October 7, 2013

Secretary John Laird
California Natural Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Secretary Laird:

On behalf of the San Diego County Water Authority (Water Authority), thank you for your September 11, 2013 letter to Chair Wornham and me responding to a January 2013 multi-agency letter requesting analysis of the Natural Resources Defense Council’s portfolio approach to statewide water management and the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BCP).

We look forward to working with you to help develop a BDCP project that achieves the co-equal goals and is affordable. As the largest member agency of the largest State Water Contractor, the Metropolitan Water District, the Water Authority and its ratepayers are being counted upon to pay the second-largest share of BDCP costs. Yet, we have been relegated to the status of an outside observer who may have no financial stake in the BDCP. Accordingly, we request the opportunity to become more directly engaged in the BDCP cost allocation discussions and negotiations process – and be part of the solution. The stakes are sufficiently high for the San Diego region to be afforded the opportunity to be at the cost allocation negotiating table.

As you know, the Water Authority has not endorsed any alternative that has been considered by the BDCP program or advanced by others, including the Natural Resources Defense Council’s Portfolio Alternative and the Delta Vision Foundation’s BDCP-Plus. However, we firmly believe that a thorough and comprehensive analysis of Delta fix alternatives is critical to help inform the ultimate selection of an implementable plan for achieving the co-equal goals.

The Water Authority is committed to helping find a Delta solution, and to that end, is continuing its multi-year effort to inform our Board of Directors and civic and business leaders in our region on a variety of issues associated with the Delta. In addition, over the past several months, the Water Authority Board and staff have been engaged in an intensive, comprehensive review of BDCP-related alternatives to assess how various options may improve the San Diego region’s water supply reliability along with risks associated with each. This review process is ongoing, and is scheduled to continue into 2014. We were disappointed to learn from Natural Resources Agency Deputy Secretary Jerry Meral at our September 12 Board workshop that determinations regarding the cost allocation among contractors will not be concluded when the BDCP and its environmental documents are released for public review next month. Although we plan to
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submit a formal comment letter during the BDCP environmental review process, the allocation of BDCP costs and the resultant rate impacts on San Diegans will remain a central element in our Board’s consideration of which option to support.

While we had hoped that your Agency’s evaluation of the Portfolio Alternative would be helpful to the Water Authority’s ongoing review and analysis, some of the information contained in your September 11 letter raises more questions than it answers.

- The letter states that a single-tunnel, 3,000 cfs conveyance facility (which is proposed in the Portfolio Alternative) would cost $6 billion less than the BDCP preferred alternative (9,000 cfs twin tunnels) - $8.5 billion compared to $14.5 billion. However, on September 16, a corrected version of the evaluation was posted on the BDCP website, which indicates that the 3,000 cfs single-tunnel conveyance facility would only cost $3 billion less than the BDCP preferred alternative. Further, none of these numbers match Dr. David Sunding’s economic benefit analysis, which he shared with us at our September 12 Board of Directors workshop, which identified the cost at $10 billion.

Many entities that are undertaking review and analysis of the Delta fix options, like the Water Authority, would benefit from reliable cost estimates for the conveyance features of the Portfolio Alternative. The lack of clarity in the cost estimate has made it challenging to have a meaningful cost comparison of the various conveyance feature sizes. Could you please provide an apples-to-apples cost comparison of the 3,000 (single tunnel), 6,000 and 9,000 cfs conveyance project sizes?

- In terms of the benefit cost ratio of alternatives, your evaluation indicates that “the 3,000-cfs tunnel has a negative benefit cost ratio, largely because the cost of the 3,000-cfs tunnel is approximately two thirds of building the proposed 9,000-cfs twin tunnels but the water yield is much smaller.” The evaluation may be accurate; we are not attempting to dispute or refute the calculations and findings. However, with the numerous cost estimates for the conveyance features included in your own evaluations it is difficult to definitively understand the benefit cost ratio at which the evaluation arrives. A more comprehensive evaluation and identification of the appropriate assumptions would be valuable for those seeking to undertake independent analysis of cost-related information.

- The evaluation regarding the potential water supply yield in water recycling and water use efficiency projects that could be achieved from a $3B investment in local and regional water supply projects requires additional analysis. Your evaluation indicates, that with respect to investments in local and regional water recycling projects and water conservation projects, “it is doubtful that a $3 billion investment would produce even 100,000 acre-feet of reliable new water supply in urban areas, and would do nothing for agricultural users.” This evaluation appears at odds with the Department of Water Resources’ California Water Plan Update, which provides an analysis from which it may be concluded that a $3 billion investment in water recycling projects could actually
produce approximately 400,000 acre-feet of new water supplies (2009 Water Plan Update, Page 11-10). In addition, data developed by the Water Authority on local project costs and implementation also indicates that BDCP’s estimate is very low. We believe this warrants additional analysis to better understand how your evaluation arrived at a potential yield of 100,000 acre-feet or less. We would be happy to share the Water Authority’s data and our observations on local supply development with your staff.

- The evaluation with respect to the ability to export water from the south Delta following a significant seismic event stated that, “It may take from one to 10 years to rebuild enough Delta levees to once again allow substantial exports from the south Delta.” While certainly more work remains to be completed in terms of the efforts that have been undertaken through the Delta Emergency Rock and Transfer Facilities Project and the Delta Emergency Response Program to secure water supply reliability following a significant seismic event, it is our understanding that significant progress has been made to reduce the worst-case export outage. A more comprehensive analysis on this issue would be beneficial.

We look forward to working with you to consider a BDCP project that is implementable, achieves the co-equal goals, and improves water supply reliability and is affordable within the San Diego region and the rest of the state. In addition, we look forward to arranging a meeting with you in the near-term to explore avenues for additional information sharing and the Water Authority’s participation in the cost allocation negotiation process.

Sincerely,

Maureen A. Stapleton
General Manager

Attachments:

1. January 2013 multi-agency letter regarding NRDC Portfolio Alternative
2. September 11, 2013 correspondence and Portfolio Alternative evaluation from Secretary John Laird