
From: Jim Jorgensen <jim.jorgensen@wavecable.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:31 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: no tunnels please

Please do not construct the tunnels

--farmers/ranchers with acreage, vineyards, orchards for decades will be displaced.

--no assurance the tunnels will 'work'-be effective, cost is enormous

--no water for farmers in san Joaquin, Stanislaus, & Merced county from tunnels

--will displace many endangered species of wildlife & birds

Jim & Dianne Jorgensen

4735 Whitney Blvd.

Rocklin, CA 95677

Tel: 916 624 1810

E: jim.jorgensen@wavecable.com

From: Nicole Ureda <nicole.ureda@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:51 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose the Delta Tunnels

Dear CA Department of Water Resources and Federal Bureau of Reclamation,

I am a CA voter and I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels plan. As an environmentalist and longtime resident of the Bay Area, I know that our fresh delta waters are critical to our precious local ecosystem and numerous local species and, with the epic drought, already critically limited. I do NOT support the BDCP;. Please DO NOT pass the BDCP.

Thank you,

Nicole Ureda
2765 Stiles Court
Napa, CA 94558

From: r switzer <prswitz@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:55 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: *AGAINST* THE TWIN TUNNELS !!!

I want to go on record as strongly opposing the California Water Fix.

The environmental impact statement is criminally negligent in its incomplete assessment of the plan's impact. In fact, there is no impact statement that could presume to assess the entirety of harm that would be caused by implementation of such a plan.

The water that sustains the ecological structure of one of the world's most productive ecosystems should not be diverted to irrigate arid soils to grow water-intensive export crops.

Our watersheds depend upon returning salmon to replenish their nutrients. The migration must not be further interrupted.

In short, there is no defensible reason to implement this plan, which only serves oligarchical greed. Please support the healthy ecological future of California — please disapprove this poorly conceived plan.

Sincerely,

Paul R. Switzer
1197 Honey Run Road,
Chico, CA 95928

--

What we do not make conscious, emerges later as fate--Carl Jung

From: Greta Lacin <gretal@lacin.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 7:16 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a concerned citizen, and I have watched this issue develop over the last several months.

I am concerned that water is being moved from Northern California sources that have little to no water to spare, regardless of the need of farmers and other interests to the south.

I am also very concerned that even the pretense of conservation has been recently further reduced, revealing it for the window dressing that it is. I do not believe that any measures that are suggested will make up for the loss of precious fresh water that moves through the Delta, holding back salinity intrusion, and nurturing the fish and wildlife nursery that is the Delta.

I am concerned that endangered and precious species such as the Sandhill Crane will be disturbed from their ages old nesting grounds, further threatening this fragile population. I believe that the intrusion of salt water will move up the Sacramento and even American Rivers, irreversibly damaging these estuaries.

And finally, as our weather changes and denies even Northern California of snowpack, there will be escalating competition for scarce water. It makes far more sense to use our resources to develop alternative methods to harvest the water we have, including waste water and ocean water, rather than draining the Delta. Building the tunnels will not create a resource that isn't there to begin with, nor will this project encourage the creative development of smarter usage.

Thank you,
Greta Lacin

From: Greta Lacin <gretal@lacin.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:14 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan comment

I did not find the issue of changing weather patterns discussed in the environmental review documents. It appears that the project is based on the idea that relatively recent historical weather patterns will hold, in which the Northern state is blessed with sufficient snow pack in the winter, providing warm weather water supplies, and the southern state will lack this winter snowpack and resulting water supply. It is just as likely that weather patterns will shift, in which the south state is deluged with rain that is not captured, but is drained off as quickly as possible, while the north state will lack in sufficient snowpack, resulting in a deficient water runoff. In other words, the entire project is based on a historical rain and snow pattern that, even now, is changing. I did not find this issue addressed.

Thank you,
Greta Lacin

From: mlundbom <mlundbom@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:55 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix

We are strongly opposed to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix. This is an outrageous plan that hurts us as almond growers. This plan is disastrous for our fragile Delta ecosystem. The cost is staggering. Why is it the Governor's enormous ego to leave a legacy is so foolishly wasteful and ridiculously disastrous to our northern California population. This proposal is just as horrific as the plan of the high speed train.

