

KENDALL L. MANOCK
 DOUGLAS B. JENSEN
 DONALD R. FISCHBACH
 JOHN L. B. SMITH
 GEORGE L. STRASSER
 JOSEPH M. MARCHINI
 CRAIG A. HOUGHTON
 ANDREW R. WEISS
 JAMES B. SHEKOYAN
 CARL R. REFUERZO
 JOHN G. MICHAEL
 CHRISTOPHER L. CAMPBELL
 ROBERT D. WILKINSON

JEFFREY A. JASCH
 LISA M. MARTIN
 GAYLE D. HEARST
 GLENN J. HOLDER
 WILLIAM M. WHITE
 KATHLEEN A. MEHRAN
 RICHARD S. SALINAS
 DAVID E. HOLLAND
 CHARLES K. MANOCK
 MATTHEW E. HOFFMAN
 ALBERT J. BERRYMAN
 DEBORAH A. COE



A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DIRKS PALOUTZIAN
 OLGA A. BALDERAMA
 GARY N. LENTO
 MATTHEW B. FARMER
 JOHN A. BASINGER
 C. FREDRICK MSINE III
 SUZANNE D. MCGUIRE
 WILLIAM E. CHALTRAW, JR.
 BRONWYN G. BRADY
 ERIC C. COLE
 ALEXANDER COLLINS, JR.
 ELIZABETH K. CAMPAGNE
 JOSHUA S. DANIELS
 KENNETH J. FRICK

OF COUNSEL
 JOHN H. BAKER
 JAMES OANULIN
 JUDITH L. LUND
 BRUCE D. BICKEL
 O. JAMES WOODWARD III
 HOWARD M. ZIDENBERG
 (1949-1999)

September 22, 2003

Ms. Sammie Cervantes
 Bureau of Reclamation
 2800 Cottage Way
 Sacramento, CA 95825

Re: **Comments on the Environmental Water Account Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/R)**

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
 MS. CAMPBELL (559) 432-5900
 CLC@BMR.BUREAU

SEP 24 2003

CODE	ACTION	SURNAME & DATE
1170	✓	

Dear Ms. Cervantes:

This firm represents the Root Creek Water District ("RCWD"), an agricultural water district serving approximately 9400 acres in Madera County. The lands within RCWD rely primarily on groundwater for irrigation. The groundwater basin underlying RCWD is subject to severe overdraft. RCWD was formed for the purpose of obtaining surface water supplies and promoting conjunctive use.

Although located within the service area of CVP's Friant Unit, RCWD does not have a federal water supply contract. RCWD must rely on water transfers with willing sellers to obtain surface water supplies. RCWD is therefore very concerned about EWA's potential effects on water supplies available to agricultural users.

Due to the extremely large amount of information and data contained in the DEIS/R, RCWD is still reviewing the documents and other relevant information necessary to fully understand and evaluate the potential impacts of EWA and the preferred alternative. We, therefore, request that the comment period be extended by 90 days so that additional comments may be provided. However, our preliminary review has identified several areas of significant concern at this time regarding the EWA DEIS/R.

Biological Benefits. The DEIS/R fails to quantify the benefits expected to be achieved by the EWA. The Proposed Action generally describes the types of actions to be taken and generally asserts there will be fishery benefits, but does not provide supporting data to correlate the proposed actions with any quantifiable benefits to the fishery. The discussion in Chapter 9 regarding the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region describes some numeric improvements in X2, E/I ratio, Reverse Flows, and Salvage, but provides no relevant context for

PHONE (559) 432-5900 • FAX (559) 432-5910

Classification: **CAJ 6.00**

Project: **CVP**

the gross annual numbers, nor any correlation with fish abundance or overall condition of the species. The EIR/S should include tables that show the relevant percentage changes and describe how that level of change will enhance the condition of the target fisheries.

