State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)

1001 I Street

Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Policy Statement Opposing SWRCB Granting Permits To The Department of Water Resources (DWR) For The California Water Fix's Proposed Water Diversion Infrastructure.

Dear SWRCB Board Members:

1) Totally ignored in the EIR for this project, have been the Energy Requirements, and the subsequent Environmental Pollution to California.

Currently 20% of the energy consumed in California goes to water pumping and treatment. The single biggest user of electricity in the State, is the State Aqueduct. The plans for the proposed Tunnels, and overall System, indicate total pump requirements, of 3 to 5 times the size of this Aqueduct.

Over 50 % of California's energy used, comes from Coal, and Gas Power Plants.

EPA states that “The scrubbers at Power plants are the nation’s biggest producer of toxic waste in water”, and that "Emissions of nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, and particulate matter by these Plants, represent a significant contribution to air pollution in each state”,

This does not even address the water pollution created by the fracking fluids in gas extraction.

Based on these figures, Power Plants, will have to be built and run, at taxpayers expense, just for this project.

I have repeatedly requested that energy and pollution figures be assessed and included in a Environmental Report, but have been totally ignored. (See attached questions).

The effects of these to our environment, and our health, are of significant concern to the majority of Californians.
You can stop this happening and change the future policy direction, to a more intelligent one.

2) What really bothers me though is:

Why are we even considering the Tunnels? We are not facing reality - even man made global warming deniers, say that we will experience a warming spell for a long time to come. Why aren't we investing Californian Taxpayer's money, wisely?

A transfer of water that benefits one farming community in the south, over another, in the North, is not a sustainable, long term, solution. Especially when their water pumping is being subsidized by our Taxes, and the costs hidden in the records (I have seen), at the SWRCB.

Why aren't we facing reality; California is warming. We need to stop projects like this and invest in water conservation methods.

We have a perfectly good water conveyance system right now, (that could probably do with expanded winter storage), but the reality is that we really need is efficiency, local water storage, water conservation projects, water recycling, grey water landscape irrigation, groundwater recharging, desalination projects, stormwater capture and reuse, tiered, (unsubsidized), water rates, to reduce wasteful use, cooling tower water conservation projects, water efficiency audits (and suggested solution) task forces.

Look what Orange County have done with their water recycling project - amazing.

Farmers should be encouraged to stop growing water intensive crops, especially when they seem to be mainly for export, increase the adoption of more efficient watering and drip irrigation systems, and to retire off areas that are fast becoming desert, or that require large amounts of water to dilute selenium and other salts. Maybe incentives for farmers to install Photovoltaic panels on these retired fields, would provide a long term replacement, income.

We should be supporting high efficiency residential and commercial water fixtures such as low flow toilets, sinks, shower heads, landscape irrigation, etc, (which actually pay for themselves through lower water rates), and so many other solutions.

Even buying everyone in California a duel flush toilet, would save more water, tax payers money, and create more jobs, than this boondoggle, corporate welfare project.

I requesting that you not approved DWR permits for additional water diversions in the North Delta, and instead encourage all the suggested forward thinking, sustainable alternatives.

With respect,
William Brooks,
3241 Becerra Way, Sacramento, CA 95821 27th July 2016

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Unanswered Environmental Impact Report questions:
1st requested Dec/15/2011

THE PROPOSED DELTA WATER CONVEYANCE SYSTEM:

Total Proposed Energy requirements for the whole project (for complete source to receiver (max/min/mean): _____/_____/_____ kWh / acre foot of H2O

Total Proposed Pump capacity for the complete system (source to receiver) (max/min/mean): _____/_____/_____ m3 per second

Anticipated yearly INCREASES in EPA listed, environmental pollutants, due to the necessary power generation, for whole Conveyance System (source to receiver?)

Power Plant Wastewater (dissolved):
Aluminum: _____
Arsenic: _____
Barium: _____
Boron: _____
Chromium: _____
Iron: _____
Manganese: _____
Cadmium: _____
Magnesium: _____
Mercury: _____
Nickel: _____
Other heavy metals: _____

Power Plants - Air Pollution:
Nitrogen Oxides: _____
Carbon Monoxide: _____
Carbon Dioxide: _____
Sulfur Oxides: _____
Hydrocarbons: _____
Particulate matter: _____

Gas extraction and Fracking Water Table Pollution:
Formaldehyde: _____ Methanol: _____ Diesel: _____ Naphthalene: _____
BTEX compound group (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene):
_____,_____,_____,_____
Kerosene: _____
2-BE: _____
Ethylene glycol: _____