

Appendix E

Online Survey – Open-Ended Question Responses

Survey Overview

This appendix provides the online survey open-ended questions and responses. The quantitative questions and responses are included in Appendix D.

The online survey was available from April 26 through May 31, 2012. The survey was announced by email to approximately 1,100 contacts on the Delta Vision Foundation contact list. DVF staff distributed email announcements on April 26, May 8, and May 21 encouraging participation in the survey. The survey was also posted on the DVF website.

One hundred and twelve people provided input through the online survey, with 81 participants completing the entire survey.

Open-ended Questions

The following are the open-ended questions included in the online survey (the other questions are quantitative questions shown in Appendix D):

3. Please provide additional information or comments about the progress in reducing the risks to the Delta ecosystem and water supply reliability.
5. Please provide additional information and comments about actions that have made progress and are on track.
6. Please provide additional information and comments about actions that are not making progress and are falling behind.
8. Please provide additional information or examples of effective agency or organization leadership, management, planning, and implementation related to the Delta Vision Strategic Plan.
9. Please provide additional information about how specific state agencies or organizations need to improve related to the Delta Vision Strategic Plan.
11. Please provide additional information about federal agency participation and cooperation related to the Delta Vision Strategic Plan and work to achieve the two co-equal goals.
13. Please provide additional information about constructive stakeholder participation related to the Delta Vision Strategic Plan and subsequent implementing legislation.
14. What do you see as the major barriers and constraints in efforts to achieve the co-equal goals?
15. What recommendations do you have for improving the State's progress and action on the two co-equal goals?

Questions and Responses

The responses have been edited for grammar and clarity.

Two Co-Equal Goals

Please provide additional information or comments about the progress in reducing the risks to the Delta ecosystem and water supply reliability.

1. Adequate, reliable funding is necessary for success.
2. In-Delta water users are being thrown under the bus
3. For Delta ecosystem, I would say we are going best way in existing situation, but for water supply reliability, I'd like to say, we need to consider more aggressive education, advertise, incentive, rate. Specifically, the State of California being spend huge fund and budget for water conservation but I think it is a time for review and discussion about the management of water conservation capital.
4. The Plan seeks to apply uniform policies, principles, and recommendations across all regions of the state, yet we have focused only one ecosystem, the Delta. In fact we have linked ecosystems and the Plan needs to insure we are not creating inherent risk for all regions.
5. The Delta ecosystem needs good water quality and outflow including flushing flows. The greatest risk to the ecosystem is an isolated conveyance allowing Sacramento River water to be diverted directly from the River rather than from the Delta pool to serve areas south of the Delta. There is no apparent beneficial correlation between salmonid fish populations and restoring Delta lands to tidal wetlands or flood plains. The relevant period of focus is late 1960s forward not the 1850s. The export of surplus water from the Delta can be made more reliable by recognizing the true yield of the Delta watershed with due recognition of the priorities for the Delta and other areas of origin and the public trust. The DSC is ignoring Water Code section 85031 as well as the fact that the SWP did not develop the 5 million acre feet per annum of supplemental water that was to come from the North Coast by the year 2000. With a realistic recognition of the amount of water that could be available, efforts can be concentrated on self-sufficiency in the importing areas. The result will be greater reliability for SWP & CVP contractors as well as those in the Delta and other areas of origin. In a reoccurrence of droughts such as 1929-1934 or 1987-1992 the Delta watershed will not produce sufficient water to meet even local needs. Those who believe that an isolated conveyance will be properly operated or that adaptive management will protect fish, have ignored the invocation of emergency powers in 1976-77, 1991-92 and again in 2008-09. They also overlook efforts such as those included in HR 1837. The DSC is intended to rubber stamp the export contractor plan for conveyance (water grab).
6. The current BOs are science based. The State Board flow criteria are encouraging. And, with stronger protections in place in the past year, we are seeing some encouraging biological recovery.
7. Continued inaction.
8. The sizing of the conveyance system suggests that water supply reliability has trumped the ecosystem restoration goal.
9. Two salient points here. 1. Current and past Delta actions have tended to ignore primary hydrologic function; namely, that one cannot focus on a spatially discrete area (e.g., Delta) when dealing with hydrology. If this were a land use plan, unaffected by distant processes then it would be fine to focus only on the Delta. But it is not; the hydrology of the Delta is driven by upstream actions, both managed and natural. 2. "Co-equality" is being pursued as a fixed, largely unattainable standard or prescription. Why? Because other than the arithmetic truism of one plus one always "equaling" two, attempting to attach a fixed "equality" to socially variable elements such as ecosystem function and water supply delivery does not work that way. Co-equality, as the Delta Vision promotes, is a subjective decision based on the public sentiments of the day. They are not fixed.
10. Delta ecosystem is almost all man made now (no wetlands, no salt/fresh flux, mostly exotic species). Accept that and manage for water delivery and do-able fisheries. Don't let smelt wag the entire effort and end up with an expensive ineffective plan.
11. The progress is a shallow veil.
12. Based upon the NAS report, the current form of the BDCP is an ad hoc pro forma plan to support a preconceived plan. A much better and holistic approach would be to a) identify unimpaired flows and b) the amount (volume) of stream

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

flow diverted from each upstream watershed. Then we can begin with a much better idea of the amount of water we are discussing, how it is put to beneficial use and initiate a much more informed process of water management.

13. The folks driving BDCP have been focused almost exclusively on exporting an amount of water that their own analysis shows is unworkable. Whether they can back off the greater amount and still convince ratepayers it's a good deal is unclear.
14. Existing efforts through the SWRCB and BDCP are critical to reducing risks to the Delta ecosystem and clarifying the amount to water needed to protect it. These determinations will define water supply available for developed uses.
15. Need to see less studies and more assets in the ground.
16. More true alternatives need to be considered and all of the water sources need to have a combined analysis and decision. For example, currently desalination plants, Colorado River Water supplies, and other watershed supplies like Hetch Hetchy are considered separately so the public only looks at optimize at one site. The alternatives also do not look at partial desalination of brackish water from the San Francisco Bay that is outside the smelt and delta habitat. San Francisco and Los Angeles need to consider impacts in their backyard or switch water supplies instead of exporting the problem to the delta like they did the Owen Valley and Hetch Hetchy in the past? If this broader need was looked at then both the farmer of the San Joaquin Valley and Delta as well as the fish in the Delta would not need to compete over a damaged resource.
17. Fish need enough clean water to survive, so do people.
18. Reliability is a statewide issue with many options. Ecosystem protection has many competing challenges that are politically and financially hard to overcome.
19. It seems like scientists are getting closer to consensus on the fishery problems, and what NOT to do. The BDCP effort seems to be collapsing because the amount of water the State & Federal Contractors want to pump is damaging to the fishery.
20. Frankly, I see some plan for achieving the goals emerging in the next year. Whether it is a good plan remains to be seen, but once it is out there, we should see movement since so much money is standing by to be used.
21. Talk of a non-permittable project six-plus years and \$150 million into the project is a great concern.
22. Levee maintenance is helpful. SWRCB requiring more treatment of wastewater discharges into and upstream of the Delta.
23. Ecosystem restoration that would have positive results is being sacrificed for water supply.
24. Flow standards are too high 25% of unimpaired flow may be sustainable if we start there we may be able to come to a better operating standard.
25. Water reliability is not more water! It is the same or less that is achieved more often. This is the biggest fallacy of this entire process. The co-equal goals are a joke if you try and get more water out of a system that doesn't have any more to give. We do not need more water going south, they get more now than they ever have in the past. They want more?!?!? Can you say addiction?
26. The biggest chance of success comes from stakeholder involvement, public education, transparency, using the best available science, having a strong adaptive management program, and ensuring thorough independent scientific review. The biggest risk of failure in achieving ecosystem restoration comes from too much compromise on the part of the fish and wildlife agencies - because the Public Water Agencies have been slowing the process down and often, it seems, holding the process hostage (particularly in the context of BDCP).
27. The Delta Stewardship Council's success in achieving the co-equal goals is dependent upon solid and dependable scientific data, an understanding of the flexibility of the water system, an understanding of the way water is managed in the state, an understanding that just because you have a permit for use of water does not mean that you are going to get it 100% of the time, and that you have an open and transparent process. The BDCP portion of the program is in trouble and is driven by the water contractors while the ecosystem parts are not treated co-equally.
28. We should not be looking at the Delta for reliable water supplies. Are we kidding? 2+2 does not equal 5.
29. It is easy to set goals in legislation, what trips everything is existing law, statues and bureaucratic politics. Cal Fed showed us that nothing happens unless EVERYONE is willing to give in from their own entrenched positions. The process proceeds under the assumption that someone else will be responsible for responding or giving up their position!