In one section, the DEIS/R overstates the benefits of the EWA actions to fish populations. On pages 255 through 259 in Chapter 9, *the* document text states that the preferred alternative will reduce average annual salvage by about 136,000 delta smelt, 1.1 million salmon, 29,000 steelhead, 1 million splittail and 9 million striped bass. However, on Tables 9-56, 9-57, 9-58, 9-59 and 9-60 these numbers are shown to be total estimated salvage *reductions over* the 15 year modeling period. This error should be corrected.

In addition, simply reducing take at the pumps by fractions of 1 % does not necessarily translate to increased populations, much less the survival of species. For example, EWA effects on population levels as a result of reduced direct mortality (take) of salmon are small. Sheila Green's presentation at a recent Salmon Workshop documents this. According to Ms. Greene, 2002-3 EWA actions reduced the direct mortality to winter run outmigrants by 0.014% of the estimated number entering the Delta. In 2001-2, the corresponding number was 0.009% of those entering *the Delta* and 0.12% of those leaving the Delta (surviving to Chipps Island). In that year, 0.07% of older juvenile salmon leaving the *Delta* were saved by EWA actions and 0.03% of the fry/smelt. Corresponding numbers in 2000-1 were, for winter run, 0.02% of those entering the Delta, 2.8% of those leaving, for older juveniles, 1.7% of those leaving the Delta, and for fry/smolt, 0.51% of those leaving the Delta. At the same workshop, NOAA Fisheries reported a 20% harvest-related mortality to winter run. The EIR/S needs to specify how such small take reductions justify the high cost and potential adverse impacts of implementing the EWA at the proposed levels.

The conclusions of the 2002 EWA Science Panel indicate no identified ecological significance to take reductions achieved by EWA. The Science Panel notes that the choice to focus on take *may be driven by policy rather than science*. It is questionable whether actions taken by *EWA result in benefits for fish* and fishery protection. Since the Science Panel has failed to identify any quantifiable benefit from the EWA actions for the first two years, there is little justification for continuing the program at current levels and certainly no justification for expanding the program to 600,000 AF.

Accountability. The preferred environmental alternative and associated Action Specific Implementation Plan lack the quantifiable measures of performance that would be expected with such a broad reaching *program*. These documents have no apparent accountability for effective use of water or financial resources. The lack of performance measures puts in doubt whether the DEIS/R has fully considered the range of impacts and appropriate mitigation measures that will be required to implement such a program and the associated costs and benefits. Before

Ms. Sammie Cervantes
Bureau of Reclamation
September 22, 2003 Page
3

extending or expanding EWA, the implementing agencies should utilize a cost/benefit analysis to determine the best way to use limited financial resources for fish protection activities. EWA should be only one of several alternatives in that analysis.

Water Marketing/Pricing Impacts. In the DEIS/R, the EWA is not proposing any new sources of water. The program is a reallocation of supplies from existing *uses to the* environment. The DEIS/R fails to adequately evaluate the economic impacts of this reallocation on agriculture from two *perspectives*. The DEIS/R does not evaluate the full geographic scope of the potentially impacted area and fails to adequately address the impact of purchasing water at such unreasonably *high* prices that agricultural users who currently rely on water transfers to meet their needs are faced with reduced availability of water supplies and increased costs.

The economic analysis limits its analysis of economic impacts in the San Joaquin Valley to Fresno, Kern, Kings and Tulare Counties in the Export Service Area. Madera and Merced Counties could be impacted by the EWA both from the perspective of fallowed lands and reduced supply availability. The EIS/R must evaluate *impacts in all* areas that could be impacted.

More importantly, the economic analysis admittedly does not address the potential impacts of increasing water/energy costs and/or impacts of groundwater overdraft upon water-short agricultural users and their supporting communities as a result of an aggressive and well-funded water purchaser entering the market. In Section 11.2, the DEIS/R makes *an* inadequate attempt to justify its failure to address the significance of economic impacts as required. Furthermore, the DEIS/R discusses the concept of impacts based on reduced supply and higher cost to those who rely on water transfers, but does not consider it an impact worth quantifying. We disagree.

