



October 28, 2015

BDCP/WaterFix Comments
P.O. Box 1919
Sacramento, CA 95812
BDCPComments@icfi.com

RE: Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft
Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) for California Water Fix

To whom it may concern:

The Center for Food Safety (CFS) is a national non-profit public interest and environmental advocacy organization working to protect human health and the environment by curbing the use of harmful food production technologies and by promoting organic and other forms of sustainable agriculture. CFS has more than 500,000 members throughout the United States, with offices in San Francisco; Portland, Oregon; Honolulu; and Washington, D.C.

CFS submits these comments on the Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) for the project previously known as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, and now known as California Water Fix. CFS is opposed to Alternative 4A and urges the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Bureau of Reclamation (Bureau) to select the no-project alternative and abandon the flawed tunnels project.

In general, Alternative 4A represents a near-total capitulation to the wishes of southern San Joaquin Valley agribusiness interests. Both DWR and the Bureau have long acted as agents of these special interests, in a manner far out of proportion to their contributions to the statewide and regional economy. This is especially true considering the recent shift in the southern San Joaquin Valley from row crops and rangeland to tree crops and other "permanent" crops. The shift to tree crops in the southern San Joaquin Valley has greatly padded corporate profits, but has also hardened demand for Delta exports, dramatically reducing what flexibility existed in the State Water Project and Central Valley Project. The Delta ecosystem and the communities dependent on the Delta as a functioning, sustainable shared resource have suffered as a result.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
660 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, Suite 302
Washington, D.C. 20003
T: 202-547-9359 F: 202-547-9429

CALIFORNIA OFFICE
303 Sacramento Street, 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
T: 415-826-2770 F: 415-826-0507

PACIFIC NORTHWEST OFFICE
917 SW Oak Street, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97205
T: 971-271-7372 F: 971-271-7374

HAWAII OFFICE
1132 Bishop Street, Suite 2107
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
T: 808-681-7688

office@centerforfoodsafety.org

centerforfoodsafety.org

Rather than spending billions of dollars to transport water hundreds of miles for the benefit of a few select politically-connected profiteers, we should focus on supporting sustainable agriculture, sustainable economies, true water supply enhancements, and a rational, equitable water infrastructure system. Alternative 4A is not the answer.

We offer the following specific observations and concerns, to supplement the many comments already received by concerned members of the public and interested organizations:

Alternative 4A does not meet the coequal goals of the Delta Reform Act.

Alternative 4A does not meet the coequal goals of the Delta Reform Act, particularly the goal of “protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem.” The RDEIR/SDEIS incorrectly states that Alternative 4A will “improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability...” (RDEIR/SDEIS at p. 4.1-1.) But by separating the tunnels portion of the project from the ecosystem restoration portion of the project, Alternative 4A makes compliance with the Delta Reform Act impossible. While Alternative 4A includes several “environmental commitments,” these are primarily focused on limited terrestrial habitat restoration projects. Not only are these restoration projects far too limited given the scope of the project, they fail to adequately address the largest consequence of the project: the removal of freshwater from the Delta ecosystem. The essence of the Delta as an ecosystem is its confluence of freshwater and saltwater. Removing large quantities of freshwater from that ecosystem will not only prevent the protection, restoration, and enhancement of the Delta but will have devastating consequences to the ecosystem and to the Delta economy. These consequences are almost completely ignored by Alternative 4A.

Alternative 4A does not address the severe over-allocation of Delta water.

A recent study by California Water Information Network demonstrated that consumptive water rights for water from the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins total five times the amount of water that is actually available in those systems. The Delta Vision Taskforce showed that there are 245 million acre feet of water rights in the Delta, which has average natural flows of only 29 million acre feet per year. And just within the State Water Project, water contractors hold contracts for at least twice as much water as the SWP can reliably provide each year. The cause of the disconnect between available water and allocated water – “paper water” – is based on both the incomplete build-out of water storage facilities in northern California and on the historical capture of state and federal water agencies by water contractors, primarily agribusiness interests in the southern San Joaquin Valley.

The RDEIR/SDEIS completely fails to address this fundamental problem. The RDEIR/SDEIS describes one project objective as being to “[r]estore and protect the ability of the SWP and CVP to deliver up to full contract amounts....” (RDEIR/SDEIS at p. 1-8; see also p. 1-9 [NEPA-related purpose statement].) But delivering full contact amounts is an illusory goal due to the incomplete build-out of the SWP system and the over-allocation of

the Sacramento and San Joaquin basins. To the extent the project provides a solution, it is merely to rob Peter to pay Paul: delivering full SWP and CVP contract amounts will require someone else getting less – far less – water in any given year. Identifying those water users who will suffer is easy: any non-SWP and non-CVP user south of the proposed water intake pipes will have to do with less, while the SWP and CVP contractors, holders of illusory paper water contracts for water that does not actually exist, will get a windfall. More likely, though, the water users south of the proposed intakes will continue to use their contracted and allocated amounts, kicking the suffering down the line to those users with the least political and economic power: the fish, birds, plants, and animals that make up the Delta ecosystem.

Alternative 4A fails to address the severe economic and ecological harm that will likely be caused by the tunnels project.

Dewatering the Delta at the scale envisioned by the tunnels project and described in Alternative 4A will result in significant salt water intrusion in the Delta ecosystem. Yet Alternative 4A euphemistically describes this change as a positive: “Alternative 4A would allow the Delta to be managed in a number of different ways, including maintaining salinity as it is currently managed or allowing salinity to fluctuate more freely in the Delta as it did prior to the development of upstream reservoirs.” (RDEIR/SDEIS at p. 4.3.25-9.) The suggestion is that the only thing blocking more natural fluctuations in salinity is the presence of the southern intake pumps and the need to transport water stored in northern reservoirs through the Delta, to those pumps. But the Delta was a significantly altered ecosystem even before the development of upstream reservoirs. A number of factors, including the drying up of much of the Delta with the building of levies, upstream consumption of water, and upstream water diversion by Bay Area communities, have had significant effects on natural salinity fluctuation in the Delta. And in turn, agricultural and residential/commercial development in the Delta and downstream have placed all sorts of constraints on the system to maintain a certain amount of freshwater at the expense of natural salinity fluctuation.