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

30. BDCP is effectively the hinge of policy making, with the SWRCB, DSC and DFG being placed second in policy priority and awaiting BDCP decisions to frame the exercise of their independent authority and responsibilities. This effectively elevates a narrow definition of water supply to primacy.
31. The water exporters are planning to build two 33-foot diameter tunnels diverting the Sacramento River around the Delta. This will destroy the eco-system and make the water supply more unreliable.
32. No one wants to define what water supply reliability actually means. As such, there is no water diversion goal to be achieved, and everyone has their own definition. Contractors - return to diversions in the early 2000s, and conservationists wanting to reduce diversions to that in the 90s or below. Reliability must be defined in the context of what water can be counted on in the face of needing to restore the Delta ecosystem and recover listed species.
33. I am not certain there is consensus regarding what needs to be done to restore Delta habitat. Many talk about aquatic habitat while others look at terrestrial. The discussion of BDCP to develop 10's of thousands of acres of habitat are met by Delta landowners with hostility. There needs to be a shift of positions on both sides in order to make progress. Regarding water supply reliability, the DWR is completing studies necessary to determine the best path forward to achieve reliability. The levees programs enjoy a productive working relationship with the local districts that maintain and improve the levees. The emergency response preparedness is improving, and there have been exercises to improve the ability to restore flow of export water. While not a complete solution, it is moving in the right direction.
34. Hard decisions must be made and the resource agencies, particularly federal, have to get out of analysis paralysis mode in futile search for "certainty." BDCP is best hope for progress on co-equal goals.
35. Until the State abandons the outdated mid-20th century water supply solution in favor of 21st century local water supply projects that are more cost-effective, quicker to build, and use less fossil fuel energy to transport water the length of our long state, both co-equal goals will remain in jeopardy. If we act locally with water infrastructure investments, then the Delta habitat will begin to recover and water will be available locally for less money.
36. BDCP is clearly a failure. It cannot seem to get realistic in goals or means.
37. The battles over "who pays" and "who is to blame" are very entrenched and prevent the necessary cooperation from happening.
38. Fix the levees.
39. Louver efficiency at the pumps and salvage of fish is inadequate. the gates at the fore bay should be replaced with screens to eliminate the need for louvers and salvage operations.
40. Increase the water supply by obtaining water from the Columbia River into Lake Shasta. The average flow in the Columbia River is 265,000 cfs, or 6 acre-feet/sec . One study says California needs an additional 6 million acre feet per year this is 4% of the flow in the Columbia river into the Pacific Ocean.
41. The BDCP process seems to be designed with a decision already made and they are just cherry picking the information to support the decision. The Delta Vision, as it incorporates the BDCP, will be flawed if a transparent and open process is not followed.
42. I follow the DSC and BDCP meeting/reports and have over 22 years of experience in working on Delta water quality/developed about 100 papers/reports on Delta water quality issues, www.gfredlee.com and find that it is highly unclear that the current approach will be successful. As of yet, neither groups have meaningfully addressed Delta water quality issues.
43. Frankly, I think if you looked at "best science" standards and looked at the water supply demands with the same rigor applied to eco-system issues you would find the claims and data to support water supply reliability are grossly misstated and not very credible. Is there a real need, yes... just water suppliers do not have to undergo the same rigor of "good science" which is demanded of the environmental needs. Then the economic analysis components of these are all just WAGS (not science) so we seem to be demanding more science for the portion of the programs which already offer the best science.
44. We have water spilling out of Folsom lake today (4-27-12) and pumping is restricted by rules set up without tested science. Fish numbers are up nobody knows why. Outside of last year we supposedly were taking too much water out of the delta. How does that work? We have taken Ag drainage out of the delta to improve water quality so why is the salinity not improving? Do you think taking water out east of the delta for cities around Sacramento and south delta without appropriating more allotment and the sewage salt might have increased some since 1990 when we were in a similar water supply situation? We have pumped less out and quality is down!

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

45. If water districts and huge farmers are selling water--Then they are getting too much water. This exported water was originally designed for annual crops and delivered as extra water. Now perennial crops are getting water that is not excess. The fools in charge have agreed to deliver more water than the Delta has.
46. The peripheral canal is the wrong way to go. Ecosystem restoration efforts have been lackluster at best.
47. It's all about power politics and the big money billionaires like Stewart and Linda Resnick, real estate developer, John Vidovich, and others in Southern California, who are reselling the water for tens of millions of dollars. Gov. Brown just wants to finish his father's legacy of finishing what his father started--at all costs. I suspect, if it goes through, his sister, Kathleen Brown, who works for Goldman Sachs, will reap the commission on the water bonds. Read *The King of California*, the biography on the first mega-farmer in California, Jim Boswell. It reads like a coach's play book for today's drama on this peripheral canal issue. Boswell's son flew from ranch to ranch, picking up bags of cash for Gov. Pat Brown. Nothing much has changed, only the names from Pat Brown to Jerry Brown, etc., etc.
48. Restoration being proposed is unlikely to recover fish species. New conveyance will not be affordable and will undermine restoration goals because it is too large.
49. Ban a peripheral canal or tunnel.
50. The concept of co-equal goals is difficult to define.
51. The BDCP is inherently flawed process in that water contractors have succeeded in demanding increased amounts of water to be exported out of the estuary. This not only fails to meet the intent of the law that established the Delta Stewardship Council mission to restore the estuary, but it significantly undermines the role of the State government to support the DSC mission that includes reducing exports due to their impacts on the aquatic ecosystem.
52. The BDCP is the overriding variable, with very uncertain prospects.
53. Would like to see more "non-conveyance" related efforts to improve water supply reliability -- reliability should be measured at the point of use, not point of diversion
54. BDCP has stalled and appears to be at a critical crossroads. The proposed project in the administrative draft did not meet the objectives of ecosystem restoration and it remains to be seen whether the water export community is willing to provide more water to Delta flows to help achieve this objective.
55. Current efforts are staggering in not a bad direction, in terms of technical and scientific thinking. However, there are tremendous political impediments. Many stakeholders are currently playing a game of chicken. The political rhetoric and posturing involved risk the entire enterprise, and the delays risk the public and body politic becoming distracted by other issues and giving up, essentially, on progress on the Delta. More forceful involvement from the Governor's office, hopefully with Federal support, seems the most promising approach to breaking this deadlock. Whether this is done through BDCP or DSC planning processes probably does not matter. A BDCP breakdown might be needed to motivate some stakeholders, but would be risky in other ways.
56. Current efforts are disjointed with little or no coordination, collaboration on issues of ecosystem restoration, water supply reliability, flood risk management, and levee strengthening.
57. The Flow standard thru the delta is not realistic and will do more harm than good.
58. There seems to be an overly cautious approach to making decisions and investments in both water supply infrastructure and ecosystem restoration, with the result being the status quo. Continuing delays increase the probability of a catastrophic seismic or flooding event that will destroy the state's opportunities to make improvements in both/either of the co-equal goals.
59. Delta Stewardship Council is making good progress re: the need to balance the needs of the co-equal goals plus Delta as a place. Taking the time to do it right. BDCP is going the opposite direction and continues to avoid using the advice of the scientists and trying to close a deal behind closed doors. Very bad form!!
60. All current proposed solutions are not sustainable. We need to focus on water demand reduction programs and not so much on the engineering vision of water supply augmentation.
61. Farmland losses associated with shifting water allocations and permanent habitat conversion both north and south of delta is of great concern to me. Increased water supply for fish and humans must remain a top priority. Increasing storage in wet years by building Sites Reservoir & increasing storage at Shasta must be implemented. Delta "stressors" must be addressed including predator and wastewater constituents impacts. Simply requiring "more flows" is not the answer.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

62. Water supply reliability can be achieved by acknowledging the limits of the system. No conveyance facilities or action to increase exports from the Delta should be taken until the amount of water needed to insure in-Delta needs is ascertained. The State of California, particularly the State Department of Water Resources is derelict in their duty to protect the Delta and Delta counties from use of the system to increase wealth and growth outside the Delta. The water supplies outside the Delta should be made "reliable" by minimizing reliance on imports from the Delta and maximizing reliance upon conservation, desalination, reuse, and retirement of salt-laden farmland.
63. The process seems to be focused almost entirely on how to construct some means to move water from the north through or around the Delta. A western Delta alternative is not being studied. The "process" asks for input and then seems to ignore it.
64. Decision-making in the Delta is at an historical standstill.

Actions Progress

Please provide additional information and comments about actions that have made progress and are on track.

1. Not enough time has passed to allow much progress. The Delta Plan is still in draft.
2. Well, certainly in terms of raising awareness and dedicating significant resources to the issue of Delta "vitality and security", there has been ample movement towards this objective.
3. Growing recognition that water supply reliability has to come from actions outside the Delta, and substantial progress towards that end has occurred. Significant increase in conservation, slowing population growth is actually decreasing urban demand.
4. The forum and evaluations have not been unbiased.
5. Governance - requires collaboration with an effective decision support system. This is not part of the program design at this juncture. Ecosystem restoration and recovery - elements of the why and what are addressed although not to the degree necessary for significant forward progress. Water supply reliability - no one has adequately defined reliability yet. Is it you can receive 90% of your allocation 5% of the time or is the definition you can receive 30% of your allocation 85% of the time. Delta vitality and security - the ESP is the most viable piece of analysis available to date.
6. Good progress by DPC getting economic sustainability plan done and making mostly acceptable recommendations to the Council. Council has been slow but make good progress with 6th draft.
7. Delta Stewardship Council progress on Delta Plan and Delta Protection Commission progress on ESP are both examples of governance structure making progress. The strict ecosystem protections currently in place by court orders are yielding progress for the ecosystem.
8. A lot of input has been provided but more decisions are needed.
9. The governance reform that's been done isn't going to solve the problems. That became clear at a Water Education Foundation Delta Levee Standards Conference. While reclamation districts are responsible for their own levees (often with substantial state subvention funds), the risks of levee failure are shared. The State Plan of Flood Control basically ignores non-project levees, even though these levees serve the state's interest. While the state invests significantly in the levees, they enforce no firm standards. I wonder if a JPA with agencies and reclamation districts would work best--they could develop a system-wide plan.
10. The idea of a regional authority is out there. That is positive. As far as emergency preparedness there needs to be a regional authority element (with funding) involved in the ongoing effort that will be needed to maintain any enhanced response systems we put in place. Current and planned levee work is enhancing water reliability and also serves to maintain the Delta as a unique place.
11. Governance groups have been established and are moving forward with their plans
12. DSC causing much needed serious discussions to occur about a whole range of previously ignored issues.
13. The Stewardship Council and the SWRCB and showing glimmers of independent thinking.
14. None
15. Science continues to be collected and analyzed. The NAS study gave clear strategy and framework for addressing what needs to be done.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