The impacts on water availability and pricing are real and will result in more than just economic impacts to farmers. If farmers are unable to purchase water at affordable prices, there will be adverse impacts to groundwater levels, with resultant subsidence in some areas. The
agriculture

EIR/S must consider the cumulative and long-temp, impacts to _____ and associated communities that will result from reduced availability of currently available water supplies.

Funding Source Uncertainty. The funding mechanisms and the potential reimbursement by water contractors are not explicit in the Draft document. Without an understanding of the funding source it is impossible to understand potential financial impacts of the program on CVP and SWP water contractors. For example, use of CVPIA and Water and Related Resources funds may have a direct adverse economic impact upon CVP water contractors and there may be, therefore, direct adverse environmental impacts within their service areas. These items should be addressed in the EIS/R.

Ms. Sammie Cervantes
Bureau of Reclamation

September 22, 2003

Page 4

Groundwater Impacts. There are numerous unavoidable impacts to groundwater levels and local economies which could be severe for the San Joaquin Valley. These impacts are inadequately addressed in the DEIS/R. The document assumes that impacts of any purchases of banked groundwater in the export *service area* will be evaluated by the environmental **documentation associated with that groundwater bank. This piecemeal approach to environmental** documentation does not adequately *address the cumulative* impacts of multiple groundwater banks working in the same area. As most of those that live and work in the current overdrafted areas of the San Joaquin Valley realize, *the* removal of significant supplies of water to the region will result in a long term cumulative impact.

In addition, the chapter on groundwater clearly indicates impacts to groundwater levels as a result of EWA purchases. The impacts of the "Flexible" purchase alternative are greater than for the Fixed purchase alternative. Groundwater *level declines* of the EWA purchases are compared to groundwater declines during droughts, but ignore the fact that the groundwater declines caused by EWA purchases are not confined to drought years and simply assume that wetter years will allow groundwater basins to *recover*. In areas like the San Joaquin Valley that are chronically overdrafted, any reduction in the net supply to the region is a long-term impact.

Air Quality Impacts. The analysis in the DEIS/R fails to consider the potential air quality impacts from land idling or increased groundwater pumping that result from reduced availability of water to agricultural users that rely on water transfers. The San Joaquin Valley has significant and well publicized air quality problems, and any program of this size that has the potential to worsen the problem should carefully evaluate and identify all of the potential ways that air quality could be impacted,

Energy Impacts. The DEIR/S identifies and evaluates potential impacts related to groundwater substitution and increased pumping at the SWP, CVP and *other major pumping* facilities. However, it fails to address impacts of energy use for increased pumping that may result from reduced availability of transfer water to those who rely on water markets for a portion of their supply. It also fails to address the impacts of pumping from groundwater **banks**.

CVPIA Actions Yield Replacement Impacts. The CVPIA (Section 3408 (j)) mandates that the Secretary of the Interior *develop a least-cost plan to replace the yield* of the CVP by the amount dedicated to fish and wildlife purposes. The Draft EIS/EIR should address if and how the EWA impacts the CVPIA yield replacement requirement.

Infrastructure Assets. New to EWA activities is the inclusion of physical infrastructure as assets to be utilized by EWA based in part on comments made by DWR staff at the August 28, 2003 public meeting in Fresno. If EWA is in fact contemplating acquiring storage what type of infrastructure is

Ms. Sammie Cervantes
Bureau of Reclamation
September 22, 2003

Page 5

being considered, the potential cost and benefits, and the impacts upon water users and the environment.

Summary. In summary, the DEIS/R has not adequately identified or evaluated all of the potential impacts and needs to be revised accordingly. In addition, the document needs to provide adequate biological justification for the significant water and financial costs of the EWA.

RCWD appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on *the* proposed project. We look forward to future evaluation and discussion of our concerns and those of other interested parties.

Very truly yours,



Christopher L. Campbell
BAKER, MANOCK & JENSEN

CLC:sdg

@PFDesktopl::ODMA/GRPWISEBMTDOM .PresDocs.PS4Lib:225881.1
10282.0003