Signed:
Robert Lundbom
Michelle Lundbom
Brian Lundbom
Rachel Lundbom
and families

From: bweetamus@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:10 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Bay Delta Water Plan.

I don't like this plan. Two huge tunnels? Nope. Ain't gonna cut it for wild and aquatic life. Humans are hogs. There is no hope for other species if we continue to promote ourselves as the be all, end all on this planet.

Good luck to all who have worked so hard

Sent from my iPhone

From: jerryrobinson@reagan.com
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:42 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: BDCP Bad Idea

To whom it may concern:

The Bay Delta Conservation Plan is a bad idea just on the face of it. Do not spend another \$15 Billion dollars that this state does not have. It will eventually have to be paid for by taxpayer money. It is just another boondoggle that Jerry Brown is trying to line the pockets of his friends in the Labor Unions and Construction Industries (his biggest lobbyists). They are the only ones who will gain from this very sad plan.

This plan simply covers the facts with fog. No one gets any more water. There are no new sources of water here. It drains one watershed to fill another with no plan to replace the water taken.

As usual, the great new plan will spend money, our money Oh, I know, that the initial source of money will be bonds - but they are backed by the taxpayers of California! We are the ones who will be paying the interest! We will eventually have to pay the premiums that come due on the bonds! The loser is the taxpayers of California who get nothing in return except more red ink in our annual budget.

It looks so easy. Just sell the people on 3 tunnels. That will solve all the problems. The labor unions, the construction engineers and laborers, the architects, the planners, the administrators, and the secretaries will all get a fat paycheck. But what will we get? Nothing but more dry lands that cannot be farmed--More notices to farmers that their 100 year old water rights have been taken away by bureaucrats that don't care about the ruined farmer whose land has been in the family for three generations.

Any project that requires big money is worth looking where the money flows. Follow the money and you will see who is getting rich at the expense of the little guy.

Stop this insane plan now. The BDCP should never be funded. It is a losing proposition before it gets out of the gate.

Jerry and Betsy Robinson

From: Bob Pope <vintner25@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:01 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: BDCP Comment

To whom it may concern
re: BDCP - No.

Is enriching a handful of people a good reason to destroy the Delta? No.

It is certainly possible to engineer such a structure, and to engineer the political situation to allow it to happen.

But should we further increase the salinization of the West Side? No

Should we destroy the delicate balance by allowing saltwater to migrate North and East through the Delta? No.

How would you even think it is possible to replicate the environment that you would be destroying by flooding a few islands and other minimal 'improvements'? You can not.

The levee situation has not been improved in many decades, and yet they have resisted all the earthquakes. The minimal breaks that have occurred would have been prevented with the minimal maintenance that should have been occurring all along. But hasn't been funded, likely to create the appearance of an emergency situation

Selling almonds to China does not trump the health and vitality of a national treasure - the Delta.

Growing other ill-suited crops, such as alfalfa and cotton, is not a reason to destroy the Delta.

All the serious scientific reports emphatically state the achievement of "co-equal goals" is ludicrous.

Salinization is already occurring and killing huge swaths of land. The problem has been created and still not resolved over many decades.

This idea is so ludicrous on so many levels that it is beyond comprehension that anyone would seriously consider moving forward with the project.

Please quit supporting the political goals of a governor still hoping to match his father's legacy.
Please quit supporting the financial goals of other political leaders just lining their pockets.

Southern California would best be served by slowing their growth rate so they can invest in renewable resources, such as Desalinization. They will not support the outrageous expenses that will be thrust upon them were this moronic idea to move forward.

Kindest regards
Robert Pope
964 Stonegate Cir.
Oakley, CA 94561

From: RL Silvers <rlsilvers@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:57 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: BDCP Comments

Water conveyance and management can be accomplished much more efficiently restoring levies. Meanwhile the dry valley is the wrong place to grow thirsty crops. Like species, farms should migrate in the coming years to wetter climes. Please forgo the Twin Tunnels for a more cost effective and future-facing alternative.