Alternative 4A proposes an incredibly expensive solution that attempts to address only one of these factors – the need to transport water from northern reservoirs to the southern SWP-CVP pumps – at the likely expense of the other users dependent on freshwater flows in the Delta. Any enhanced salinity fluctuation enabled by increased northern diversions caused by the tunnels project will be seen by downstream users as a negative, and they will likely work to prevent it, a fact the RDEIR/SDEIS misses. The result will be increased stress on an overstressed ecosystem, not increased management flexibility, as Alternative 4A promises.

The RDEIR/SDEIS also fails to adequately discuss the role of the tunnels in facilitating and encouraging north-south water transfers. The vast majority of these transfers are from agricultural users in the Sacramento Valley to agricultural users in the San Joaquin Valley, meaning that their purpose is to shift agricultural production from the north, where there is more water, to the south, where there is less. This is environmentally inefficient, and pencils out as economically efficient only because many of the costs of the

transfers are borne by taxpayers or spread among all water users, not borne solely by the recipients of the transferred water. The tunnels will increase the number and frequency of north-south water transfers by removing the natural impediment of the Delta. Moreover, transfers will increase exactly when the Delta and other ecosystems are in most need of water – when water is scarce and the value on the market makes such transfers economical to southern water users. This will exasperate the stress that is already present on sensitive species when water is scarce and could drive some species closer to extinction.

Increased north-south water transfers will have devastating impacts that are not adequately analyzed in the RDEIR/SDEIS. First, many, if not most, of the new water transfers will involve groundwater substitution. Increased groundwater pumping to facilitate water sales will result in depleted aquifers and groundwater subsidence. It will also result in dewatering of streams and rivers. The surface waterways of the Sacramento Valley are tightly connected to groundwater; surface water recharges groundwater aquifers while groundwater provides water for streams and rivers. Today, less than 30% of the consumptive water use in the Sacramento Valley is from groundwater. That percentage will certainly rise with the construction of the tunnels and the increased water transfers that will result, and with it land subsidence will increase and dewatering of rivers and streams will increase.

Separating groundwater and surface water through overpumping of groundwater to satisfy north-south water transfers facilitated by the tunnels will have devastating impacts on aquatic species and on terrestrial and avian species dependent on the surface aquatic ecosystems of the Sacramento Valley and the Delta (like the giant garter snake and migrating birds). These particular significant impacts are not explored in the RDEIR/SDEIS.

Land subsidence will have other devastating impacts, as is already evidenced in the San Joaquin Valley, where overpumping of groundwater has caused severe land subsidence. Impacts can include increased flooding; reduced freeboard and carrying capacity of canals, aqueducts, rivers, and flood control channels; damage to engineered structures like buildings, roads, bridges, pipelines, canals, aqueducts, levees, and wells; and loss of aquifer capacity.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the RDEIR/SDEIS.

Sincerely,



Adam Keats
Senior Attorney
Center for Food Safety
303 Sacramento St., 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
akeats@centerforfoodsafety.org
415-826-2770

From: Adam Keats <AKeats@CenterforFoodSafety.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 4:48 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Comments by Center for Food Safety
Attachments: Center for Food Safety Comments re BDCP CalWaterFix.pdf

Please find attached comments by the Center for Food Safety on the Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) for California Water Fix.

If you have any trouble opening the attachment, please do not hesitate to contact me.

--Adam

Adam Keats, Senior Attorney
Center for Food Safety
303 Sacramento Street, 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
415-826-2770 (main)
415-430-9403 (direct)
www.CenterForFoodSafety.org

October 27, 2015

To whom it may concern,

I am concerned and alarmed by your proposal for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan to redirect water from northern California to central and southern California.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. Additionally, the proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Redirecting water from the Delta will ruin the rich history of the region by destroying an ecosystem, which has supported a diversity of life. This proposed project would have catastrophic consequences on the region, specifically for farmers who support the communities in which they live. Siphoning off water from our region will only end up as a net loss for everyone involved.

I would encourage the Governor to look at reinforcing the existing aqueduct, and implementing rainwater collection alternatives; including the creation of storage capacity in the form of new dams and groundwater sustainability projects.

Sincerely,

Paul Brennan
5330 Harrison St
Linden, CA 95236

From: PAUL BRENNAN <ptbrennan@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:54 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Brennan: BDCP Opposition Letter
Attachments: BDCP Opp. Letter.docx

See attached.

From: Earthjustice <action@earthjustice.org> on behalf of Diana Curington
<info@earthjustice.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 12:56 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Oppose the Delta Tunnels/"California Water Fix" (Alternative 4A)

Oct 29, 2015

Bay Delta Conservation Plan
CA

Dear Conservation Plan,

Please don't do this Gov Brown! Save animals and protect wild spaces!

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels Plan.

The deceptively named "California Water Fix" does not address the multitude of adverse environmental, public health, and economic impacts the proposed Delta tunnels project would cause. Further, the plan ignores alternatives that would save California tax- and ratepayers billions of dollars, while investing in jobs and local water sources that build sustainability, instead of severely damaging the Delta and Bay ecosystems.

I urge you not to permit the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A) project to move forward.

Sincerely,

Ms. Diana Curington
540 Greenside Ave
Portsmouth, NH 03801-4721
c.curington@comcast.net

From: Earthjustice <action@earthjustice.org> on behalf of Annie Malone
<info@earthjustice.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:26 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Oppose the Delta Tunnels/"California Water Fix" (Alternative 4A)

Oct 28, 2015

Bay Delta Conservation Plan
CA

Dear Conservation Plan,

We need to sustain our environment and not allow exploitation for profit.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels Plan.

The deceptively named "California Water Fix" does not address the multitude of adverse environmental, public health, and economic impacts the proposed Delta tunnels project would cause. Further, the plan ignores alternatives that would save California tax- and ratepayers billions of dollars, while investing in jobs and local water sources that build sustainability, instead of severely damaging the Delta and Bay ecosystems.

I urge you not to permit the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A) project to move forward.

Sincerely,

Ms. Annie Malone
3506 Myrtle Ave
Long Beach, CA 90807-4642
aaamalone@msn.com

From: Holliday Cullimore <hcullimore@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 11:21 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: BDCP Comment: Opposed

California Water Fix fails to maintain co-equal goals for sustaining a water source for California and maintaining or improving the habitat and water quality in the Delta.

Water quality in the Delta is degraded and is getting worse. Ca. Water Fix fails to address this issue in any meaningful way; it blatantly violates the Delta Protection Act and the EPA Clean Water Act. The salinity in Suisun Marsh at Rush Ranch is twice what it was last year at this time and is indicative of what flows will be like with the tunnels in place. The x-2 salinity line is moving further east with the drought. We need freshwater flows to keep the salt out. Taking water out above the Delta and shipping it through tunnels around the Delta to pumps further south is not going to help mitigate water quality issues at all. This affects drinking water for those in the Delta and beyond as well as habitat for wild mammals, fish, birds, and Delta farmers.

