

Ballanti, Rachel

From: john@████████.com
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2012 8:27 PM
To: California Water Commission
Subject: CWC Draft Strategic Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Sir;

Here are some comments a few of us in the high desert put together regarding the California Water Commission Draft Strategic Plan.

1. Page 7 WATER SUPPLY RELIABILITY discussion lacks reference to our states' collective history of struggling to comprehensively understand the delicate balance of water in the California basins and our neighboring states and the impact regional decisions have had which may have been beneficial for one area, yet detrimental to others (hard to guess we are from the desert, huh?). We dont suggest any changes to wording to give due to that facet of the history of water management in California, but do suggest the end of the 2nd sentence in water supply reliability be changed to ... "Significant investments are needed to expand and upgrade aging infrastructure, including the State Water Project, Delta conveyance, and regional projects to better address local water needs for all California regions." ... in order to emphasize that the CWC is for all of California, not just select areas.

B Further, we would like the last sentence in this section to explain what is included in the phrase, "deteriorating levee system". For instance, is the Los Angeles Aqueduct included? If the CWC Draft Strategic Plan intends to include the LA Aqueduct in the "deteriorating levee system" and thus included as a potential project for investment, then we disagree. The LA aqueduct should not be state supported, but should be state monitored, just as any infrastructure development within the state (houses, buildings, roads) are monitored & regulated, but not all are funded by the state.

C 2. Page 10 CWC Figure. All of the entities named (in the circles) are stakeholders. Naming "Stakeholders" as a separate stakeholder seems redundant. Further, the inclusion of the PUBLIC is not the same as the PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA, as the PUBLIC includes all persons in California, including tourists, visitors, traveling persons (truckdrivers driving through), etc. The PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA are "California Residents" and are collectively a distinct subset of the PUBLIC, and a stakeholder. California Businesses (or any legal entity) also are a distinct subset of state and local interests. We would like to see "Stakeholders" replaced with the "California Residents" and another circle, showing "California Businesses" added.

- D 3. Making changes to Figure on Page 10 may cause a change to Figure on page 12, but we dont see a need to change the big circles on page 12.
4. Page 17: Goal 1, Strategy A. Inform & engage public on water issues. This strategy lacks discussion of capturing metrics on the planned work. In other words, the CWC will engage the public and listen to commentary/input on additional facilities to the SWP. However, how will the CWC defend that this process is of value for the stakeholders in the long run? Nothing to change in the wording wrt this concern, just a question of what methods for capturing value added and defending that this is a good process will the CWC use in their strategy. And in concert with Strategy C. --> Possibly, a web database presence, which allows capturing input on specific issues, germane to regions, etc. might be useful. Could capture (1) concern, (2) recommendations, (3) CWC review considerations, (4) dispensation, (5) score as to whether this captured concern added significantly to improving the final management of the SWP or was simply improving understanding for the stakeholders (could even categorize which kind of stakeholder)
- E
- F
- G 5. Page 17: Goal 1, Strategy A. As stated above, only captures public engagement wrt the SWP. What about other water issues within the state. For instance the Mono Basin, thru to the Imperial Valley. Is the CWC not responsible for overseeing decisions in this area?
- H 6. Page 19. Same comment as above re SWP. What about water management decisions in areas of the state that are not germane within the SWP reach (Tahoe to Imperial Valley, etc.).
- I 7. Page 20 Goal 3: Is the purpose to support sustainable management of water or support management of water to achieve sustainable water? we suggest changing this goal to ... "develop and support water management policies that result in a sustainable and healthy water infrastructure and a healthy environment."
- J 8. Page 21: Goal 3: All Strategies, and most poignantly Strategy A: "Policy Leader" ... it would seem that the CWC is only a source of influence if it has no arbitrating authority over other California Water agencies (DWR, local districts and boards).
- K 9. Page 21: Goal 3: Strategy B: The Strategy to develop Strategies is redundant. Do you mean top level intentions on how to go about it? or deciding where to establish / build-up storage? What might be good to say here is ... "Commission will oversee and review systems analysis of water storage options, vet final results through public discussions, and advance good management of water storage investments."
- L With regard SBX7-2, this is no longer the name of the bill, which has been retired for now... need to correct wording here to represent the upcoming 2014 pending bill. perhaps simply delete "... and, if the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Act of 2012 (SBX7-2) is passed," ... and state "When funded by the legislature, the Commission

will select water management projects ... " (notice we increased the scope from water storage to water management projects).

M We would like assurance that this infrastructure improvement Goal (all of the strategies in Goal 3) will consider all of California, not just those areas fed by the SWP.

Thank you...

A bunch of guys, unofficially hanging around the garage...

Inyokern CA