Thank you,

Rodger Silvers
Daly City

From: Doug Baker <dougbaker2@earthlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 10:45 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: BDCP/California WaterFix Comments

I am writing in regards to the EIR for the California WaterFix project. I believe that the delta tunnels proposed under this project will have a very damaging impact on the San Francisco Bay Delta. As the largest estuary on the West coast, the delta is dependent on the right balance of salt and freshwater. The current problem of saltwater intrusion will only worsen if water is diverted before it even reaches the delta. The tunnels will degrade water quality for the people and farms of the delta, as well as endangered species and habitats. Furthermore, the proposed project will also worsen water quality for millions of people in the East Bay and northern San Joaquin Valley who are dependent on the delta for their drinking water.

In short, this project will destroy the farms and wildlife of the delta without providing a drop of new water. When I moved to California in 1982, the voters had just voted down a proposed peripheral canal for good reason. For these same reasons, please stop the proposed California WaterFix with its "peripheral tunnels" and instead consider alternatives to more wisely use this very limited resource so that the delta is truly protected.

Douglas Baker
5385 Broadway
Oakland, CA 94618
DougBaker2@earthlink.net

From: John Anderson <captainjra@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 10:08 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Build a barrier- not tunnels!

I feel that California needs to install a permanent "Anti-Saltwater Intrusion Flexible Flow Management Barrier" across the Carquinez Strait INSTEAD OF building the tunnels.

It would feature closable gates and would allow unfettered navigation and fish migration.

Such barriers are seen now in Holland and increasingly throughout Europe.

Such a barrier would nullify the threat of saltwater intrusion due to levee failure of ANY type at ANY time. It would also be used to throttle and manage the outflow of precious fresh water otherwise lost to the bay and sea as determined by varying conditions.

Properly designed, it would also provide a potent defense against rising sea levels.

With this barrier, the current flow thru the Delta would continue unchanged, as-is.

Only during emergencies would the gates be temporarily closed until conditions stabilized.

I believe that this solution would cost far less than the tunnels and would provide far more benefit to the entire state's farmers and municipal users of the Delta's fresh water.

Respectfully,

John R. Anderson

BSME / MBA

Andrus Island, Calif

From: Stuart Schwartz <stuart@theimageflow.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:32 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: - "I am opposed to the "California Waterfix" aka Twin Tunnels project. "

- "I am opposed to the "California Waterfix" aka Twin Tunnels project. "

Stuart Schwartz

Stuart Schwartz

The Image Flow
Inspiration for photographers

401 MILLER AVE. SUITE A • MILL VALLEY, CA 94941
415.388.3569 • WWW.THEIMAGEFLOW.COM

[Subscribe to our weekly newsletter here](#)

From: pgburnham@juno.com
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 7:24 PM
To: BDCPcomments

Dear Environmental Review folks for the Delta Tunnel Water Export plan

Any environmental review is incomplete if it does not address the impacts of irrigating San Joaquin Valley lands that are Selenium laden. Until a solution to the Selenium accumulation and runoff problem has been solved it is infeasible to continue to irrigate more Selenium laden soils. If the tunnel EIS does not address the Selenium problem caused by irrigation, it is incomplete. Currently Selenium laced water is being drained into the San Joaquin River. We should not turn the entire Delta into another Kesterson toxic swamp. Stop irrigating Selenium laced soils.

Patricia Gail Burnham
5305 Illinois Ave
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Extended Stay America

<https://ad.doubleclick.net/ddm/clk/280917141;116012120;i?http://www.extendedstayamerica.com/?mid=dis-fix-0-aol-tex>

From: Peter Alexander Furniture <pafurnitureco@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:24 PM
To: BDCPcomments

I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnel River Plan.

This is a destructive bandaid taking water out of areas in greater need and populations, including Mother Nature. There are better ways to spend money and better long term solutions.

David Baughan
President
Peter Alexander Furniture
415 314 3571
palexanderfurniture.com

From: fredrinne@monkeybrains.net
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:01 PM
To: BDCPcomments

No tunnels. Forget it.

From: Elizabeth Dougherty <eliz@whollyh2o.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:52 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: CA WaterFix

What needs to be fixed is not water but the way *we* are managing. The CA WaterFix is no way to sustainably manage water. We are looking to the state to set conservation and reuse as the standards. If, when we come to the nth degree of conservation and reuse, as well as mandatory water budgets for each individual household, business, institution and agricultural setup.