3. Habitat quality is drastically reduced in this new plan. Less than a quarter of what was originally proposed will be "rehabilitated." This plan is focused on moving water south with minimum expense to restoration.
4. Reduced water flows in the Delta will further decimate wild native fish populations, fail to provide habitat for migrating birds, reduce the amount of sediment "dropped" in the Delta and Bay which is needed for wetlands which will be essential in coping with climate change as salt water level increases. The only thing likely to increase are the algae blooms in the Delta.
4. The CA. Water Fix will not supply enough dependable water for agriculture in the Central Valley. (Even Kern County Water Agency has made note of that!)
5. This is an economic boondoggle starting at \$2 billion and projected to end up around \$62 billion when interested is added in. All that for degraded habitat, ecological disaster, and no more fresh water for anyone.
6. The degraded water quality and reduced flows in the Delta will irreparably harm the Northern California economy because recreation of all types that make the Delta a popular destination will diminish as the water quality and flow worsens. There will be a ripple effect. It will also damage the salmon, crab, and other fisheries off the coast because the Bay and Delta serve as nurseries for young species caught in the ocean.

Thank you for taking the time to read my post.

Sincerely,

Holliday Cullimore

From: Nancy Praizler <praizlermom@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 6:52 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: BDCP/WaterFix

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the BDCP/WaterFix proposed by Governor Brown. This is a bad plan that will lead to mismanagement of our precious, scarce water resources. It will drain the Sacramento River, our creeks, streams, and our aquifers. Our farmers and residences will suffer from depleted aquifers as will our north state economies, environment, and communities. A similar plan - called the Peripheral Canal - was rejected by voters many years ago and we continue to oppose this plan. Our water resource is precious and we will fight to protect it from politically-motivated, bad plans such as this one.

Sincerely,

Nancy Praizler
Chico, CA

From: mgoblegmc <mgoblegmc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 7:58 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Ca Water Fix

To Whom It May Concern,

Jerry Brown has been a decent governor, but he is dead wrong with his tunnel plan.

These tunnels will not generate more water. The water currently pumped from the delta is already UNACCEPTABLY LARGE and has resulted in jellyfish in Stockton, year round seal populations are ALREADY deep into the delta, and saltwater intrusion is way too far inland.

Yes, we send fresh water out to sea. It's supposed to go there, and a lot more of it is supposed to be with it, it's the way mother nature intended. Salmon rely on the smell of their home turf water to guide them back to their spawning grounds.

The peripheral canal was voted down decades ago. The agrigreed has worked around environmental rules for too long. The California delta is one of two on the planet, and it's not right to destroy what's left of it.

If this project t is so very necessary, let's add some legislation to it. Let's make clean, fresh water a right for all human beings in this state, and make it illegal to buy and sell water for profit. Seriously. No more water profits. I bet the tunnel plan will suddenly become unnecessary.

Make farmers grow crops suitable for the area they are grown in. No more rice crops in the desert areas. Only water sipping plants, and if the land is not suitable for the crops allowed, it should be retired and turned into a solar energy field.

It would make more sense to transport the water on our new bullet train. Governor Moonbeam has balanced the budget, which is why he was elected. It's time to stop trying to make some kind of name for himself and do the job we pay him for.

Mark Goble.

From: R. R. <rrly951@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:21 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Comment - The California Water Fix

I would like to go on record in opposition to the California Water Fix, Delta Tunnels Project.

This project has not been properly presented to the public in such a manner as to see true benefits for Northern and Southern California. There are no guarantees as to the true positive affect this project will have on local communities, farms, wildlife and fish. Also, no assurances that the project will come in under budget and meet all deadlines. The cost, known and unknown, is not balanced by the projected end result. The State of California has a fragile budget, and environment. We cannot risk damaging either.

Sincerely,
Richard Riley
Stockton, CA

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Connie Skoog <cmskoog@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 4:18 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Comment on RDEIR/SDEIS from voting Californian

Dear Decision Makers,

I will make this as short as I can, considering how strongly I feel about it. First, I want you to know that I read as much of this revised report as I could. I read all of the "Overview of Key Revisions" and read more in depth on the subjects closest to my heart and mind.

Perhaps a brief story will help you understand my reaction to this misguided, outrageously expensive, obsolete solution. Before our first typhoon, after recently moving to Taiwan, my husband and I argued as to whether we should simply tie up or take down our new sun room shades. Shortly thereafter, we lost our roof, our garage and that sun room. Your organizations have been arguing about what to do about our shades (I attended many meetings to witness these spats) whilst ignoring the oncoming typhoon!!!!

Though you may feel that you have cloaked this revised document with enough verbiage about the environment and the condition of the Delta's farms businesses and fisheries to fool people into thinking you care about these vital interests, it is clear that your goal is to be able to provide "full contract amounts" per "existing agreements" to inherited "rights" of the lucky few, many of whom are the generous benefactors of elected officials. You clarified that these full contract amounts would be delivered only if there is any water available. If we are to actually provide a **California Waterfix**, that is where we need to start the fixing. I know that water rights are considered sacrosanct, and I sympathize with those who have inherited water and live off of it...by reselling it with enormous markups....but those contracts were made in a different era, and many would not stand up in today's environment. We need a new plan for water rights....PERIOD.

When I read that the RDEIR/SDEIS would present some "ALTERNATIVES," I was encouraged. Finally, they are considering the alternatives to those incredibly expensive tunnels that will sit empty for at least 1/3 of the time (at today's drought rate). No. You were just considering different places for the tunnels, ways to implement the tunnels, and so on.

This revised plan is little different in it's efficiency in addressing environmental, public health and economic impacts. ES 1.2.2 exemplifies your perception of the environmental crisis: "minimizes or avoids adverse effects....to listed species." How about RESTORES OR REVIVES EXISTING SPECIES???? The sneaky way you have held your "informative meetings" shows how little you want the public to really understand what this will mean to users (ratepayers) in California.

As far as economic impacts go....the farmers, businesses in recreation and tourism, and especially fishermen would like you to look at what they contribute to California's economy!!! The signs on 5 and 99 lament the loss of jobs in the central valley. Antonio Cortes of the UFW stated that 90% of the workers his union represents in California are undocumented workers. So how many JOBS held by US citizens will be lost if some of the farmland (especially impaired land with rising saline) is retired and used for wind farms, solar farms and other profitable uses (which will need workers)???