16. Pursuit of the Delta Plan...but Draft Six is seen to be watered down from previous drafts.
17. Legislative package of 2009 provided valuable, though limited progress on governance.
18. Significant restoration identified that would be helpful for species recovery.
19. The Delta Stewardship Council could provide a plan that allows the Delta to move forward on improving water supply, ecosystem, and Delta as place; however, they seem to have assumed a regulatory role and want to control, rather than guide, all things Delta.....whether they are in the Delta or only connected to the Delta.
20. Lots of investment in upgrading Delta levees, but still denial in Delta of risks of catastrophic failure and impacts of climate change from both upstream and rising sea levels. Stewardship Council seeming to be moving in more positive direction to provide value-added in governance realm rather than just agency # 201 seeking to impose command and control.
21. Substantial investments in local water supply projects in the Southern California export area have been made, but more need to be achieved. Urban export water service areas have also done a good job on water conservation. Protecting the Delta as a unique and evolving place and expanding statewide storage have made the least amount of progress due to myopic focus on building a peripheral canal. The various plans to protect the Delta need to provide more assurances to Delta communities/residents and status as an equal stakeholder in governance. It is not appropriate for the state to promote utilizing land in one area of the state to benefit other areas, without providing sufficient control, assurances, protections, and compensation to the Delta region.
22. Delta Vision has done an admirable job of getting the needed participants together in a forum to determine solutions. All the right people are there!
23. I am aware of no boots on the ground action for any of these issues. I understand folks are writing management and guidance documents.
24. Lack of integration of agencies.
25. Delta levee failure from flooding and earthquakes key issue not being addressed by Delta Stewardship Council
26. Governance remains too evasive. Management of inclusive approaches is nearly impossible. Not all things are going to be equally represented and the most important items (to "me") still seem to under-represented. I am disappointed in the appointments to the Delta Vision; yet someone somewhere needs to make choices... but the delta balance is like pornography; we will know it when we see it. Your science is just art; and much of that art remains obscene... I think the best thing we can do with governance is to know this will not be a finished product and adaptive management must be embraced as the new norm and we do not have good governance models.
27. Farm drainage has been removed. Fish numbers are up.
28. There has been a lot of study of the ecosystem needs and we know more than we used to. Same for water supply reliability.
29. The new/revised institutions seem to be functioning pretty much as expected. The only threat is the Governor's proposed re-organization that would put the Delta Stewardship Council under Resources. That would be a huge step backward.
30. To date, the BDCP is the only promising project.
31. The establishment of the Delta Council represents moderate progress for governance. The Council still has to implement and accomplish their tasks.
32. The Delta Stewardship Council is established and functioning with repeated acknowledgement of the co-equal goals.
33. The independent science panel and the DSP are moving in the direction of the Delta Vision but clearly restrained by the opposition housed in the administration.
34. Governance will continue to the "easy" job. Balancing the remaining "mutually exclusive" factors will continue to the uphill battle. Focusing on implementing an integrated regional planning process which gives local control for implementing proposed actions would foster <sic>.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

Please provide additional information and comments about actions that are not making progress and are falling behind.

1. We are in danger of falling behind if funding does not appear.
2. Delta agriculture is being sacrificed to satisfy export water supplies contrary to area of origin and delta protection statutes.
3. The DSC is simply another entity now that agencies will need to seek approval from regarding "covered actions" which is a creation within the Delta Plan. In this effort, there are not less requirements or less governance there is more.
4. It's probably easiest to refer you to a paper. See the paper, "Accelerated Climate Change: How a Shifting Flow Regime is Redefining Water Governance in California", presented at the 27th Annual California Water Law & Policy Conference in San Francisco, April 19-20, 2012. This paper explains what is missing, why it is important, and the possible implications.
5. Demonstrate a TRIAGE process that weighs various long term ecological states for the delta. This "restore to pre development " is not realistic
6. Delta Plan actually proposes reducing the levee standard in the Delta to HMP, and does not prioritize achieving 100-year flood protection in small communities.
7. integrate comments from above. Thank you.
8. Council has been so focused on Delta Plan that it hasn't fulfilled its oversight role. BDCP still faces same tough decisions it faced two years ago - but the knowledge base has improved with the effects analysis.
9. Immediate actions (levee improvement, emergency preparedness, etc.) could go a long ways to improving water reliability and security Development of storage is woefully behind and lacking funds necessary to make needed progress.
10. Habitat function needs to be demonstrated before irreversible changes are made.
11. Delta Plan is delayed. Water Bond's destined for failure this election cycle. There is no \$\$ for actual projects that "hit the dirt."
12. Emergency preparedness is at a critical crossroads. CalEMA just (5/9) indicated that the Governor's office had authorized release of the SB27 report. We now have a joint strategy for improving safety. At the same time, CalEMA indicates that funds have been allocated within their department for work on a Delta Catastrophic Flood Plan, DWR continues to implement their planning effort, and the first bond funds will be issued this summer for local preparedness projects. These separate efforts, if properly coordinated and integrated, could implement many, if not most, of the SB27 recommendations in the next two or three years. Will that coordination happen? Will an integrated and efficient effort to spend these funds come about? While that work goes ahead will a regional mechanism with secure funding into the future be created to maintain these enhanced response systems on behalf of the many hard-pressed and often distracted public safety agencies involved in flood response? That is why the next six-twelve months are an important crossroads in the effort to improve Delta public safety. If we mess this effort up there may not be a second chance to make meaningful change.
13. No significant progress on even no-regrets projects.
14. Interim projects.
15. Delta vitality and security isn't even on the list for most decision makers.
16. The BDCP is a broken program. When after five years the same exact work is being performed with the same exact answers, it is time to realize that the powers that be are not accepting the real answers. This bring me another rock plan is never going anywhere. What is going to happen is the water user will get more water and the eco-system is doomed. History repeats itself and the Central Valley's greed is all-consuming. When Resnick can make a phone call and upend the entire process something is very wrong.
17. BDCP process is flawed and is being steamrolled to a pre-determined outcome. Ecosystem protection is not being balanced with water supply reliability Delta sustainability economically and socially is being steamrolled by the water contractors who, with junior water rights, are dictating the agenda.
18. BDCP, Co-equal goals, levee standards and public safety, looking at the Delta as a system and not island by island.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

19. DSC behind schedule in delivering Delta Plan. Staff drafts (through # 5, and available hints re further delayed # 6) narrow the application of the Delta Reform Act and frame important parts of the draft toward the positions of the water exporting community. Note also the shift in political context of the DSC as suggested by the proposed "reorganizaiton" placing it under the Secretary for Natural Resources.
20. Governance has moved from contractor and agency control to a better balance, but there is little assurance that management of the system will be non-political and un-biased. The Delta communities are still not engaged, distrustful, and feeling like they aren't appreciated. Water supply is the primary focus of BDCP, with better balance in the DSC.
21. BDCP needs to get off the dime and stay on schedule (which is a much too long one to begin with). Need to start getting decisions on moving forward with additional surface storage and conjunctive use projects. Legislature should be using this period of low interest rates to invest in water infrastructure for backbone system.
22. Delta levees will continue to be the infrastructure that protects water conveyance through the Delta for: today, during construction of any peripheral canal, and during the operation of a dual conveyance system utilizing both North and South Delta pumps. Yet, the state and Delta planners are not actively promoting the statutory continuation of the one program that has proven to improve water supply reliability by reducing the risk of levee failures: the Delta Levees Program. Apparently, Delta planners and the state can't see the forest for the trees.
23. Storage is going nowhere and is critical. Ecosystem restoration projects are all talk, no action. BDCP is a disaster. Levee projects are ready to go with nobody leading or starting except for the EBMUD projects.
24. There is much uncertainty on whether the Bay Delta Conservation Plan will come to fruition and how it might take shape. This piece of the puzzle hampers the ability for the Delta Plan to be clear and robust, and leaves a big unknown on how financing for Delta improvements will be provided.
25. There is next to no consideration of existing gas and electric facilities that are extant in Corps/CVFPB levees. The Corps of Engineers directive to PG&E is to essentially "move your facilities off our levees." With nearly 12,000 gas and electric structures within 100 feet of levee centerline of the 1,600 miles of levees, there is not a grasp by the agency as to what the ramifications of that position is. There needs to be support from the DVF to work with federal and state agencies to reach a solution that such facilities can co-exist in levees and not have adverse impacts to the functioning and integrity of levees.
26. Not fixing the levees. Planning is totally top down ignoring Delta Ag interests.
27. I am aware of no boots on the ground action for any of these issues. I understand folks are writing management and guidance documents.
28. See previous comments about predetermined outcome.
29. Specific environmental restoration early action plan for next 10 years needed.
30. I think we need to dump the dual goals. Without a healthy eco-system there will not be a reliable water supply. We really need to broaden our thoughts (and that will put you further behind). The delta is just not a pin point on map; you are wrestling with a system that reaches from Shasta to San Diego. Grappling with just the trunk while the limbs are free to whip at you is a losing fight. If the delta is as important as we say it is; then real leadership needs to commit the \$60 billion that is needed. As long as we keep trying to talk about smaller numbers, we get smaller thinking. With a \$60 billion dollar price tag; maybe the delta is not so important as other choices we can make.
31. All exporters should contribute to water supply restoration for delta including riparian users. Irrigation practices must show efficiency thereby freeing up water for system improvements and better water balance for cities and Ag. Gray water recycling must be instituted especially east of delta to reduce water expropriation and increase supply. Water once taken from system must not be allowed to be put back in a degraded condition worse than when taken. If this is not done the salinity and other constituents will go up over time with population, and the delta will struggle.
32. Governance - Eliminate the DSC and let the DPC handle it. Too many layers of expensive and bureaucratic government. Ecosystem Restoration & Recovery - Spend the bond money on restoration, forget about recovery, it's too expensive and not necessary. Water Supply Reliability - Build more storage, make the process for approvals 6 mos., max. No canal to southern California, there's not enough water. Delta Vitality & Security - Keep the DSC out of the Secondary Zone. It's using Land Use control as a land grab!
33. Most of the meetings now are being held in Sacramento, where it is too expensive to drive there and pay for long term parking, so can't help you. All these meetings are just dog and pony shows anyhow.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

