

From: Richard M. Frank
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2008 05:27 PM Pacific Standard Time
To: Mike Chrisman
Cc: Phil Isenberg
Subject: Reactions to Delta Vision Committee Staff Report

Mike-

I assume you're in Poland by now, effectively representing the State of California's climate change-related interests there. On a related point, I enjoyed your op-ed piece in last Saturday's Sacramento Bee.

I want to take this opportunity to share with you the fact that I wholly agree with and support the comments DVTF Chair Phil Isenberg presented to the Delta Vision Committee at its most recent meeting. Additionally, I wanted to share with you some of my own concerns about the Committee staff draft:

- * In all candor, I think the staff draft is quite timid, esp. re: governance questions that are at the heart of the DVTF recommendations. It seems to authorize existing state agencies to proceed with Delta-related projects to which they're already committed, while ignoring the more controversial aspects of state agency reform and reorganization that the Task Force recommended.
- * The staff draft, in my view, places undue reliance on the BDCP process. While that process is a commendable and necessary one, I believe it is not nearly as broad as the approach advocated by the Task Force. A long-term restoration of the Delta ecosystem will require much more than compliance with the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, for example. Additionally, the focus of the Task Force has been on the co-equal goals of reliable water supply and a restored Delta ecosystem. I fear, by contrast, that the BDCP process will view remediation efforts in the far more traditional sense--simply as mitigation for existing or contemplated water diversion projects.
- * With respect, the Delta Policy Group proposed in the Committee staff report does not appear to represent a serious effort to address necessary Delta governance problems. In my view, the suggestion that the Policy Group develop MOUs with local governments in the Delta strikes me as simply a perpetuation of the status quo--i.e., fractured, ineffective governance.
- * The proposed direction to the Water Board and Department of Fish and Game to take action on certain issues such as water flows is most welcome. But the absence in the staff draft of any aggressive timetable within which to accomplish those objectives seems to me a major omission. Other positive staff

recommendations--e.g., the proposal to obtain new legislative authority to allow the Board to undertake comprehensive water monitoring, reporting and enforcement--would also benefit from more aggressive but feasible timetables.

In conclusion, much of the specific content of the Task Force's Vision Statement and Strategic Plan is absent from the Committee staff draft. Like my Task Force colleagues, I believe the former recommendations are worthy of support and implementation. I urge you and your colleagues on the Committee to embrace that view when you adopt your recommendations for the Governor and Legislature.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. And safe travels!

Rick

--

Richard M. Frank
Executive Director
California Center for Environmental Law & Policy School of Law
University of California Berkeley, CA 94720-7200