You are well-acquainted with the real alternatives to these tunnels. If you really think these tunnels will cost \$15 billion after all is said and done, I have a gorgeous bridge I would like to sell

you..... The estimated \$60 billion could be spent on increasing usable water through recycling, raising the aquifers and increasing each county's water independence; that's when we will find a real Waterfix for California.

Do not spend another taxpayer dollar studying this ridiculous plan. No more revised reports, alternative ways to waste taxpayers money. Give us some new state-of-the-art scientific ideas and a real California Waterfix.

Sincerely yours,

Connie Skoog
5220 Sandmound Blvd
Oakley, CA 94561

From: Lowell Grant <c21vintage@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 2:47 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Comment on water tunnels

This project verges on insanity, promising to divert water from the delta that may never flow downstream for lack of runoff/rainfall in the hotter, drier climate of the future. If it were to be built, the taxpayers of California will all be forced to share the costs for the benefit of a very few, which is absurd.

I have a suggested alternative that makes perfect sense. Take half the amount of money, cover the canal system with solar panels or thin film solar, which will reduce evaporation, leaving more water to be put to ag use, use the electricity to cover all of DWRs power needs as well as producing enough electricity to power massive desal plants along the coasts near major metro areas, again, leaving more water for ag purposes. This would also be a great job training program, would reduce the cost of solar for all of us, due to economies of scale and will work better in the hotter, drier climate of the future.

Lowell Grant
1800 Zablo Lane
Upper Lake, CA 95485

From: Rick Auerbach <ricauerbach@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 1:55 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Comment Opposing Proposed Twin Delta Tunnels

I would like to go on record as opposing the plan to build two large tunnels underneath the Delta to carry water to to uses in the Central Valley and Southern California.

My opposition is based on two points:

- 1.) There is not enough water to both support the health of the Delta and to supply water to users further south with the magnitude of the proposed tunnels.
- 2.) Before risking the health of ecosystems and agriculture in the areas where water originates, all reasonable conservation methods should first be instituted.
California has not done this thus far - much, much more can be done. Reducing river and Delta flows to irrigate golf courses in the desert climate of Southern California makes no sense.

Sincerely,
Rick Auerbach

From: Diana Grossi <nonnapapag@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 3:54 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Delta Estuary

You can't take anymore water from our delta without destroying the habitat. Please do not support the twin tunnels project.

Sent from my iPhone

From: William Knaus <knaus@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 6:35 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Delta Tunnel Project

This project is misguided. Should it come to fruition, it will kill the ecology of not only the Delta, but the San Francisco Bay and Northern California fisheries. It will not be reversible. California's water needs will not be fixed by this measure. Instead of spending billions of dollars building tunnels, implement the needed water conservation measures throughout Southern California and start building the desalination facilities that this state needs for its future. Don't reek havoc on our environment. We are already losing the fish, crabs, and many other species of animals by previous disregard of the environment. Please rethink your actions. You must agree. Our children's State is in your hands.

Sincerely

Bill & Lynn Knaus
Delta & Bay Advocates

From: Linda Vetter <silvercharm@pacbell.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 5:01 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Delta Tunnels

We don't need delta tunnels shipping more water south. It is time we got smarter instead of continuing old technology and worked at conserving water, desalinization and recycling the water each region of California already has. Taking more water from the Delta risks salt water intrusion further up into the Delta than we have now. The tunnels likely will lead to a ruined Delta for future generations.

Linda Vetter
216 Finger Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94062

From: Steve Gurnari <gurnarilandscape@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 5:56 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: delta tunnels

As a child I recall the San Francisco Bay fill plan that would have destroyed the Bay environment, wildlife refuges, and recreational accesses, leaving only a shipping lane strip of water. Had that plan been implemented we can today see what long reaching environmental effects it would have had not only locally but all the way into the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys and Sierras. The Plan to build tunnels is and would/will be viewed as environmentally damaging as well. Anyone who puts their signature of approval on such a devastating plan should be held accountable in the public eye and court of environmental destruction. STOP IT NOW!

From: Jan Jones <jan@metrostation.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 3:30 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Delta tunnels

Please do not approve the Delta tunnels. I believe they will do huge damage to the already fragile delta. Saltwater incursion is already increasing, the False River Dam is trying to keep it out. Please don't spend lots more money shipping water south. We need it here. Protect the delta estuary.

Thanks,
Janice L Jones
2612 Tulare Av
El Cerrito Ca 94530

From: Naomi Hatkin <nhatkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 3:54 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Delta tunnels

I was very distressed to read in the newspaper that the public will not be able to vote on whether the delta tunnels get built or not. All we can do is comment on the delta tunnels environmental impact report. Below are my comments.

It is way past time for Californians to stop living as if they lived in the land of plentiful water. We cannot compensate for nature's revenge on our profligate living (in other words, the four-year drought) by raiding the delta of more fresh water. In doing so we are ignoring other species' right to habitat and degrading water quality for those who depend on delta fresh water for their drinking water. I consider the construction of the tunnels to be environmental abuse.

As the impacts of climate change become real, we must find real solutions to our struggles for enough water. Draining the delta of water and life is not a real solution. It only substitutes one problem for another.

Respectfully,

Naomi Hatkin
5530 Carlton St
Oakland, CA 94618

From: Lynne Inman-Hoffert <inmanhoffert@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:21 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Delta Tunnels

I oppose the Delta Tunnels because I do not believe they solve our water issues. I *do* believe they would have a negative impact on the economy of the Delta and Bay Area. I *do* believe they would become a detriment to tourism, water recreation, fisheries and farmland. We can and must find better alternatives to address our water crisis.

Thank-you.

--

Linda Inman-Hoffert

4492 Camstock Ct. Concord, CA 94521

From: Charlene <charmchugh@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 3:43 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix

I am writing to oppose the Delta Tunnels/California "Water Fix

We cannot hope to maintain a healthy estuary by taking more fresh water out of an already struggling habitat which the Delta Tunnels will do. With the effects of climate change increasing each year, we must protect the many benefits this estuary provides for humans and the environment.

There is a huge negative environmental impact on many species - fish, animals, and birds....many of them protected or endangered species. This proposal violates the Endangered Species Act by actions resulting in the "destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat of species."