34. Governance of the Delta is even more fragmented and confusing than it was before the 2009 water package. The delta's vitality and security would be crushed by current plans to convert massive amounts of farmland to habitat and divert freshwater out of the system at the top of the estuary.
35. The BDCP process continues to jeopardize the potential success of the DSC to succeed in its mission to restore the estuary's ecosystem. The water contractors, who have governed the BDCP process behind the scenes, have done their best to obfuscate their efforts to maximize water exports at the expense of the estuary aquatic ecosystem. This ecosystem still demonstrates significant declines in primary and secondary food web productivity in what has been described by scientists as a collapsing estuary. The DSC has not demonstrated it can overrule the decision makers who will determine the content of the BDCP.
36. Just not that much detail as to what our plan is to address these things. Seems to be more like a plan to develop plans.
37. Delta Vision and The Delta Plan are mired in bureaucracy and lost in the weeds.
38. Refer to my last comments regarding BDCP, which today, represents the only real activity towards Delta restoration and water supply reliability. However, water supply reliability needs substantial improvement because no new ideas for operations and exports nor new impetus for water use efficiency that provides sustainability and decreased reliance on the Delta have been offered.
39. This process is taking way too much time. Remember what every person has said, "It's not IF it is WHEN." Stop playing POLITICS and get to the job at hand.
40. The BDCP is the most important activity currently related to the Delta, and the delays in making a decision on a preferred alternative and advancing both habitat improvements and new Delta conveyance puts the whole state economy at risk.
41. Very little progress on development of additional storage and moderate progress on the flow criteria needs.
42. Carbon from managed wetlands holds great promise and could use more work from the conservancy.
43. Focusing on implementing an integrated regional planning process which gives local control for implementing proposed actions would foster "buy in" from areas outside of legal delta. In the north state all the locals hear is "you're taking our water" and some are scared you're taking the surface and then going after the groundwater.
44. The planning is being controlled by the water contractors.

State Agency Leadership and Effectiveness

Please provide additional information or examples of effective agency or organization leadership, management, planning, and implementation related to the Delta Vision Strategic Plan.

1. All the planning efforts are woefully behind schedule and have rushed product to satisfy arbitrary time schedules for delivery at the expense of a quality product.
2. Chairman Isenberg has demonstrated strong leadership, management direction, and implementation prowess. He is also creative, passionately driven, and willing to look "outside of the box" - he will not accept the status quo just because it may be easy. His willingness to address new paradigms in California hydrology and water resources planning is refreshing - very rare in most agencies. Chairman Saracino of the Water Commission also has shown remarkable knowledge of the prescient issues.
3. Some individuals simply want to 'make a deal' and are being aided through contracted personnel from SFWCA that have a very targeted and specific goal in mind. It's time to change the channel.
4. State Board has made real progress on preparing for flow objectives
5. Delta Stewardship Council's use of the DPC report and recommendations on the Delta, which take a very provincial, consistent with the Commissions make up, of the Delta.
6. The legislature needs to look longer term and make some tough decisions. The NRC study highlights what people ignore, which is there needs to be a bigger view and decisions made.
7. Do not focus so much only on export pumps, other stressors will harm the delta in the near term if they are ignored or not given enough attention.
8. State Water Resources Control Board is carrying out its responsibility with regard to flows.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

9. Phil Isenberg and the rest of the Delta Stewardship Council and staff are to be commended on the progress made in developing the Delta Plan, which is likely to be a major mechanism for achieving the co-equal goals.
10. Delta Stewardship council is open, transparent and invites discussion. Legislature has provided direction.
11. No agency is taking real leadership. Senator Wolk is on the right track.
12. The Council is in pursuit of the coequal goals as defined in legislation...but it is being discovered that the legislation left a lot undefined. The Council is attempting to pull it together but with less effectiveness than previously thought.
13. The Governor and legislature have provided direction and funding to preserve the Delta and make justified improvements. DWR and Resources Agency implement programs that work with locals to move in the right direction on levees, habitat development, subsidence reversal, carbon sequestration, use of public land for public purposes, etc.
14. Recommend you talk to people about the Delta Watermaster position and its effectiveness. Suggest Jerry Meral, Fran Pavely, Phil Isenberg, Dave Machado, John Herrick (South Delta Water Agency), Doug Obegi (NRDC), David Guy (Northern CA Water ASSN.), and Tim Quinn (ACWA). Immodestly speaking, I feel our Office (Delta Watermaster) has done a good job reducing uncertainty regarding how many people are diverting water in the Delta, how much water is being diverted, and the validity of water right claims in the Delta. In addition, our policy level Reports have raised important issues such as the Reasonable Use Doctrine and water use efficiency.
15. The SWRCB and DPC seem to be doing the best job to meet their statutory roles based on their limited funding and short timelines given.
16. As an outsider to the process, and it is difficult to evaluate individual agency roles in the progress for solving problems in the Delta. However, I am disappointed by the news that the governor is considering taking the Delta Stewardship Council and placing it in the Resources Agency. It needs to remain independent to be effective in dealing with the agencies listed above.
17. Phil Isenberg and his staff are effective at moving the process along in a supportable way.
18. The list is the problem. Most of these entities lack the resources to play sound role, which they might otherwise be capable of doing. The Governor chose the rail as his legacy. We as Californians may need to follow that lead and realize we have the wrong fight in the delta; it is the "me" generation using problem solving tools based upon their perspective of rules and order... using less water; eliminating lawns; may be okay if we stop handing out tax dollars like candy to corporate ag (and the little local farmer that never had a good year yet continues to drive a \$60k pickup). We created the delta problem with this culture and these tools; not going to fix it that way.
19. Water board work on quality.
20. The DPC's Economic Sustainability report provided key information about how to sustain the Delta as we try to meet the coequal goals. DFG has been vigilant in insisting that the BDCP be held to the NCCP standard if it is to be permitted under CESA. The Delta Conservancy has responded to local concerns regarding large-scale habitat projects and is working to create the necessary relationships for constructive conservation efforts to occur.
21. Legislature has had numerous oversight hearings -- keeping agencies on notice, nudging them where appropriate, and ensuring all perspectives are heard and considered
22. DWR, DFG, and the Resources Agency are working hard to find a BDCP that can achieve the coequal objectives. They have spent a lot of effort, money, and resources in seeking solutions. Unfortunately, there is still a long way to go.
23. Does the state have an inter-agency task force on Delta issues? It might be useful for the DSC or Natural Resources Agency (perhaps together) to convene the state agencies involved to assemble a white paper on state issues related to the Delta. Dept. of Transportation willingness, ability, and plans to maintain various roads in the Delta, particularly routes 12, 4, and 160 are of vital importance. Similar thoughts for DFG, DWR, and Boating and Waterways would be very useful. How much money and coherence can state agencies muster here?
24. Jerry Meral is attempting to move the process along in a positive direction.
25. The CA Water Commission I believe is being the most proactive. Last year's series on storage was a great public outreach and educational event. More frank conversations on issues, concerns and solutions need to take place regardless of the political climate or election year. The future of California is what's at stake; any ONE person's political appointment or current or future political career should take a backseat. I really like Fish & Game Chief Bonham's frankness and willingness to "try" something new. I saw him speak at the SRWP's "State of the Watershed"

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

on May 22 in Sacramento. I don't agree with all his actions, but he seems like he will listen and consider actions outside the typical government way of doing business.

