

Ms. Meredith,

There are three things I would like to bring to your attention and some questions that beg answers.

First, I notice that on the BDCP website, Tom Birmingham is listed as the Westlands Water District representative on the Steering Committee Members list.

The man who speaks for the Westlands Water District is not Mr. Birmingham. Why is the man who exclusively and frequently speaks for Westlands at the BDCP Steering Committee meetings not listed as its spokesperson?

Second, at the BDCP Steering Committee on Jan. 14, 2010, we heard the biologists/scientists who manipulate data on their beloved computer modeling mention the term "tradeoffs", apparently an official and very scientific term. Let's see if I understand. The CFS through the Delta can be diminished if the fish have another nice swimming pool elsewhere. Why keep the minimum flowing necessary for a healthy Delta estuary if, say, the Yolo Bypass is there for the fish? Who cares if the Sacramento River becomes a sandy backwash? Who needs the River, anyway? It's all part of a "tradeoff," you see.

The Westlands rep reminds us that we have

to be realistic. No pie in the sky. We just can't have it all. Well, finally the BDCP has a way to get around one of those three things that it was supposed to accomplish: ① contribute to the sustainability of the Delta, ② restore the environment so the fish can swim, procreate, and (we all hope) increase in numbers, and ③ ensure clean, safe, and reliable water supplies for California. Let's look at the priorities: removal of good water from lush, verdant existing agriculture for use by big agribusiness in desert lands - check; restore the dying fish populations (but don't blame the BDCP if the fish just continue to get knocked off, it's not their fault, see, they're working really hard and doing their best, and be sure you mention this to those pesky environmentalists who are constantly ripping at their heels) - check; keeping the Delta healthy with proper flows - well, you just can't have everything, remember? Something's got to give, right? Isn't it great the BDCP can use "tradeoffs" and not have to worry about the darned old River and the communities around it, anyway?

Third, I bring to your attention that the men who patrol the Fremont Regional Water Intake Plant are

armed with semiautomatic weapons. Why do you suppose armed men are necessary? Will there also be permanent armed guards at the five proposed intakes if the Canal is built? Will there be armed guards ready to throw out curious neighbors, as happened to two middle-aged friends of mine who drove together onto the Freeport property, wishing to find out when it would open, etc? These women couldn't possibly have been mistaken for a threat, but they were ejected by men with guns at the ready. I have heard the water problems in California referred to as Water Wars. We are in a sad state if weapons-carrying thugs are necessary.

These last questions are not rhetorical hyperbole. They are serious with serious implications, and I would like you to give me answers. Thank you.

Barbara Dawson

P.S. By the way, I apologize if there are duplicates in the articles I have printed for you and Outreach. I have not kept a list of what I have given you, although, of course, I have copies of everything for myself.

BD.