In addition, the tunnels will cause increased contamination of municipal water and wells in the 5 Delta counties...San Joaquin being one of them!

Intrusion of salt water into the Delta will negatively impact the agricultural economy due to inability to plant and irrigate crops because of increased salinity. There are generations of farmers whose livelihoods would be ended, with farming crops that feed the state and much of the nation no longer grown! The agricultural economy powerfully impacts that of the California state economy! Millions, even billions, of dollars would be lost.

The tunnels will obstruct and even destroy the waterways now used for boating, marinas and recreational activities that are a major part of the Delta economy, not to mention the quality of life for generations of local residents.

There are far less expensive and destructive alternatives to the tunnels:

1. More aggressive programs statewide to enhance efficient water usage.
2. Water recycling and ground water recharging projects statewide.
3. Retiring thousands of acres of pollution generating farmlands in southern San Joaquin Valley.
4. Improving Delta levees to address potential earthquake and flooding hazards.

CA Water Fix tunnels will not produce more water, more reliable supplies of water, or improved environmental conditions in the Delta.

I adamantly oppose the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix project. Please do not cause further harm to our state and Delta region. Explore other additional possibilities, including desalinization plants, water storage projects, and others.

Charlene M. McHugh

2145 Beverly Place

Stockton, CA

95204

From: ghowells <ghowells@pacific.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 2:19 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Existing Twin Tunnels Plan is Flawed

Hi,

I am, as noted in my ID below, a retired Professor from the University of the Pacific. I will keep my comments brief as your time is valuable. I approach the project from a social and historical direction and am commenting on what I know and have taught to undergraduates in my Social Psychology course. It may surprise you that I am not vehemently opposed to any form of a "tunnel plan." I have examined the reports of knowledgeable researchers at U.C. Davis and accept their conclusions that some form of peripheral canal or tunnel may be needed to best address threats to the levees and the environment in the Delta.

What I am completely opposed to is the magnitude of the project. I have studied in considerable depth the water grabbing tactics of the Los Angeles Water Department with regard to the Owens Valley and later tributaries feeding into Mono Lake and the City of San Francisco ultimately succeeding after the earthquake in damming the Hetch Hetchie Valley. In all of these instances, powerful political forces overrode scientific arguments and robbed areas of their environmental and basic property rights.

We now are in another one of those political overrides of sound environmental issues with the wealthy players being again Los Angeles and other cities to the south and the Westland Water District (another one of those well-intentioned but totally botched projects which lacked the funding to have it developed correctly). The size of the Twin Tunnel project far exceeds the water supply that will pass through it. Further, any rationale that the size is to allow massive flooding surpluses to go south but no additional water taken from the Delta is absurd and any person at all familiar with California water wars can see that the reason for the massive size of these tunnels is to be able to take massive quantities of water to the south with the whims of whatever politicians can be paid off to support changing the language of any initial promises.

The only way to insure that this does NOT happen is to reduce the size of the tunnels to no more than 50% of their current size and even smaller to prevent such a water grab and the destruction of both the Delta environment and probably the livelihood of many of the farmers in the northern San Joaquin Valley. If one examines the same kind of slippery grabs sending water to Southern California that has already taken place in the canals from the Delta, we can see slippage that in many cases was saved only by the decreasing population of the Delta Smelt. Many indications suggest that the current drought may end extinguish the entire population and then what marker can be used to argue that too much water is being sent south? Maybe this is part of the idea that Delta Smelt will not be a factor when water is taken from rivers to the north of the Delta?

There are many very good arguments being proposed based on science for why the current massive twin tunnels should not be constructed. Many very intelligent people have labored for years to try and present rational arguments. However, the point is that the tunnels are primarily political and, as we are currently seeing with Republican Presidential candidates, rational and scientific arguments have absolutely NO credibility there. Rational appeals are very important but the bottom line is that completion of the twin tunnels project as it is currently proposed will only be one more chapter in the story of the California Water Wars. The project in its massive form is only to facilitate a political water grab for wealthy Central and Southern California water interests who are unwilling to examine alternative (but admittedly expensive) ways to solve their own water problems.

Thank you for your time,

Gary
Gary N. Howells, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
Psychology Department
University of the Pacific
Stockton, CA 95211

"*Dulce bellum inexpertis*" Erasmus: War is delightful to those who have no experience of it.

From: Dave@gbacpa.com
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:17 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels

I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because of the harm that will be done to the San Francisco Bay-Delta business, tourism, fishing, and farming communities. Additionally, the cost of this boondoggle far out weighs any benefit that would be received.

David Wilson

David C. Wilson, CPA, CVA
Grant Bennett Associates
1375 Exposition Boulevard, Suite 230
Sacramento, CA 95815
dave@gbacpa.com
(916) 922-5109 Voice
(916) 641-5200 Fax

Proudly Celebrating 55 Years in Business.

www.gbacpa.com

Represented through Alliot Group, a worldwide alliance of independent firms

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate that information. Although this email and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus, or any other defect which might affect any computer or IT system into which they are received and opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that they are virus free and?no responsibility is accepted by Grant Bennett Associates for any loss or damage arising in any way from receipt or use thereof.

From: Abiah Karthausser <abiahkarthausser@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 4:23 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose the Delta Tunnels

Please add my name to the opposition of the Delta Tunnels. Mainly because I want to preserve clean, fresh water for drinking, recreation, fishing, industry, and agriculture. Both habitat and endangered species would be affected adversely if the Delta tunnels are built. Without increased, not decreased, fresh water flows, the San Francisco Bay Delta ecosystem will continue to degrade. Our Bay will die along with the newly created wetlands.

Thank you,

Abiah Karthausser

From: Anne Largent Smith <katesma@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 4:34 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Twin Tunnels

To whom it may concern:

Before the comment period closes, I would like to submit my opposition to the construction of the tunnel project. I believe it will be environmentally devastating to the Delta region, an unacceptable consequence. I believe that people can find ways to conserve that make the tunnel project unnecessary.

Thank you.

Anne Smith
6890 Atlanta Cir.
Stockton, CA 95219

From: Leland Frayseth <leland.frayseth@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 9:19 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose the tunnels

I oppose the tunnels because I believe it would be bad for Sacramento salmon and it will lower the water quality at the Contra Costa Water district intakes which supplies water to my home in Concord CA. Thank you for considering my comment.

From: John Anderson <captainjra@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 7:03 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Install a Barrier!!