Conservation and reuse will lead us into not only greater water security but a right approach to longterm behavior and thinking. Wholly H2O opposes the CA WaterFix.

A moving body of water,
Elizabeth

"My personal philosophy is not to undertake a project unless it is manifestly important and nearly impossible." *Edwin Land*

=====

Elizabeth Dougherty
eliz@whollyh2o.org

From: bertgbrown@aol.com
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:16 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: California Water "Fix"

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to you at the California Department of Water Resources and to you at the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

STOP THE TWIN DELTA TUNNELS!!!!

The California Water"Fix" is not a fix at all. It diverts water from Northern California to Southern California thereby transferring the water shortages from Southern California and adding them to Northern California's water shortages. And it is being proposed during a four year (and counting) drought. The amount of money required to finance this debacle could have been diverted over previous years to build more dams and desalination plants (we happen to live right on the largest ocean on Earth, you know?) But Governor Jerry Brown cares not one whit about any of this. He cares only about his "legacy", whatever that means. He should be caring about the future water-health of California and not his wealthy donors down south. And a report came out today from the State Water Board stating the all of California's water districts except for four, have complied with the water conservation standards put in place to benefit ALL Californians. And what a surprise...all four violators of the standards are Southern California districts. Apparently they feel they don't have to comply....and why should they? They know Gov. Brown's tunnels will be gushing water to them eventually, turning the essential Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta into a giant mud puddle.

Shame on the cities of Beverly Hills, Indio, Redlands and the Coachella Valley Water District for not caring about our state's water resources ...and shame on Governor Jerry Brown for conceiving this crime against one of California's largest natural resources.

STOP THE TWIN DELTA TUNNELS!!!!

Sincerely,
Bert Brown

From: mike <mijuhall@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:13 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: california water fix

Hello,

I OPPOSE the Twin Tunnel Project!

I have a comment that I would to have answered please.

My understanding about the State Water Project and the Central Valley Project is that the only water to be pumped out of these projects would be what was left over AFTER the Delta received the amount of fresh water flow it needed to be a healthy system all the way to the San Francisco Bay, how can this be true with the decline of the Delta's health?

I would like to know what the flow numbers are considered as for a healthy Delta and what that amount of flow is now. Plus I would like to know what the forecast numbers are with the twin tunnels running at full speed.

We need to stop this over allocation of water- Please

Thank you,

Mike Hall

From: michael kelley <kelley_ranch@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:53 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: Carol Schoen
Subject: California water fix

To Whom it may concern

I am 100% in favor of the Bay/Delta water fix as revised. The inlet stations at Clarksburg will pull water with a Chloride of approximately 5mg/L. We have been receiving in Southern California via the California Aqua duct water with a Chloride of 60 to 120. This imports into Ventura County approximately 25,000 tons of salts per year. This is one of the most damaging events that could occur for our water environment. We have saline pollution now in our streams and rivers because of the effluent from the waste water discharges and the domestic use run off from lawns and gardens both with high salt content because of the high salt content that the water has even before it leaves the delta.

The capture of the water at Clarksburg will deliver a water to the Southern California area that will allow us to use the waste water discharges with out needing to be processed by reverse osmosis to take the salt contaminants out. These salt contaminants are only being picked up from the current process of allowing the water to be contaminated by about 3 cc of sea water per liter of fresh water and yet this small amount of sea water contaminant is costing millions to be removed before secondary use can occur.

For these reasons I very much support the California Waterfix as revised.

If you have any questions or comments please feel free to contact me.

Michael Dan Kelley
5544 North Greentree Drive
Somis, CA 93066
805 890 6095
kelley_ranch@msn.com

From: vnorling@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:10 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: California Water Fix

I was born 71 years ago in San Mateo County and still live here to this day. the changes I have seen to Northern California and particularly to the coastside have not been pretty. the economies of towns from crescent city to Monterey have seen their fishing industries devastated. today i read the National Marine Fisheries Service is worried chinook salmon may become extinct due to low water flows out of lake Shasta resulting in warm water killing the juvenile salmon. This summer the delta suffered choking weed growth due to a lack of water flushing out the system. The lack of healthy water flow will also result in salt water intrusion that will have negative affect on local farms and city water supplies. Fort Bragg is currently asking it's restaurants to use paper plates and cups to avoid having to wash dishes because of salt water intrusion on the Noyo River has polluted the water supply. This is drought related but is an example of things to come if more water is diverted from the delta.