26. The Governor's Administration is not operating in a manner which effectively balances the needs of the Delta with the needs of the rest of California. The Governor is taking a "top down" attitude - planning and promoting an isolated conveyance system, which will decrease Delta water quality while enhancing that water quality shipped out of the Delta. The Governor's office is pursuing an obviously one-sided solution. The isolated conveyance facility is an old idea - newer, more effective and less damaging solutions are possible, but are not given priority by the Governor's office. VERY POOR LEADERSHIP.
27. The complex nature of the issues makes decision-making almost impossible.

Please provide additional information about how specific state agencies or organizations need to improve related to the Delta Vision Strategic Plan.

1. Start over with a better DVSP.
2. There should have been boxes for "No Idea" since many of these agencies are either not involved or working behind the scenes to where we don't know if they are effective or not.
3. No comment.
4. DWR is not releasing timely information or accurately describing critical studies regarding the Delta. This slows down progress, and leads to poorly informed decision making. A few examples. 1. Putting forward a levee investment framework that has no engineering or scientific justification before releasing background technical reports, and withholding that report for a long time when requested. 2. Holding back critical information and analysis for DRMS Phase 2 for several years, and then not disseminating the information properly or broadly. The results clearly show levee improvements have the highest benefit-cost ratio. 3. Taking 4-5 years to release information from the LIDAR analysis of Delta levees. 4. Failing to conduct benefit-cost analysis of BDCP options that are consistent with its own economic analysis guidelines, and best practices in public policy analysis.
5. The Resources Agency is co-opted and has become biased in the decision-making process. Hence, the process is not viable and the cost estimates are extremely vague. It's time for a benefit-cost analysis by independent and reputable professionals. Merge that with the results of the NAS reports and then we can restart the process.
6. The throttling of agencies to support the effort needs to be undone. Yes, we need to control costs but it is pennywise and pound foolish that an agency can't hire people when billions of dollars are at stake. This will become another high-speed rail fiasco unless this changes.
7. Everyone needs to understand, and be able to articulate, what an "evolving Delta" is. What enduring values does this region hold? What should be maintained despite this evolution?
8. Prioritize.
9. The Administration and Natural Resources are operating with total disregard for process, existing law, and science.
10. BDCP process is driven and directed by the water contractors. They put up with (grudgingly) with the conservation community and then go work behind closed doors to develop strategy and process. The State Natural Resources Agency needs to become more assertive in oversight and direction and collaboration.
11. DWR should realistically look at futures without Delta water. What happens after a seismic devastation in the Delta?
12. Natural Resources and DWR are pursuing settling for the low rung of the ladder rather than willing to describe what could be done and then triage because of finance, etc. It is evident that the many new faces lack the history and background for current discussions and as such appear to be driven politically rather than by science or what is practical or implementable. There is seemingly an alarming disregard for what the private sector is doing in the Delta to address the fears put forward by the state.
13. The main problem with implementing the Delta Vision or co-equal goals is that the DVF, the State Legislature, the Delta Stewardship Council, and the BDCP have all FAILED to ever define in specific quantitative and measurable terms what exactly water supply reliability, ecosystem restoration, or Delta as Place really mean. Unfortunately, every citizen in the State would have a different definition of each and so do all of the stakeholder and government agencies. No doubt, developing the definitions in measurable and quantifiable terms will take time and be very painful, but it is a necessary step that MUST be taken in order know whether ANY Delta Plan will be successful. No one will be able to claim victory in terms of implementation until they know the exact goal/objective they are trying

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

to achieve. This has been the same problem for the last 30 years and will continue to be perpetuated until this difficult job is done.

14. Resources Agency and DWR seem to think there are only 2 water agencies in the state and will continue to fail as long as they continue with that approach.
15. The Department of Water Resources has the appearance of acting like an arm of the State and Federal Water Contractors. The act of placing high-level water contractors staff in management roles in the Department really adds to this perception.
16. As an outsider to the process, and it is difficult to evaluate individual agency roles in the progress for solving problems in the Delta. However, I am disappointed by the news that the governor is considering taking the Delta Stewardship Council and placing it in the Resources Agency. It needs to remain independent to be effective in dealing with the agencies listed above.
17. BDCP process and coordination.
18. It took Federal receivership to "fix" healthcare in our prisons. That is a much smaller problem. But it will take extraordinary powers to invoke a frame work that can start to address the delta. Then we need to start working on the delta for what it is not what is was or what some think it should be. It is a cesspool of 150 years in making and of impacts that need to be mitigated, contained or removed; yet some real hardy people and critters managed to survive as life went on. But that means water importers, ag, environmentalists, and "locals" all need to have expectations re-calibrated. The Delta Vision Strategic Plan may be the best tool to do it; but not with the current powers.
19. Fire scientists found cooking information for political agendas that cannot pass peer review.
20. There is no protection for in-Delta growers. The only protection is for those that get our exported water. Nobody gives a damn about the people that live or work in the Delta. The water exporters would like to gut the endangered species act so they can get more water.
21. DWR needs to be independent from the SWCs, who are currently running the DWR Delta programs relating to BDCP. The Governor is transfixed by the idea of building the peripheral canal without regard for the long-term needs of the state or impacts on the areas of origin. The Resources Agency is not ensuring that the BDCP process is meeting the coequal goals and addressing the concerns of all stakeholders. The DSC <sic>
22. The leadership by the Resources Agency is not functioning in the best interest of the estuary but has taken a strong position on the side of additional export of water out of the Delta. This is in conflict with the Delta Vision Strategic Plan as it will continue to assure the decline of the estuary.
23. Very little evidence that CalEMA, CDFA, or CalTrans are doing anything -- they might be, but it isn't obvious.
24. DFA and Caltrans have been missing from the activities. They may be doing work behind the scenes, but I have not seen them working up front.
25. Not a single state agency is taking the lead in advocating for improvement in the state's long-term water supply. The Governor says water is a high priority, but he doesn't commit the resources or make the appointments to support protecting/increasing our water supply. The state and federal resource agencies want assurances before acting that cannot be obtained, and the delays are very likely to fill the Delta with saltwater, limiting habitat and water supply opportunities.
26. A stable support system to achieve the Strategic Plan is the reliable water supply through the Delta, the ecosystem restoration efforts, a reasoned and enforceable flow criteria through the Delta (to the Bay, not the pumps), and additional storage to regulate all of the above. State agencies are still in their own "silos", without the integration and coordination. The integration of purpose and actions is absolutely missing!
27. Be open to trying new solutions regardless of political fall-out.
28. The key players in the planning process have not changed over time. They are there to plan, re-invent themselves, and plan some more. There have been times where a process is declared that players will not get something for nothing (for example; "beneficiary pays"), but that is eroded by positional bargaining. A great example of that is the water contractors only being willing to fund studies and participate if the result will be a 50-year incidental take permit.
29. Data sharing in a real meaningful way would be a first step.

Federal Agency Cooperation

Please provide additional information about federal agency participation and cooperation related to the Delta Vision Strategic Plan and work to achieve the two co-equal goals.

1. Who knows? Feds have not lived up to their obligations with "cooperating agencies" under their own guidelines, most of us are in the dark.
2. No comment - other than feds should probably reduce involvement. Probably no fed dollars will become available.
3. The politicization of science needs to be called out for what it is. The exporters asked for a review by the NAS and didn't like the results. Nunez et al with HB 1837 is the backdoor to accomplish a long-time settled legal battle on the San Joaquin River. Other farmers are happy to have one or two crop yields while the agricultural interests in the San Joaquin are not satisfied with just two or three crop yields. And why are ag interests able to discharge water without an NPDES permit?
4. Federal leadership missing, but good engagement on the ground.
5. The Corps needs to share more data. They do a lot of work in the Delta but are limited by project specific focus. They could lead more.
6. Cooperate, get away from "turf" issues.
7. Federal agencies have not been helpful, in my opinion.
8. DOI should be requiring BOR to bring to the table all the various water management programs that are currently ongoing for transfers, etc. DOI should be putting all water contracts on hold until the process is resolved. DOI runs the show for the federal agencies and does not do a good job of coordinating with the other federal agencies (at least that is how it looks publically) and does a terrible job in outreach to Congress (except perhaps Senator Feinstein).
9. The Federal Agencies seem to be more independent of the politics de jour, as such they are seen as the champions when it comes to protecting the Delta ecosystem. You don't see Westland employees in these agencies!!!
10. I do not have sufficient information re these agencies but note that you have not included the US Congress here, where House legislation and Senate requests for NAS actions and other pronouncements have not supported progress on the co-equal goals.
11. The state and federal wildlife agencies have provided good leadership in the development of a plan, though it is not sensed that political arms are taking their lead.
12. The Department of Interior (USBR) should be leading the federal agencies in improving all aspects of the largest estuary on the west coast and the source of the CVP. They are absent.
13. All projects (except stressors) being proposed to improve water supply reliability and ecosystem function propose to make alterations to the State Plan of Flood Control and potentially have significant navigation and public health and safety impacts. Therefore, flood management needs to have equal attention to water supply and ecosystem.
14. USACE has a horrible policy on tree removal from levees, which will have serious effects on Delta levees. They need to be told they aren't the boss anymore.
15. I think these agencies are here to cooperate. It would be nice if Federal Government could speak with just one tongue. But why should we expect that when the issues are so complex and diverse. It would short sell the Federal responsibilities if all these agencies were not participating.... but they do not have unlimited resources so it is out of balance.
16. Agencies are part of federal executive branch of government and California has suffered political agendas from one administration to another which prevents progress depending which side of the aisle you are on.
17. The DOI is not critically reviewing the scientific merit of the proposals by BDCP with respect to the coequal goals or meeting the standards of the ESA.
18. The federal resource agencies are focused on their mandates of ESA protection. This is good, but they also need to propose solutions/experiments to help achieve progress and disengage from the status quo. Unfortunately, that is not part of their culture.
19. The Federal agencies need a more coherent voice.
20. Federal agency activities are mostly unknown.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

21. The only agencies I have directly seen impacts from are USBR, USFWS, DOI. I marked the other agencies low according to my vague familiarity with their actions related to the Delta. Improvements to the Red Bluff Diversion Dam relied on the cooperation amongst a multitude of agencies. Whomsoever leadership it is attributed to, should be commended!! This kind of cooperation should be repeated OFTEN in order to see meaningful improvements to the Co-equal goals.
22. Federal and State agencies are collectively ignoring the basic fact that water flowing into the Delta is a limited resource. Agencies should be striving for more effective programs of water conservation and storage to limit the need for increased pumping from the Delta. Where is the call for a limit to growth that depends upon Delta water exports? The agencies, and our State Government are failing miserably.
23. Same comment applies as the previous...same players trying to get something for nothing.

