

November 5, 2009

Ms. Nemeth:

There were two comments made at the BDCP Delta Workshops held in September 2009 which I did not see on your Report to the BDCP Steering Committee of October 22, 2009.

First, I distinctly remember a workshop participant pointing out that the promise of 15,000 CFS was dependent on the building of the Auburn Dam. Since the Auburn Dam was never built, how can the promise of 15,000 CFS be expected to be kept without modification?

Second, when I expressed my concern about underwater Sacramento River drilling for samples down to 200 feet, I mentioned the potential contamination of well water as a public health threat, and I also mentioned the possibility of seismic activity caused by drilling at seventeen Sacramento River sites. In addition, I distinctly remember Mr. Marshall from the DWR in his last sentence on the subject, saying to me that there were "no major faults" in the Sacramento River area, from which I was expected to infer, I suppose, that the drilling would not cause seismic reaction. This directly contradicts the DWR/BDCP assertion that there are major faults in the Sacramento River proximity which may in the future "liquefy" the levees. Explain this inconsistency, please.

Barbara Dawson
Workshop Participant

November 5, 2009

Ms. Nemeth:

Please add these thoughts to those expressed by the participants in your BDCP Delta Workshop Report.

I heard, more than once at separate workshops, the question asked that why cannot the peripheral canal be made in the footprint of the ditches already existing which had been dug when I-5 was constructed? The answer given was that these ditches have in the meantime become riparian habitat, therefore using them would disrupt the wildlife there. Why would disruption of this habitat trump any other disruption which will surely occur with an enormous canal built elsewhere?

I have heard that these ditches are rented out for water skiing. The disruption of water skiing to a quiet little corner of riparian habitat such as these ditches are presented to be, would play havoc with any wildlife there. The presence of water skiing with its noise and activity demonstrates that protection of these ditches is a low priority to the DWR/BDCP, therefore the argument of not using these ditches for the peripheral canal because it would disrupt wildlife there just doesn't hold water.

Comments, please.

Barbara Damion
Workshop Participant
→ OVER