At the same time driving down 101 last weekend to San Luis Obispo I observed miles of wine grapes. Going up 505 and 5 to Redding all I see is almonds, many of them just planted when here we are in the middle of a drought. The same holds true for 101 north through Sonoma and Mendocino Counties - grapes, grapes and more grapes. The October , 2015 San Mateo Times wrote a front page article on the huge growth planned for the Coachella Valley, Santa Clarita Valley and a whole new city in the southern San Joaquin Valley. Is all this sustainable? I do not think so. The California Water Project of the 50's was supposed to satisfy our needs and had protections to insure the delta would receive adequate water to protect the environment. All that project did was increase demand that could only be met by ignoring the original protections. The California Water Fix will have the same results. Already the conservation portion that was sold to the public has been discarded. On September 22, 2015 in another San Mateo Times article it was disclosed the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Real Asset and Property Management Committee was meeting behind closed doors to discuss purchasing 37 parcels of Contra Costa land. Why? Is this nothing more than the Owens Valley revisited, a scam on the people of California that will further damage Northern California, it's natural resources and it's people? I think so. Please scrap this twin tunnels concept and let the state learn to live within it's means as pertains to water without stealing it from one group of people to benefit another group of people.

thank You
Victor C. Norling
302 Count Road
Woodside, Ca. 9062
vnorling@comcast.net

From: CONNIESIERACKI <conniesieracki@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:27 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: California Water Fix/Tunnels

I am opposed to the California Water Fix Plan. I do not think tunnels to take water from an area dependent on that water for wildlife, agriculture and recreation makes sense. Our beautiful State was designed to balance diverse needs. We are rich in resources. I do not think we should tip that balance just because we can. Yes, we have water needs, but in a large part that is our fault. We have runaway population in areas where the environment does not support population growth. We grow crops which demand more water than available in areas where they are planted.

We need to look for solutions beyond robbing one area of its natural resources to support an area that is depleting its own resources or cannot sustain its own growth or population with the resources it has available. That just makes no sense. We need to be stewards of the environment if we expect reasonable, sustained life and livelihoods. I support conservation, desalinization, water storage facilities but also a more reasonable and reasoned policy of growth so we don't have to make demands on the environment that are unreasonable. Taking water from a rich biodiverse region which contributes to supporting the existing population of the area and contributes economically to the State to support unchecked population in an area that cannot support itself is wrong.

I fervently hope these tunnels are not built and that we work together to seek alternatives.

Connie Sieracki
212 Guaymas Place
Davis, CA 95616

From: Bob Ackerly <backerly@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:02 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: California Water Fix

Gentlemen/Ladies:

I am opposed to the proposed California Water "Fix" for the following reasons:

- 1) The cost benefits analysis is out of whack! This project does not produce one single drop of additional water to the State of California and only serves to help farmers and consumers in the south at the cost of destroying towns, habitat and disrupting lives in Northern California for 100's of square miles. New storage facilities and desalinization plants make a heck of a lot more sense than this political boondoggle. Lets follow the money and see who is being paid off and what politician's promises are being kept. Why would any Northern californian expect to pay for this in new taxes when there is absolutly zero \$0.00 of benefit for us?
- 2) Where are the extensive environmental studies that would be required if I were to try and move forward with such a project that will undoubtedly disrupt and harm the Delta and its environs and habitat.
- 3) Where is the common sense that tells us if make farmers pay for this monstrosity of a project, they will not be able to afford to grow low grossing crops like Roma tomatoes, corn, beans, etc. and only focus on exported crops like almonds, walnuts, etc. that are higher grossing and readily exported to Asian markets at high prices? What does that do to California consumers and US customers for those fresh food products?
- 4) What is the mitigation plan to restore the Delta to its pristine condition after the State rips it all up building football field sized muck piles within one mile of a 12,000 population center? Who is going to dispose of it and what about the smell, leaching of dangerous chemicals and metals into the groundwater aquifer?
- 5) There will be absolute devastation to the waterfowl and fish populations as this project goes forward that will take years to restore, if ever. What is the cost and who pays for that loss? Why is there no remediation plan in this latest iteration of Jerry Brown's water follies?
- 6) Is this a Tunnel Plan or a EcoRestore Plan? Or is it a plan at all and just a money/water grab by southern farmers and water companies? Can they afford to pay for it or will the State be stuck with the billions this ill-conceived plan will cost?
- 7) How many billions will this project be underfunded? Do we really have a handle on what the final cost might be? Will the state lose control of its primary water source by selling off future rights to pay for it? We've seen how these projects usually end up - just look at the train to no where project. Fresno to Merced? Ha! Useless.
- 8) How badly will I-5 be impacted and what about the farmers and towns in the path of these monstrous water sucking tunnels?

