and Sunny Rd. Stockton is the bottom of an old swamp. Sunny road is below sea level. Mater of fact it was the bottom of the swamp, therefore the soil is Adobe, which, in the hot and dry summer months, become a cracked waste land, except it is not waste but some of the most fertile soil in the world. At first, water was available about 5 to 6 feet deep as were the, up to 3’ crakes in the Adobe, and then there was the “hard pan”. (Note; I know this is poor writing-but-)
Mr. Wilkerson’s place was at the start of the road. He collected all the garbage from all the people on Sunny Road, except for us as we had four acres and had dug a big hole in which to throw away all the “garbage”, (to which, my brother and I used it for a soss pool, at that time there was no services, used it to raise the ground level, paved it over and then made a “Trailer Park”. That is how I got the idea how to raise the ground level of the Delta!
Now let us take a look as what is “garbage”? All past and present life, man, animal and plants, are a “bio” hydrocarbons. In other words, molecules of carbon, hydrogen and oxygen. No matter what it is, egg shells, fruit peels, paper and yes even “Tin” cans, (not bio, but iron, which is a valuable element in the creation of living things). Not to mention grass clippings and tree/ bush trimming. Therefore, soil is what everything is made, (of), “Bio”. It may even possible not to have to remove the soil in order to recover the land, but mix it in the present soil.