Stakeholder Participation

Please provide additional information about constructive stakeholder participation related to the Delta Vision Strategic Plan and subsequent implementing legislation.

1. No comment.
2. The record speaks for itself.
3. Still mostly an insiders' game and no clear focus for involvement of business/labor et. al.
4. The Bay-Delta Conservation Plan process, although heavily criticized has made substantial efforts to reach out to interested communities within and upstream of the Delta. The Delta Conservancy has initiated a process to develop shared understanding and to identify common interests.
5. The stakeholder effort needs to engage the end user and not assume that water companies represent them. They need to realize they are making a decision many miles away and have impartial information.
6. Identify smaller beneficial projects to get SOMETHING done.
7. Clearly, stakeholder involvement is critical. However, the Public Water Agencies have a few representatives who are far from constructive in their involvement.
8. The program needs to have a summit or integrative approach that brings people together.
9. Constructive participation depends on the platform one is viewing from. Those that are moderately engaged are the ones holding the Vision Process feet to the fire when it comes to protecting the Delta, its ecology and way of life. Unfortunately, the co-equal goals is viewed as taking away from protecting the Delta, its ecology and way of life.
10. Without any public, structured stakeholder process, the DSC processes to develop a Delta Plan reflect the predictable greater participation by organized interests and allow participation based on largely private expression of those interests to staff. In addition to tilting participation rates, this greatly reduces the ability of the DSC to frame dialogue in terms of effective implementation of its statutory responsibilities.
11. Water agencies and Ag districts are only interested in more water, though they talk about restoration and recovery. Their media and political outreach in D.C. has been constantly about more water, and undermining the regulatory oversight in the Delta. Not helpful.
12. Unfortunately, all of the above stakeholders are advancing their own definition of water supply reliability and ecosystem function rather than a shared definition that is measurable and quantifiable as discussed previously. The result is every group going in their own direction. So, the processes are driven and controlled by the most politically powerful towards their own definition, to the exclusion and detriment to other stakeholders.
13. I am not familiar with these groups.
14. The water contractors are driving the BDCP train and the agencies and state seem to be handing control to them. Other entities are effectively shut out.
15. I think some of the local communities and a couple environmental groups have been least obstructive. I think the rural/ag water is most destructive and the urban water groups are not as helpful as I expect. The business and economic development and labor groups are misinformed distractions.
16. The only reason that meetings are open to Stakeholders and public at large, is that it is legally required. They pay lip service to our comments and then do whatever the hell "big water" tells them to do. These water users would turn

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

our Delta into a sewer if they could get all the water they want. For a lot of these "farmers" water is their biggest cash crop. Am I angry? DAMN RIGHT

17. To the extent the coequal goals can include their needs, most stakeholders are moderately constructive. If implementing the coequal goals mean that a stakeholder cannot continue to have access to water supply, live/work in a certain area, etc. then that stakeholder will fight against the coequal goals.
18. There are good and bad actors in each group. Generally, within each group, some are actively trying to resolve issues, some are in denial that they have any responsibility, others are simply throwing stones. I don't see any one group being superior or worse than any other.
19. All the entities listed are focused on only their needs and interests. As of yet - there is still no sense of "we" only of "me" or "us" in terms of organizations and communities. Progress will be difficult to achieve under these conditions.
20. Most are playing chicken and defending turf, rather than looking to the long term.
21. The environmental community seems split between those truly interested in the Delta ecosystem and those that just want to stop growth and development. The business community seems too content to sit on the sidelines and wait for someone else to address water supply issues.
22. Everyone needs to come to the table in a positive "let's get things done" manner instead of protecting their ideologies. It's a give and take. The environmental community received a lot more upfront in SBX7-7 while everyone else is giving...it's their turn to be constructive and less zealous in their demands.
23. Same comment as before...same players trying to get something for nothing.

Barriers and Constraints

What do you see as the major barriers and constraints in efforts to achieve the co-equal goals?

1. Lack of funds to keep efforts on timeline. Hampered by unrealistic legislated timelines - haste makes waste.
2. Ideology driven stakeholders including the Legislature. Lack of legislative knowledge and understanding of complex problem solving in resources has littled <sic> the path to success.
3. Lack of leadership and lack of funding.
4. Export water users still expect increased in diversions. Funding - and the lack of a credible BDCP or DSC finance plan is a major obstacle.
5. Funding and agreement on a path forward.
6. As noted previously, a major barrier is the assumption that "co-equality" in natural resource goals can exist as a fixed standard. It cannot. Natural resources, and the values that society places on them are fluid, waxing and waning depending on a number of variables (e.g., economic climate, social awareness, personal income, family priorities, etc.) – they must be accepted as being dynamically balanced. They will change, and often abruptly. So, the pursuit of "co-equal" goals, as defined, is unattainable; since the "equality" will be out-of-date as soon as the initial agreement is ratified. These goals are also being sought after without first addressing the fundamental issue facing California water resources; a shifting hydrology. A shifting hydrology alone will usurp any management prescriptions and make whatever is developed largely irrelevant. Trying to develop Delta prescriptions and solidify co-equal goals for the Delta without first addressing the larger issue of a shifting California hydrologic baseline is like trying to refinance a home without knowing what your income will be; clearly possible – but very ill advised.
7. Restoration is a poor / unachievable goal. Try for something sustainable even if it includes NO SMELT
8. Attempting to achieve two co-equal goals.
9. Nobody agree on anything.
10. The lack of a clear definition of reliability is resulting in current conflict. This needs to be clearly defined.
11. Politics is interfering with objective unbiased assessments.
12. Financial burden, transparency of governance, and recovery state versus jeopardy state of concerned species.
13. As it has been, an unwillingness to directly confront difficult decisions and compromise.
14. A consensus on priorities, people vs. environment

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

15. Continuing lack of understanding and agreement about what the Co-equal goals mean in relation to the Delta as place. Presumption within the Delta that ecosystem restoration means maintaining the status quo with restrictions on exports. Also continuing disagreement over what "reduce reliance" on the Delta, question being, in the future or now.
16. Project funding. Political will. Ability to compromise. Unreasonable expectations.
17. Competing interest groups/demands.
18. Lack of an agreed upon definition of water reliability.
19. Narrow set of solutions offered.
20. Impossibly high expectations by all.
21. Cheap plentiful water is necessary to make agriculture profitable. Our farmers have an insatiable thirst—whether they are in the Delta, in counties of origin, or in the deserts south of the Delta.
22. The drought is over and public awareness of the need to conserve is declining. The public unwillingness to pay for water or ecosystem benefits is near universal. Most of the water warriors of California retreat to their historic positions rapidly, and are too timid to embrace much of any change.
23. Complexity of the problem. The many duplicative or overlapping planning efforts and initiatives only creates confusion. The fact that most agencies or organizations involved have their focus on one part of the problem and not all hurts the ability to see an overall plan that addresses all aspects of the problem.
24. Leadership in various agencies--commitment to getting it done,.
25. SELFISH INTERESTS!
26. The major barrier in efforts to achieve the co-equal goals is that the Delta Reform Act created a new process but didn't change anyone's way of thinking about the Delta and California's finite water supply. I believe the co-equal goals means not sacrificing one goal in order to achieve the other. This is impossible.
27. The people who are really in charge could care less about the co-equal goals!!!!!!! I work within the BDCP and this is the most obvious problem. DWR and the Bureau are the ones in charge. More water, all the time. This is the constant mantra. If you say this won't work, there is no more they don't listen. They have been having the same arguments FOR FIVE YEARS! This has become a titanic waste of tax money!
28. The huge reliance on Delta water by people outside the Delta. The relatively limited scope of the Delta Plan geographically. Water that is not priced at its true value. Stakeholders whose interest is only in the economic benefits of water to their district or industry. Lack of reliable funding for State-run programs to provide for sufficient staff, or plan longer term projects that require more than a 3-year grant cycle.
29. Parties need to quit endless posturing and make some decisions.
30. It all rests on whether BDCP can be completed and believed in. If the base is not developed correctly you cannot build a program that works.
31. Reality and science.
32. The incompatibility of the coequal goals and the many definitions of what the coequal goals mean.
33. (1) Institutionalized "winners" re water use who protect and seek to advance privileged policy positions and economic advantage from current policies. (2) Agencies with "public trust" responsibilities are weak and constantly under attack (see # 1 above). (3) Recognizing the challenges to establishing a new agency (DSC) in this context, it has not made as much progress as hoped.
34. Not recognizing that flows through the Delta must increase and adequate habitat must be restored in order to stabilize fisheries.
35. 201 regulating agencies, each protecting their own turf. There is no economic incentive to develop the needed habitat to improve the Delta ecosystem. Even when there are funds to pay the first costs, there is no funding for ongoing maintenance and no income derived from habitat areas. Perhaps Carbon sequestration will provide a living income from habitat development.
36. Lack of decision making to move forward on various fronts: BDCP, storage, funding/bonds. Media more interested in conflict than progress. Loudest voices in Delta Counties cannot be satisfied with anything but "no project." Resource agencies unwilling to permit project without "certainty" of outcome, which is delusional.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