Stop the Tunnels!

Stop the out of control spending!

Stop the madness!

Sincerely,

Bob Ackerly

From: Toni Sterling <toni@sterling-consulting.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 8:51 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: California Waterfix

Dear Sir or Madame,

I am opposed to the "California Waterfix" aka Twin Tunnels project.

Please do NOT proceed with this project.

A very concerned citizen.

Toni Galli Sterling
CEO
Sterling Consulting Services, Inc.

toni@sterling-consulting.net
Tele: 415.717.6158
Fax: 415.233.9750
Visit us at: www.sterling-consulting.net

Marketing & Project Management Professionals
From Start to Finish

Sterling is a nationally certified woman and minority owned business.
Proudly serving the SF Bay Area for over 20 years.

From: Tina Duncan <tina_duncan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:38 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: California WaterFix comment

I am vehemently opposed to the Delta Tunnels for the following reasons:

1. The benefits do not match the cost. According to Dr. Jeff Michael, University of the Pacific, the estimated benefits for the project drop by \$10 billion without regulatory assurance for water deliveries so that costs EXCEED benefits by at least \$8 billion. The costs will be born by farmers and urban ratepayers. Since there is no added water, urban RATEPAYERS, obtain no benefit. Yet the rural and urban rate payers have not been notified of the expected rate increases when they should be allowed to vote approval, like any tax increase.
2. If farmers must pay for more costly water, then they will grow only profitable crops, not necessarily those which meet the needs of Californians, for example, water-hogging almonds to export overseas.
3. Why is the "Fix" for our lack of water to build tunnels that do not provide for any additional water in a drought after prior water rights and public trust needs are met? During many years, they are likely to be dry. Other alternatives DO produce more water.
4. The California WaterFix does not help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by the 2009 Delta Reform Act.
San Francisco Bay-Delta business, tourism, fishing, and farming communities cannot trust that the tunnels will be operated in a manner to protect our interest, especially because the State Water Resources Control Board, the Department of Water Resources, and the Bureau of Reclamation have allowed for the waiving and weakening of Delta water quality standards and species protections during the drought, endangering numerous Delta species and bringing some to the precipice of extinction.
5. The California EcoRestore is not part of the California WaterFix. Hence the California WaterFix does not meet the coequal goals required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act. Even if the EcoRestore were included, it does little more than meet the existing mitigation for prior damage, and does not mitigate for the new damage that will be caused by tunnel construction and by removing water that otherwise would flow through Delta.
6. On top of all this, the route selected is the worst alternative that could be selected since it does not protect Delta farm communities and Delta recreation as required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act. It is only the cheapest. A construction project through the heart of the Delta, through the sensitive estuary and loud pounding through bird habitats for years is not the way to protect the fish or fowl. Instead, the alternative to route the tunnels far east, by I-5, should replace the current route.
7. Construction plans include de-watering Delta farmers' wells for years, making farming and living in their homes not possible. Yet there is no provision to provide remuneration to them.

