Edmund-
I listened to the ISB meeting last Thursday, especially to the Tunnel item discussion. Its probably better that I wasn’t signed up to make comments since I have had a chance to collect my thoughts which I would ask you to convey to the members.
I was dumb-struck by what I perceived to be the following assertions by Ms. Buckman and Mr. Singh:
That the current drought is not part of the baseline condition to be considered.
That climate change is “future conditions” that need not be addressed.
That fishery conditions are not part of the project purposes, which are limited to SWP water supply, and need not be considered.
That water supply availability can take supposed additional storage projects and revisions to regulatory standards into account.
That problems will be addressed by a “real time management approach” as they occur.
The ISB has recently spoken on the subject of water supply reliability with considerable expertise and clarity. If its recommendations are applied to the SWP and CVP it will be clear that both projects have relied upon a water supply in their promises to their contractors which doesn’t actually exist.
Questions raised by ISB members during the presentation will, if factually addressed, reveal that the Tunnel Project is an anachronism and a clear squandering of funds that could be used to actually address the water needs of the State.
The reluctance of the presenters to schedule the NOP date starting the comment period further hampers the ability of the ISB, and the rest of us to read, analyze and comment upon the EIR (a massive undertaking) when it is thrust upon us, especially if its comment period overlaps the NEPA analysis as well.
The ISB is to be complimented upon its preparations for the upcoming task(s) and its sensitivity to the real issues exhibited by its preliminary concerns expressed in the meeting.
Thank you.
Tom Zuckerman