

I'm Martin Gothberg,

Thank you for your time and service to our community.

I am taking a day off work to be here to let you know my thinking on your joining the lawsuit against the Bay-Delta Plan.

I understand you feel justified in doing so, but it is a mistake.

You are by implication getting in bed with the wrong people.

I was at the State Water Board Hearing in Merced in 2017.

I listened to about 30 politicians speak in angry defiance to the Board against the plan.

One, stewing in vitriol and what sounded like a lot of hatred inspired by Trump, loudly threatened to 'unleash the dogs of war'.

None one in his cohort stood up to say he had crossed the line.

Imagine hearing that knowing it would soon be your turn to speak as the lone voice for the plan.

I maintained perspective knowing that Merced County was especially hurting economically yet I still asked for a police escort to my car.

We are not Merced County. We don't issue threats.

I'd rather we 'release the dogs of therapy' and work with the State Water Resource Control Board.

But first you should drop your lawsuit. It is based on incomplete and bad science (example):

One of the first statements I heard from staff at the January Water Commission meeting was a falsehood that the SFPUC has been called out on many times. How unoriginal.

Until flow, adequate to restore our salmon-based ecosystem is guaranteed, I will see you at the ballot box and oppose measures that favor water for growth over restoration.

Perhaps you have read the letters to the Mercury News after your OpEd.

I am not alone in opposing your misguided efforts.

Thank you again for your time.

Letters to the editor

the views of at least one of its constituent cities.

Palo Alto City Council views differ from water district's — *Dave Warner, Palo Alto*

Regarding the opinion piece, “Why Santa Clara Valley Water District filed lawsuit against California” (Mercurynews.com, Feb. 5), the water district's conclusions are surprising.

The Palo Alto City Council heard from both sides, the water suppliers and the environmentalists. They concluded that the risks to the water supply were minimal, that the state water board's proposal was badly needed and voted unanimously to support the state water board's plan.

Clearly the Santa Clara Valley Water District's views do not reflect

Thursday, 02/07/2019 Pag.A08 Copyright (c)2019 The Mercury News, Edition. Please review new arbitration language here. 2/7/2019

Supposed science against more flows a red herring

Re: “Opinion: Why Santa Clara Valley Water District filed lawsuit against California” (Mercurynews.com, Feb. 5): Much can be done to decrease water use: recycling and reuse. There’s no need to use clean mountain water to water our golf courses and lawns. Increased use of groundwater has limited potential as the state now restricts overdrawn of aquifers, so little risk of subsidence of land.

The supposed science against more flows is a red herring, like Trump’s fake news. Scientists at all levels — federal, state, local, nonprofit and academic — support increasing freshwater flows. I have yet to see much science that says otherwise, although it’s always bandied about. While there are a few small projects, they have failed to pan out. Just ask the SFPUC about its two decades of attempting to support its supposed “science.”

— *Chris Gilbert, Berkeley*

Friday, 02/08/2019 Pag.A08 Copyright (c)2019 The Mercury News, Edition. Please review new arbitration language here. 2/8/2019

Letters to the editor**SCVWD should support fish runs, withdraw suit**

Re: "Why Santa Clara Valley Water District filed lawsuit against California" (Opinion section, Feb. 5): Maybe Norma Camacho knows something about water agencies, but she sure doesn't know much about salmon.

Camacho could easily check salmon returns two years after wet water years and she'd see the number of salmon returning as adults always increases in response.

It's true that Central Valley salmon would also benefit from restored habitat, but the value of fast, turbid flows in delivering baby salmon to the ocean, safe from predators, is welldocumented.

The Santa Clara Valley Water District's lawsuit against the State Water

Board's recent decision to increase river flows ignores the years of science that clearly support the water board's decision. Camacho should stick to what she knows and Santa Clara Valley Water District should support California's salmon runs and withdraw its ill-advised lawsuit. — *John McManus, executive director, Golden Gate Salmon Association, Pacifica*

Water District imperils bay, Delta, future water supply

Re: “Why Santa Clara Valley Water District filed lawsuit against California” (Opinion section, Feb. 5): The Santa Clara Valley Water District’s op-ed in Tuesday’s paper serves the purpose of shooting the Water District and the rest of us in the foot.

The water district’s efforts to take more and more water out of the San Francisco Bay and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta to promote neverending growth serves to not only further damage the West Coast’s most important aquatic ecosystem but to also jeopardize future water supplies for those who live here now and for those who will inherit the further damaged bay and Delta in the future.

— *Les Kishler, Los Gatos*

Sunday, 02/10/2019 Pag.A14 Copyright (c)2019 The Mercury News, Edition. Please review new arbitration language here. 2/10/2019

Water district actions don't reflect community values

Re: "Why water district filed a lawsuit against California": I've been to State Water Board hearings and have been impressed by the science that went into the Bay-Delta plan.

Environmental groups and fish and wildlife agencies support the state's science. On the other hand, the SFPUC's science has not been peer reviewed, is junk science aimed at producing a convenient conclusion.

The water district hasn't done any of its own analysis, at least no evidence of original thought was presented at the January SCVWD board meeting I attended. The river needs both flow and non-flow measures. The state water board incentivizes this by creating a flow range — 30 percent to 50 percent.

If the non-flow measures work, then less water will be required. If water agencies are confident their measures will work,

they should embrace this approach. Floodplain habitat without inundation doesn't work. I'm disappointed in the water district for suing over environmental protections and acting against the values of the community it serves.

— *Martin Gothberg, Santa Clara*