This project is a disgrace to the democratic process, is a complete Governor's Boondoggle (how much did the proponents line Gov. Brown's pockets?), is an environmental disaster in a state that claims to take leadership in environmental protection, and truly shows the extent of corruption in the SWRCB, DWR and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Augustina Duncan
Lifetime resident of California

From: ARLaughlin@aol.com
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:37 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: California WaterFix Comments

The basic premise of this project is obviously flawed. It will do permanent damage to the Delta seriously affecting Delta agriculture, recreation and the general quality of life for millions of Californians.

And all to feed Gov. Brown's ego.

Al Laughlin
3481 Wells Rd.
Oakley CA 94561

From: Nancy Neff <nrneff@sonic.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 5:33 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: comment on tunnels

Do not build the tunnels. They will let in salt water and degrade the ecosystem for generations to come.

Nancy Neff

--
Nancy Neff
Regional Volunteer Coordinator
California Clean Money Campaign
(650) 858-2436
www.CAdisclose.org
Support the California DISCLOSE Act to show who really pays for political ads!

From: Curtis Damion <bcdamion@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:40 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: comment on waterfix

The plan for building two tunnels of massive size underneath the Delta to deliver Sacramento River water to Southern California cities and agribusinesses will produce massive air pollution for the duration of its construction, 10+ years. The mitigation for this is to buy carbon credits from areas far away. The problem, of course, for residents and visitors to the Delta, including workers actually constructing this plan, is that the pollution REMAINS intact right where it is being produced. There is absolutely NO solution to the problem of this pollution, which will likely affect the health of every person in its reach, residents, visitors, and construction workers alike.

Barbara Damion

From: JockScot@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:41 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Comment on Waterfix Project

Having made my thoughts on the Waterfix Project known earlier, I have only one comment to add at this time, a quote by H. L. Mencken:

"For every complex problem there is an answer that is clear, simple, and wrong."

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the revised EIR/EIS.

Darian Calhoun

From: Earleen <earleenclark@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:18 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Comments for California Water Fix

Date: October 29, 2015

To: BDCP/Water Fix Comments

P. O. Box 1919

Sacramento, CA 95812

From: Mrs. Earleen P. Clark

40660 Waukeena Road

Clarksburg, CA 95612-5014

e-mail address: earleenclark@hotmail.com

Telephone: 916-775-1435

Subject: Oppose the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A)

Comments for California Water Fix

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A).. After attending various meetings, I have learned the following details and facts about the above referenced plan, and I still have the following unanswered questions:

The preferred alternative continues to export water from the south Delta under most water year types. The preferred alternative does not change the status quo of pulling ESA listed fish species into the central and south Delta where survival has been documented to be extremely low.

Survival data of ESA listed fish species in the north Delta is sparse and statistical power is very low. The baseline data utilized for choosing an alternative is lacking and more baseline survival data is needed to have a higher certainty of the current condition before choosing an alternative.

Water quality modeling was not performed to determine the likely change in salinity, dissolved oxygen, and temperature in Elk Slough. How will water quality changes be mitigated for in Elk Slough?

Water elevation (stage height) was not modeled for Elk Slough. How will changes in water elevation be mitigated for in Elk Slough?

Ground water levels were not modeled for the surrounding area under all alternatives. How will changes in ground water levels be mitigated?

Construction of the proposed facilities will impact the Delta economy and Delta land values. How will changes in the local economy and land values be mitigated?

Scientific data shows that water export facilities increases predation at the locations of water export. New export facilities will likely increase predation of ESA listed fish species. How will increased predation be mitigated?

The preferred alternative does nothing to increase the survival of ESA listed fish in Clifton Court Forebay. Survival of ESA listed fish in Clifton Court Forebay is extremely low. How will loss of ESA listed fish in Clifton Court Forebay be mitigated?

Elk Slough is tidally filled. Hydrodynamics within Elk Slough have not been sufficiently modeled to determine if mitigation is necessary.

The Delta is a historical and cultural resource. How will the proposed alternative mitigate for changes to the historical and cultural value of the Delta?

The Delta is a recreation resource. How will changes in recreation quality be mitigated?

Underground tunnels do not solve the problem with stability of the water projects during an earthquake. How will the tunnels survive an earthquake?

Please direct your responses to my above-referenced comments and questions in writing to:

Mrs. Earleen P. Clark, 40660 Waukeena Road, Clarksburg, CA 95612-5014.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Earleen P. Clark