I feel that California needs to install a permanent "anti- saltwater intrusion flexible flow management barrier" in the Carquinez Strait INSTEAD OF building the tunnels. I strongly believe such a barrier would nullify the threat of saltwater intrusion due to levee failure of any type. It would also be used to throttle and manage the outflow of precious fresh water to the bay and Sea. It would feature closeable gates. Such barriers are seen now in Holland and more are planned throuout Europe. With this barrier, the current flow thru the Delta would continue as-is. Only in emergencies would the gates be temporarily closed.

Typos courtesy iPhone

From: Tadd Perkins <taddcperkins@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 4:46 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: My comments

Tunnels are not the answer to California water issues. Essentially the tunnels would take water for the benefit of one region (the Southern San Joaquin Valley) at the expense of another (the Delta). The money would be better invested in low impact surface water storage, such as another Central Valley reservoir with environmental mitigation measures. At some point we all have to with the water we have, not the water we can get.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Mary Christopherson <marychristopherson1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:54 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: My thoughts on the "Delta Tunnels"

I was in college from 1969 to 1973, right at the beginning of the environmental movement. I was fortunate to graduate from UC Davis and had professors at that time discussing the proposed Peripheral Canal and what detrimental environmental effects it would have. Fortunately back then smarter heads prevailed and that project was stopped.

I have seen a map of the currently proposed tunnels, and they are the Peripheral Canal all over again. It was a bad idea in the 1970's and it is a bad idea now.

I propose a better idea to add water storage to California is to build dams on any canyon in Southern California that floods. Even if there are homes built there before the flooding.

Or we could begin to replenish the aquifers by building wetlands above them in the subsidence zones that pumping has created so rain could be captured and returned to the ground. We might even be able to pump some flood water back underground when there is flooding if we plan for such a thing.

Just a couple of my ideas for water plans...just not those stupid tunnels.
Bad idea in 1970's - bad idea now.

Mary Christopherson

...

From: admin <lcoy@lmadcomm.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:14 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: No Delta Tunnels!

Please. Stop the tunneling project. It's an environmental disaster (another). When you kill that bay you'll have doomed hundreds and hundreds of square miles to to an unsustainable wasteland.
Please. No delta tunnels.

Larry Coy
Palo Alto, CA

From: sharonreevelamesa@gmail.com on behalf of Sharon Reeve
<sharon.reevelamesa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 7:21 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: No on Bay-Delta Tunnels

Please do not construct tunnels and divert water. The environmental impacts will be enormous and the studies have been inadequate. We must learn to get by on the water that we have. Not only that, but the crops grown with the water are EXPORTED. We shouldn't ruin California's ecology to supply food to other countries. The large increase of saltwater will surely kill many of the creatures who live there. This proposed Bay-Delta Tunnel is a colossal mistake and an environmental nightmare.

From: Gwen Fenolio <funolio@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 3:46 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Twin Tunnels

I vote a big NO to the proposed twin tunnels. NOBODY has the right to steal the beauty that is our Delta. It is a unique and rare Eco system that will be destroyed if these massive tunnels are allowed. Again, NO to the tunnels.

Respectfully submitted,
Gwen Fenolio
Oakley California resident

Sent from my iPhone

From: atwaldenpl@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:27 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: California"WaterFix"

Please hear one more voice concerned that the proposed tunnels to fix California's water problems adds no additional water supply, only re-distributing whatever is available. The process upsets the natural flows and, thereby, changes the ecosystem for not only wildlife but for people who live and work around and on the Delta. Surely, the huge amount of money proposed for this project could be used to provide more water via new storage, additional conservation efforts, desalination, and even new technologies now unknown. Please do not alter the wonder of the Delta for questionable water reconveyance.

Sincerely,
Alan Hansen
Linden, CA

RECIRC LTR # 2464

- Unused ~~Form~~
- Duplicate of _____
- Out of Scope
- Other:

(replace original)

From: Louise Renne <lrenne@publiclawgroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:10 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Opposition to Delta Tunnels

I am opposed to the construction of the proposed construction of the Delta tunnels. There are better ways to solve California's water problems without further degrading the Bay Delta ecosystem .

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jeralyn Coursey <jercoursey@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 2:30 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Please Don't!

Please don't build tunnels that will destroy natural habitats and divert Northern California Water to the south. During the current drought, I cannot imagine having less water than we currently have access to. Please don't be swayed by money but instead please consider the good of all Californians.

Sincerely,

Jeralyn Coursey
15734 Lisa Lane
Lathrop, CA 95330
(209)275-0625

Sent from Windows Mail

From: Marsha Matsuura <hudagrll@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:56 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Proposed Twin Tunnels

Dear Governor Brown,

I am opposed to the building of the Twin Tunnels. The appeal of an engineering solution to a resource problem shared by all of the citizens of the state is great. But more effective and lasting solutions will come with discussion and compromise and sacrifice from all shareholders.

Building the twin tunnels will divide people into those who believe we are doing something and it is enough and those who believe we are misusing resources which could better be used elsewhere in alternatives.

Please maximize other alternatives like stringent water conservation, groundwater recharge and making a state water plan which addresses all of the needs for the state so that we can become sustainable at all levels.

Thank you
Marsha Matsuura
Berkeley

Sent from my iPad

From: sash2000@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 9:48 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Sacramento River intakes and tunnels

I believe this "water fix" for California is far too significant a decision for a few self-serving individuals to decide. This "fix" should have been presented to the public, with all its ramifications, and voted upon by all the California registered voters.

Our Governor advises us that we are facing an on-going water shortage, his recent statement was, "This four-year drought is our future." However, it now appears that Southern California is receiving more storms than Northern California. I have lived in California all my life and have never faced a water shortage this severe until now.

We own a small ranch with three green pastures for our livestock, around our home are many large trees, lawn and shrubbery. We are on a well, and have been using our water sparingly. Our pastures are brown, our lawn is brown and the trees and shrubbery are being hand watered twice a week. So far this fall we have had one rainfall on our property that wet our driveway and washed the dust off the outer leaves of our trees and plants. Southern California, on the other hand, has received devastating floods and mud slides--there seems to be something wrong with this picture.

Why are we being asked to send our water south? The rain we receive here needs to stay here. We need it to water our vast farm lands, to furnish fresh drinking water to our northern cities, water for households and businesses. Our reservoirs are almost dry, some river beds are no longer running with water. We have provided for these times by building dams on our major rivers--so far only a few towns have run out of water and have been trucking in a supply for their residents. Most of our wells are still operating although we know that this could change at any time. If the water "fix" is completed our delta will no longer have the fresh water from the Sacramento River to keep the salt water from encroaching into our underground aquifer thus contaminating our wells.

