To:MWD Board Members [12/8/20 Meeting].12/2/20FROM:Jim BlickenstaffRE.Planning Costs/Options For Delta Convenance Project

Please consider either Option 3, or preferably, Option 4. The pretext of details presented only for options related to promoting and proceeding with a Delta Tunnel system is misguided, as to its inferred bias toward just a single, focused, water solution for MWD perceived needs. A bias that goes back decades, and has become seriously out dated, and inconsistent with current and future water sourcing challenges.

At best, a tunnel to drain water from the Delta more efficiently, is an expensive, short term 'solution.' With a permanent and costly negative impact on the fragile Delta eco-system, and it's dependent regional economies. Climate change and decades of water exports, have removed the Delta water source as a long term answer for

MWD needs. A systemic momentum for more of the same kind of solutions has to be confronted, at some point, for it's growing limitations – even, irrelevance.

The future is not chasing dwindling and unpredictable natural drainage sources, or tunnels to tap those sources. And there are viable options, but it will require a difficult but absolutely necessary, re-direction of MWD's efforts and outlook.

Additionally, there will be a CEQA issue with Option 1 or 2 as to their being a contributing factor to overall inducement of the environmentally complex and impacting Delta Conveyance Project.

For the time being, please look seriously at Option 4. It will demonstrate a

willingness to broaden the Board's scope of opportunities for answering long term MWD needs, while not getting caught up in a narrow focus on 'minutia' about only one, out of date, aspect of addressing these needs.

Thank You. -- Jim Blickenstaff