37. Failure to put in the hard work and time to define in measurable and quantifiable terms exactly what is meant by water supply reliability, ecosystem restoration, and Delta as Place will result in the same waste of time, energy, and money in searching for something that is elusive and unknown. Until then, all stakeholders will continue to promote their own definitions rather than a shared one. For instance, some water districts and ratepayers in Southern California may prefer to invest in building local water supply infrastructure, but meanwhile the majority of the SoCal water districts are promoting building a new transportation facilities to import from hundreds of miles away. Clearly, they have two different paths to achieve water supply reliability, which is a conflict, but neither actually defines in terms of acre feet of water when you've achieved water supply reliability. Another example is how some may view constructing tidal wetlands and other floodplain habitat as Delta ecosystem restoration, while others may consider increasing Delta outflows as ecosystem restoration. Again, these are two different paths to restoring ecosystem, but neither define in terms of species population when you've achieved ecosystem function and restoration.
38. Major barrier is BDCP.
39. Need to establish the long-term funding mechanisms. Once these are in place, it will be much easier for the stakeholders to stop finger pointing and work together to figure out how to best spend the money.
40. Entrenched interests.
41. The barrier is that options for many solutions will promote one of these goals over the other. However, having them co-equal sets up the options for finding a solution where both can be supported.
42. Land speculation elevating cost to purchase land for enhancement/restoration. Some water users that are unwilling to compromise/change operations to more wisely use water. Un-screened water diversions. Over emphasis of predation as cause for decline in order to steer conversation away from wasteful consumptive water uses and pollution. Resistance to compromise/water conservation by some large water users. Inappropriate ag practices in the Delta.
43. Collaboration and cooperation.
44. Water diverters self-interests.
45. Lack of consensus to implement in a phased manner the co-equal goals.
46. The concept of co-equal goals is out of balance for social/environmental or legislative processes. They may be interdependent; but not co-equal in all aspects. It is fine to embrace the concept; but like a husband and wife in a marriage, co-equal in the eyes of the law; yet only one can wear the pants (at a time). A good marriage works by the other committing to advance the other before oneself... It would be extraordinary if the Delta Vision could be a successful marriage; a tranquil co-existence would be great; but the status-quo is more likely.
47. Political partisanship stops California from movement.
48. Refusal of most interest groups to see other views than their own.
49. Greed, Greed, Greed, Greed.
50. 1. The State government bureaucracy. 2. Special interest groups led by the environmentalists and the southern California water companies and Irvine Ranch.
51. Water supply reliability must take into account water availability, which is variable in California. Reliability for one water user also cannot lead to the inability of another water user to have access to his/her water rights. Water reliability should focus more on measures that do not involve movement of water over large distances, which has many negative environmental consequences. Restoring the ecosystem is complicated and it can't be assumed that simply creating more habitat in itself will lead to recovery of fish, for instance.
52. The hell-bent, logic-be-damned stumble toward a peripheral canal or tunnel. There is no doubt in my mind that the "fix is in" and all the meetings, press releases, and surveys like this one are there merely to paper over a done deal formulated by cowards.
53. The unwillingness of water users in general and agricultural uses in particular to recognize that our state's limited supply of water must be sustainably managed to benefit the public and the ecosystems that supply this natural resource. Our government has allowed and often encouraged the over development of the use of this resources for private profit at the expense of public the sustainable ecosystems that provide for the public's fish and wildlife. Due to this, the future of the public's aquatic ecosystems continues to be in grave jeopardy.
54. The fact that too many interests benefit from the existing system of water rights (and lack of groundwater management) to allow for systemic change.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

55. Institutional issues, jurisdictions, lack of cohesive, defined scientific cause and effect.
56. Financial constraints and regionalism.
57. Unrealistic expectations on the part of nearly everyone.
58. The Delta Plan and Delta Vision rely on outdated science.
59. The inability to understand the interests of other parties and to work towards those interests. Fear and mistrust. High level of uncertainty in proposed solutions, including restoration. Rigidity of our regulatory system - to the point where it stifles possible "adaptive management" scenarios that would allow us to learn more about the system we are trying to manage. Lack of flexibility within the system we have created.
60. The co-equal goals are unattainable. You can't serve more water to those in the export region (SJV, Bay Area, SoCal) by exporting more water from the delta and then seeking to take water from those upstream to accomplish the goal.
61. Self-interest and political/legal maneuverings. An adult needs to enter the room.
62. 1. Distributed governance with ineffective decision-making -- no one's in charge. 2. Failure to employ a systems approach for all inter-related issues -- ecology, water supply, flood management, and levee strengthening. 3. Failure to employ risk-based decision-making approach on the Delta as a comprehensive system. 4. Reluctance to apply lessons learned elsewhere.
63. A lack of urgency to make decisions on habitat and water supply issues. State and federal agencies wanting safety and assurances before acting puts everything at risk. It is easier politically to react to an emergency when the levees collapse than it is to plan and invest in advance to improve both the Delta ecosystem and our state's water delivery system.
64. What has changed? The same adversarial battles continue, but now with higher stakes, costs with little progress.
65. A focus by in-Delta community leaders and stakeholders to obstruct efforts to enhance the co-equal goals rather than participating in them.
66. Lack of understanding how co- and equal differ from each other.
67. Equal study and implementation of the co-equal "solutions." Frankly, I think the ISB should be in charge of implementing the plan.
68. Barrier #1: Unwillingness of State decision makers to acknowledge the limitations of the Delta system to provide the water for growth in the rest of arid California. INEPT LEADERSHIP. Barrier #2: See Barrier #1.;
69. Groups unwilling to compromise - not all will get all.
70. Unless there is science that supports the co-equal goals of water supply and the environment, it could be that the 2 goals cannot be co-equal.
71. We continue to use 1990's era technology to address a complex, difficult problem.
72. Delta water users unwilling to let the delta water quality return to pre-upstream storage conditions.

Recommendations

What recommendations do you have for improving the State's progress and action on the two co-equal goals?

1. Need to have adequate funding. Need to have more coordination from the Delta Conservancy. Need to take the time it takes to do the job right - not just to make deadlines.
2. Return to solutions based on area of origin, delta protection statutes, traditional water right concepts, reform ESA/CESA to include true "balancing." End retribution based mitigation driven by revisionist public policy without public funding of the costs.
3. Develop a finance plan ASAP, beginning with a robust BDCP financing working group. Clarify the definition of a "reliable water supply" in the DSC's Delta Plan.
4. I would recommend the following: 1. Re-establish the new baseline hydrology. Without a corrected (bias corrected) new hydrology, all other management actions and pursuits are moot. 2. Re-define co-equality to express the notion of dynamic balancing (the current omission of dynamic balancing is the primary reason why there is such a partisan atmosphere within the BDCP – all sides are wary of fixed prescriptions 3. Move to a more real-time based operational platform - and for one thing, stop using historical hydrology to test action sensitivity. The international

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

hydrological sciences community have long since accepted the notion that historical hydrology is no proxy for future conditions. 4. Governance across the board, not just the Delta, must be re-addressed in light of this shifting hydrology. It is a very large issue and one that is clearly larger than any Delta initiative, but ignoring it would make any Delta Plan largely non-constructive in the end.