We might eek by with the help of the water rationing, the small amount of water remaining in our reservoirs and much prayer. This should be enough to prove the "water fix" is no "fix" at all. Why hasn't Southern California built its own dams catching the rainfall they receive? Why haven't they looked into desalinization? Why can't their farmers dig wells to water their crops like us? The "fix" being proposed will eventually turn California into a inhabitable desert.

DO NOT INSTALL THE WATER INTAKES ON OUR SACRAMENTO RIVER AND DO NOT BUILD THE TUNNELS UNDER OUR DELTA Sincerely, Shirley L. LeChuga

From: kenmckee54@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:36 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: bdcpc.comments.copy@nodeltagates.com
Subject: Stop the Tunnels

This is a fundamentally bad idea and you need to take a step back and really, honestly assess the impact of two giant straws that will suck the living daylight out of the Sacramento Delta. Don't allow this project to proceed without due process of a fully vetted environmental impact report that addresses the true impact of this project.

Sincerely,
Ken McKee

From: wekebu@gmail.com on behalf of creekside <creekside.wkb@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 1:37 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the Tunnels!

Citizens do not want these tunnels. Only a few who are farming in a desert.

Please do not hurt the Delta for a few who don't know where to farm.

Wendy Kelly Buddenbaum
4744 China Camp Rd
Chico, CA 95928

From: Patricia <patriciagaramendi@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 2:48 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: Dad
Subject: Stop the tunnels!!!!

Our entire town of Walnut Grove opposes this waste of \$\$\$\$.

You are not creating any new water just sending water to westlands.

They planted tree crops instead of crops that could adapt...I remember the cotton crops.

I saw sea lions from the salt water intrusion last week in downtown Walnut Grove If you build these disgusting tunnels you will be destroying the jewel of California Our Delta.....loved around the world The largest estuary in the northern hemisphere.

Please find an alternative to the monstrous tunnels.

Do you really want this destruction to be the legacy you leave your grandchildren???

Sent from my iPhone

From: KV Bunker <fortbraggbruin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 3:15 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Subject: Oppose the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A)

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the the Delta Tunnels plan.

The Delta Reform Act of 2009, in which the California State Legislature committed to the “coequal goals” of providing a more reliable water supply for California AND protecting and restoring the cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta, cannot be upheld if the Delta Tunnels come to pass. The California Water Fix does not meet the restoration goals of the Delta Reform Act; it is simply a plan to export more water out of the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary. The Delta Tunnels will also fail to provide more reliable water because the Delta watershed is already oversubscribed by five times in normal water years.

My objections to the tunnels are threefold:

The California Water Fix does not address the environmental, public health or economic impacts of the proposed Delta tunnels project. Also, the plan ignores alternatives that would save California tax and ratepayers billions of dollars, while investing in the jobs and local water sources that build sustainability.

My environmental concerns with the plan are:

- The impact on wildlife and plant species in the Delta that depend on freshwater include the Delta smelt, chinook salmon, steelhead, San Joaquin kit fox, and tricolored blackbird, protected species already on the brink that will face decimation due to a diminishing food-web.
- At sea, even the ESA-listed South Pacific Puget Sound Orca Whales depend on migrating Delta species that will be harmed by less water flowing through the Delta. *Worse, the quality of water and indigenous marine species in San Francisco Bay and its shoreline estuaries would be badly harmed by increased salinity due to reduced fresh water flow from the Sacramento River.*
- The tunnels plan seems to ignore Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act which prohibits federal agency actions that are likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or that “result in the destruction or adverse modification of [critical] habitat of [listed] species.”

My public health concerns with the plan are:

- The tunnels will cause increased contamination of municipal water and wells for the millions of rural and urban residents living in the five Delta counties.
- The tunnels plan fails to model for potential increases of carcinogens and other formation of byproducts that would cause cancer and other serious health effects.
- Environmental justice communities, who depend on subsistence fishing, will also face food and health insecurities as a result of increased contaminants, specifically mercury contamination, in fish and wildlife populations.

My economic concerns with the plan are:

- For large metropolitan cities such as Los Angeles and San Jose that depend on export water, water rates and/or property taxes will go up, but they will get no additional water.
- No analysis has been done on how the lack of fresh water flows will impact San Francisco Bay tourism and recreation. These industries depend on Delta fresh water flows for their crab and salmon fisheries, wildlife sighting, boating, and their restaurant economy. This industry is worth billions annually.
- Salinity intrusion is already impacting the western Delta farms and removing Sacramento River freshwater from the system will make matters worse. Delta farmers cannot irrigate crops with salt water and they certainly cannot plant crops in contaminated soils. The Delta Ag economy, which consists of generations of family farms and farm workers, generates \$5.2 billion for the California economy, annually.

- California coastal fishing communities depend on thriving wildlife. This historic industry is worth billions annually, with the salmon industry worth \$1.5 billion annually alone. Thousands of jobs and livelihoods are tied to these industries.
- The operation and construction of the tunnels will obstruct and disable navigable waterways for boating, marinas and other types of leisure activities, in addition to creating conditions of low water flow that will foster invasive aquatic species, such as water hyacinth. Poor water quality also creates unsafe recreation. Recreation and tourism in the Delta generate \$750 million annually.

Alternatives to Water Exports Ignored

Far far less expensive and less environmentally destructive alternatives to the Delta Tunnels were largely ignored. The plan does not seriously consider any alternatives other than new, upstream conveyance. The decision-making process (from the outset) has tilted in favor of increasing water exports from the Delta. Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:

- More aggressive water efficiency program statewide that would apply to both urban and agricultural users.
- * *Funding key desalination plants installations along California's Pacific Coast.*
- Funding water recycling and groundwater recharging projects statewide that would be billions of dollars less expensive for rate payers than constructing a new version of the Peripheral Canal or major new surface storage dams. Meanwhile, these projects move communities towards water sustainability.
- Retiring thousands of acres of impaired and pollution generating farmlands in the southern San Joaquin Valley and using those lands for more sustainable and profitable uses, such as solar energy generation.
- Improving Delta levees in order to address potential earthquake, flooding, and future sea level rise concerns at a cost between \$2 to \$4 billion and is orders of-magnitude less expensive than major conveyance projects that are currently being contemplated.
- Increasing freshwater flows through the Delta to reduce pollutants so ecosystems and wildlife can be restored.
- Installing fish screens at the south Delta pumps to reduce the current salvage of marine life.

