Clifton Court, L.P.
3619 Land Park Drive
Sacramento, CA 95818
(916) 448-7102

April 2, 2018

CWF Hearing Officers
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

Dear CWF Hearing Officers,

For over nine years, I've looked at thousands of pages of reports and documents; studied the nine projects presented; and focused on the CWF's carefully chosen project 4A H3+. At the beginning of the hearing before I submitted my testimony, DWR assured Hearing Officers that all of my farm would be taken for the CWF. In fact, because our property was going to be condemned, DWR deemed that CCLP really would not be harmed at all. DWR spent thousands of hearing hours telling us why 4A H3+ was the best choice and deserved the public trust.

On March 23, 2018, DWR released six pages of proposed engineering refinements to limit potential effects of construction. It is unclear if DOI approves of these refinements. DWR provided a table of information with the broad disclaimer, "Modification to project components would, in some cases, result in changes to how components would be constructed." I am not sure what this means nor how it would affect my rights. I also found the table confusing, so I arranged most of DWR's information by topic.

<u>Tunnels Moved</u>
Many miles of tunnels will be moved. There is very little exact details and none of the tunnels are moved for geotechnical reasons. Tunnels will be moved between Intake 3 and the IF and on Staten, Bouldin, Venice, and Victoria Islands.

<u>Shafts Shifted</u>
On Statin Island – N. shaft moved 4+ miles, S. shaft moved 3+ miles. Two more shafts will be shifted on Bouldin & Mandenville Islands

Tunnel Muck

It is unknown what % of the muck that would create 13 Great Pyramids of Giza would be located at each site.

- Bouldin Island - muck area moved to vague North area.
- Intermediate Forebay – some muck areas moved, some muck areas added.
- Byron Tract – Muck area moved North of the New Terminal Forebay – much closer to Discovery Bay

Clifton Court Forebay

No changes made to "existing" conditions of the dam known as Clifton Court Forebay. The 50 year old Forebay, which was built without an EIR/EIS, will continue to kill up to 98% of the fish that enter the Forebay. Although the dam was shut down for emergency repairs in March 2017, DWR appears confident that the numerous problems with the dam (structural, silt, and fish mortality) will best be solved by doing nothing.

New Terminal Forebay

Byron Tract – the new forebay is located in what was to be a muck area. The forebay is moved away from Kings Island . DWR claims this improves construction access. It is unknown what sort of traffic studies have been conducted to reach this conclusion. Since the Clifton Court Forebay was built 50 years ago, this region has become a major Bay Area bedroom community (Discovery Bay 13,352 (2010); Byron 1,277 (2010); Mountain House 9,675 (2010); Tracy 89,274 (2016); Brentwood 60,532 (2016). By comparison, the population in the area around 1968 was about Byron 300, Tracy 15,000, and Brentwood 3,000. Discovery Bay and Mountain House did not exist. The roads in the area (Byron Hwy & Hwy 4) have not changed much and the narrow mainly two lane roads are heavily impacted by commuters.

New Canal(s)

Again it is unknown what sort of traffic studies have been done for the construction of these two New Canals.

- The New Canal between the New Terminal Forebay and the CA Aqueduct crosses the Byron Hwy at an unknown spot
- The location of the New Canal between the SWP & CVP pumping is vague.

Power Lines

- New power lines will follow the canal alignment and the west and north side of the New Terminal Forebay. Vague information and unknown impact on local residents.

These many changes create a whole new project. I won't insult the Hearing Officers intelligence by pretending these are refinements. However, Mr. Mizell claims that the refinements are merely engineering details that CWF may or may not use. My farm's very existence appears to be based on a whim.

How can legal users of water, recreational users of water, and protectors of endangered wildlife accurately portray the injury that will be caused by the CWF if DWR completely changes the project? My testimony and cross examination in Part One and Two of the CWF would have been very different if I had known about these "refinements". I will be denied my rights as a legal and recreational user of water to take part in the hearings on the actual project that affects me if these hearings proceed. I ask that the Hearing Officers require a new hearing to give all users of water the right to evaluate and decide whether the newly proposed CWF project is carefully and thoughtfully planned; worthy of public trust; and will harm no legal users of water, recreational users of water, or wildlife.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Womack