5. Try for something sustainable even if it includes NO SMELT.
6. At some point an ultimate decision will have to be made as to which is the primary goal; drinking water for human existence.
7. Take economics and financial analysis seriously and put it at the front and center of the process from beginning to end. The absence of a detailed financial plan that clearly explains what various parties will pay and how is completely unacceptable. The absence of cost-benefit analysis of controversial multi-billion dollar public works projects is completely unacceptable.
8. Identify upstream unimpaired flows, the amount (volume) diverted within each watershed and the amount (volume) returned as ag return flows and the water quality status of those waters. Then ensure beneficial use with a range of 70-80% diversion rate within each watershed. Collaborative environmental management and a broken hub wheels no water. Auction water diversions within each watershed because we are attempting to allocate a scarce resource - water. Let's treat it so.
9. Delta Stewardship Council and/or Governor's office directly has to take a leadership position and engage with the feds at a high level.
10. Support ongoing efforts and minimize introduction of new legislative action or initiatives to change ongoing processes until they have been brought to resolution. As with all efforts of this complexity and controversy, overly ambitious timelines create an impression of lack of progress, when in reality progress is being made. Actions which affect these process only serve to delay resolution and result in unnecessary additional cost.
11. Assets are needed, not more studies Buy-in to vision of co-equal goals has occurred but we are stuck now on trying to define a roadmap to get there which accommodates everyone's interest. Can't be done so stop wasting money on trying. We need to build off of small successes, install assets as small projects in incremental stages. This way people can see what is going to work or not work without over building. Follow through on commitments - do what you say, which will build trust, which is missing and badly needed
12. Strive to find areas of agreement and common understanding.
13. Look at more options. For example, did you notice that pipes to San Francisco cross right over the proposed tunnel or that every fight is separate? I never hear about the San Onofre desalination plant being part of the debate yet it serves the same people.
14. Focus on statewide reliability to determine the size of the reliability problem and for whom the problem is greatest and why.
15. Farmers should get together, mediated by the Farm Bureau, to come up with a settlement plan that works for all regions.
16. As far as emergency response, we should push that all planning efforts (DSC, CVFPP, etc.) must conform to the SB27 recommendations. CalEMA or other organization must be pushed to coordinate the anticipated spending that will clearly be occurring in the next 24 months by DWR, locals, and other State agencies to ensure a level of effectiveness in our efforts.
17. Look at science to design improvements, not to justify a premade conclusion.
18. I believe that the only possible way to achieve the co-equal goals is through a consensus driven process where all parties are at the table. It's clearly too late for this.
19. The State can get serious about there actually being co-equal goals! Why is the one model central to everything, CALSIM, a water delivery model? Why is it on a monthly time step? Fish don't live on a monthly time step. If there is no alternative model then we should use NO MODELS!!!! I am sure no one reading this has any idea what I am even talking about. If we are concerned with water reliability why is it NEVER MODELED!!!!!!!!!!!!!! We only ever talk about there being more water on average. This is not reliability this is supply increase!
20. The Delta Plan is just a start. We need state-wide regulations on par with the Delta Plan, to achieve the co-equal goals, and to ensure that state-wide, we reduce reliance on Delta water and introduce mechanisms to increase conservation and reuse.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

21. Communication. Coordination with all groups. Transparency of process. Quit letting the water contractors drive the bus.
22. Give up and get realistic.
23. Backing away from trying to preserve yesterday's status quo, look at the Delta as part of a system in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Watershed, and call on all stakeholders to share in the responsibility to clean up the Delta. That means agriculture throughout the watershed, all industry that discharges into the watershed, all municipalities that discharge waste water into the watershed. No one party should bear the majority of the burden...maybe it means an era of limits on what to expect from the watershed. Remove all expectation or hope for non-user funding for ANY aspect of water supply, including all associated ESA and ecosystem function costs.
24. Take a firmer stance on flows through the Delta and on a balanced, non-political management structure. In state water contract renewals, recognize that the SWP was never completed, and cannot meet expectation made based on water that has never been available. Re-negotiate the water contracts to reflect actual available water in the system.
25. The Governor and legislator should continue to support improvements in the Delta. Consider methods to encourage habitat development and maintenance.
26. The Governor needs to continue to exert and up the level of his leadership to make BDCP happen.
27. Begin lengthy, statewide, inclusive, and transparent hearings to develop specific measurable and quantifiable definitions of what water supply reliability, Delta ecosystem restoration, and Delta as Place in terms of quantifiable and measurable water, species, and economic terms. Only then will you be able to measure whether progress or victory has been achieved. Another way to look at it is if you were running a race, but didn't know where the finish line is, then how can anyone ever win the race?
28. Get the BDCP to get realistic on goals and means, and move on a project that is doable. Get the State, Feds, and ag agencies to start working seriously on storage, with a strong commitment from ag to fund their share up front.
29. Need to develop methodology for cost benefit analysis of Delta actions. The methodology needs to account for hard costs that can be quantified, intangible factors that need to be considered, and uncertainty / risk in outcomes.
30. Improve current Delta infrastructure. A more moderate pipeline/canal 7,000 cfs. Put habitat on poor quality land as opposed to highly productive Ag land. Finish and maintain existing habitat on government owned land before stealing more. Dredge channels.
31. I believe some deadlines are coming up for actual deadlines, but if that isn't the case, then it is time to for decision-making. Guidance plans are important, but some agency needs to be deemed the decider or inaction will be the only outcome. I thought the Delta Stewardship Council was supposed to fill this role, but it seems they might not have the support to fulfill this role.
32. Fully screen intake to Clifton Court fore bay. Better aquatic weed management. Penalize land speculation of potential restoration. Kick LA water and power out of the Central Valley. Raise water use rates on users that continue to use water inefficiently. More water conservation. Regulate ground water extraction and use.
33. Transparency
34. Significantly improve addressing impact of diversions and flow manipulations on Delta water quality issues.
35. Need to complete BDCP and approve it in early 2013.
36. I would break them apart and define specific objectives that can be achieved. They are not co-equal or even well matched. They should be called interdependent goals; which would help start to manage expectations.
37. Give the courts an opportunity to fairly apportion water for all sources for needs and use that court body to run the system for all to benefit from and sacrifice to.
38. Interest groups need a common vision.
39. Obey existing water laws and priorities. The CVPIA signed by Bush the Elder guaranteed so many acre-feet of water for fish. This has never been met.
40. 1. Disband the DSC and let the DPC govern the Delta. 2. Spend the bond money on restoration. 3. Spend the bond money on water storage and streamline permitting to 6 months maximum. 4. Let the local government agencies control their own land use.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

41. Recommend smaller scale, trust-building projects to implement the goals. Show what measures can work on a smaller scale, assess the results, and then expand the scale of the actions that work well and have the least local impacts.
42. There is nothing to be done. Drain the Delta, you fools, and be done with it.
43. The DSC must first establish what actions are necessary to restore the health and abundance of the estuary ecosystem and dependent fish and wildlife, including the flow necessary to obtain the restoration requirements establish by the State Legislature. The process of establishing a BDCP must then be based on the amount of available water for export that will be commensurate with the goal of ecosystem restoration and one that clearly demonstrates how its implementation will enable the realization of the restoration goals based on sound science.
44. Support the SWRCB in keeping to its timetable for completing the WQCP revision.
45. Move Stewardship Council under Resource Agency. Answer the question honestly whether Sac regional wastewater permits are a primary cause of fish demise.
46. Voters need to be better educated about the true cost of properly maintaining and managing our water delivery systems.
47. State and federal regulatory agencies must be willing to explore the new science that is developing. The old flow-centric paradigm has been tested for more than two decades and has failed. For those truly interested in helping the Delta ecosystem there is ample evidence to motivate state and federal agencies to embrace these new scientific ideas. Unfortunately, they are likely to continuing their adherence to the old science thereby resulting in the continued decline of the ecosystem.
48. Better understanding of interests as opposed to "wants." Solutions that directly address the needs of all parties - whenever possible. Start implementing projects on the ground with no adverse consequences for those willing to take the risk. An example is restoration; there are many questions about it viability. Solution: start a project right away with science oversight and start learning from it. This in turn will direct implementation of other projects and start reducing the uncertainty we currently have with this strategy.
49. Realize that a major disaster is just around the corner and when the delta fails you will then come to the conclusion something needed to be done and then it will be too late. This process needs to get in gear and make some hard decisions and Fix the problem.
50. Remove the co-equal goal mantra and pass a new law where each region is responsible for itself.
51. DSC planning is a potentially effective motivator. A state task force and white policy paper would be of considerable value, especially if it went well with a DSC plan.
52. Put one organization in charge and develop a system-wide master plan to simultaneously address ecosystem restoration, water supply, flood management, and levee strengthening rather than on the piece-meal approach currently being used.
53. Make the decisions necessary to implement large scale habitat restoration in the Delta based upon the best information we have today and design and build new conveyance large enough to meet the state's needs for generations to come. Be prepared to make adjustments as warranted in the future and operate conveyance to achieve the co-equal goals.
54. Appoint a benevolent Delta czar to cut through the battlefield, dismantle the warring factions and then rebuild the necessary coalitions to work on the co-equal goals, plus the issues regarding Delta as-a-place and the levees. Maybe we have our own Iraq here in our own backyard!! Very noble goals with a need to prevail with well- reasoned decisions and actions!!
55. Co-equal budgeting process for the various branches of government.
56. See #1
57. This State needs leaders who are not beholden to political pressures, but instead are willing to live with the truth, expound the truth, and plan using the truth about water supply. Change in attitude at the highest level in the State Department of Water Resources would be a good place to begin. No plan to improve the Delta can be effective unless Delta counties, cities and landowners can "buy in". Thus far, from the Delta Vision Process through the BDCP process, the Delta region has been given no incentive to do so. The Delta Vision Foundation, and all the "leaders" purporting to solve the co-equal goals need to re-think water supply realities. The resource is limited and oversubscribed.

2012 Delta Vision Report Card

58. Needs strong leadership and the ability to make unpopular decisions.
59. Study a range of water supply goals along with a range of environmental goals. Be open to all possibilities and ultimately adopt an adaptive approach with agreed upon triggers that make adjustments to things that man has control over.
60. Review and implement some of the pre-storage conditions.