In Summary

The Delta has problems that need to be addressed, but the CA Water Fix tunnels are a 20th century idea that won't fix them. It won't produce more water, more reliable supplies, or improved conditions for the environment in the Delta.

The new EIR/EIS has not adequately addressed my above stated concerns. That is why I oppose the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A).

Reclamation and DWR should prepare and circulate a new Draft EIR/EIS that will include alternatives that reduce water exports and increase Delta flows for consideration by the public and decision-makers. Such alternatives have a far better chance of complying with the Delta Reform Act and the federal Endangered Species and Clean Water Acts.

As a native-born Sacramentan, now 60, I know the Sacramento-San Joaquin rivers Delta well. The Delta Tunnels legislation proposal from concept to budgeting and construction would be terrible and ultimately BAD for all of California.

Kevin V. Bunker
P O Box 2914
Fort Bragg CA 95437

RECIRC LTR # 2473

- Unused — Form
- Duplicate of _____
- Out of Scope
- Other:

(replace original)

From: MORI COSTANTINO <mcostantino@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 2:08 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: the water tunnel

Dear Governor Brown,

I want you to know that although I support many of the issues that you do, I *abhor* the thought of the building of the Twin Tunnels. Until the entire State of California is on board with a water conservation plan (that means the big users who make no real sacrifice), there will never be enough water for the Central Valley and Southern California. An engineering solution to this resource problem (that is shared by all of the citizens of the state) sacrifices both the fish and people of Northern California. The truly lasting solutions to our water needs will come with shared sacrifice from all shareholders.

Building the twin tunnels will divide people into those who will benefit from the redirecting of flow to the south without addressing the finiteness of rainfall and snowmelt and those who will feel the consequences of loss of river flow- California's Northwest. Be governor of the whole state!

Please maximize other alternatives: strict water conservation for all, rainwater harvesting to recharge ground water and a state water plan which addresses all of the needs for the state before promoting this water tunnel.

Thank you
Mori Costantino
Berkeley

森

From: s.olson@californiadeltaliving.com
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 1:03 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Tunnel Project-

To whom it may concern regarding the Tunnel Project,
I am deeply disappointed and opposed to the tunnel project. Our government has shown complete lack of respect for the California Delta inhabitants, farmers, land owners and businesses. As a real estate agent and property owner in the California Delta I have directly seen the negative effect on the people & the delta that this "Proposed" project has created. I pay a lot in property taxes and not once have we been given a "discount" for the negative effect this proposed project has already had on our land. The underhanded way the government has gone about starting the project before the people have any say in it is asinine.

With the currently drought situation there is "NO Extra" water to send south out of our rivers. Our wells have changed, and not for the better! Our farmers need fresh water to farm, not salt water. Farmers in the lower Delta have already seen the change in the water from fresh to salt due to the drought. I am not a scientist, but I am able to read through the Proposed project and see all the flaws.

I do not feel it is necessary to ruin the Land, Lives, and Businesses of the Delta just to fix a problem that is happening in another part of the state. STOP, STOP, STOP! this project and find another way to save water for our parched state!

Sincerely,

Stacia Olson

Realtor
Waldie & Associates Real Estate
Rio Vista, CA 94571

Direct (916)-716-4997
Fax (707)-375-1717
BRE#01359656

Rio Vista Chamber of Commerce, Board Member

From: Corinne Hillman <chillman91@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 2:40 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Tunnels

I am opposed to this project. California is in the middle of a severe water crisis and this is not a solution. I think it will harm our delta water ways, the people and farmers. This is an outrageous waste of taxpayer's money. Maybe a wiser use of taxpayer dollars would be to look into Desalination Facilities such as the one in San Diego. Converting ocean water into irrigation and drinking water. Global warming alarmists would be happy as they contend oceans levels are rising. This would be a way to bring ocean levels downward.

Bill & Corinne Hillman

From: Steve Spatola <colsteve@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 2:46 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Tunnels comments, OBJECT!!!

We vehemently object to the Governor's personal plan to deprive Central Valley farmers and residents the water and agriculture that is indigenous to the Central Valley. To permanently disturb this fragile system would render it forever useless for food, recreation and sustenance!

Governor Brown is playing to the tune of the environmental activists who reject storage of water in Northern California and the Sierras where it is most easily collected and managed. The Tunnels will benefit large farming corporations and the wealthy and the numerically overwhelming population of Southern California. The water for Southern California should be upon them to solve, not the citizens whose elective powers are the minority. Federal projects of Mississippi River water can be diverted to the West for storage and use by farmers and citizens when natural resources fall short of needs.

California must provide real leadership on this issue that has been ignored for decades when the population was smaller and now we have doubled and still the proverbial can is still being kicked down the road. Governor brown has been a poor leader for now, his fourth term. I support the division of California at the southern-most point of the Central Valley. Then, the real Southern California must provide for themselves in all aspects of leadership and economics.

We the people are ignored at all levels of this nation where the liberals control elective offices. They are patently corrupt and greedy with others rights under the law and of natural law. Time for you to grow up!

Steve and Sonia Spatola, Stockton, CA

From: Cathy Ratto <ctratto@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:11 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Twin tunnels

I am writing asking that all efforts be made to stop the construction of the tunnels. They will destroy the Delta as a productive environment.

The tunnels are nothing but a water grab by Southern Ca and the Governor. The tunnels will not provide on more drop of water. The money the

Tunnels will cost should be spent building new water storage reservoirs. Also Southern California should be spending their own money building

Desalination plants. The tunnels are nothing but a planned destruction of the environment. They should be stopped!!

Michael Ratto
ctratto@att.net

From: Steve Kasprzyk <c21falconer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 11:25 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: twin tunnels

as a resident of chico ca i oppose the governors proposed california water fix. it is crazy to think about de watering the north state when you have wall st investors, and farmers planting orchards for their own wealth when my lawn is dying. it is time it moniter ground water and make these guys pay for it , not just the electricity to pump it.

--

Steve Kasprzyk
Century 21 Jeffries Lydon

530-518-4850
c21falconer@gmail.com

Just remember to have some fun!

From: John Neal <john.ysa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 11:50 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Twin tunnels

Please put me down as a NO on this project, stop the Governor now please.

Regards

John Neal
CEO
Yuba-Sutter Aviation, Inc
www.y-sa.com
530.743.0688
530.743.6955 Fax

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

If you have received this email in error please notify us.