

**From:** David Stoeffler <dstoeffler@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:19 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** Water Tunnels

NO! The water tunnels will destroy the Delta, take water from local farmers and send it south. Northern CA cities are conserving water and the south is NOT.

Dave & Diana Stoeffler

---

**From:** sash2000@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:05 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** Water intakes on the Sacramento River, plus the tunnels

We live on a ranch in Lodi, Ca. The drought has caused dry lands throughout the central part of our state. We have dry lawns and dry pastures and thirsty crops. Everything that needs water is suffering due to the lack of water. Here, we are forced to feed our animals as we cannot water our pastures in order to save the wells. Our pastures suffer and our state economy is also suffering. The small ranchers do not need dry wells. The water intakes on the Sacramento River would draw water that we all need in Northern California.

Drawing water directly from the Sacramento River in ever increasing amounts will surely damage our beautiful delta eventually causing salt water intrusion in the wells throughout the central valley. People cannot drink salt water, animals and crops cannot drink or use salt water. What will be the solution to this problem. Far more damage will be caused to California than solution to water resources. This does not create one drop of more water just a bandage to satisfy a few well connected people living in Southern California.

We must not send our Northern California water to the rich farmers in Southern California. These people are not true farmers, they are retired doctors, lawyers, and also retired CEOs from big corporations. They will get richer using our water. Other people that will use our water are the wealthy individuals that have large estates using vast amounts of water to maintain their landscaped yards.

We implore you, do not build the water intakes or the tunnels on our Northern California rivers. The states total economy will go down a dry well, just so the rich will get richer.

**DO NOT INSTALL THE WATER INTAKES AND DO NOT BUILD THE TUNNELS, WE DO NOT NEED SALT WATER ON OUR LANDS.**

---

**From:** Laurel Morris-Wessler <laurelmw@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:39 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** NO on Tunnel!

I believe that taking water away from our estuary would lead seriously impact our ecosystem. Diverting water from one part of California to benefit another is not a statewide solution!

Laurel Morris Wessler

---

**From:** Elizabeth Everdell <elizabetheverdell@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:07 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Cc:** Coby Everdell; Johnston Kathryn  
**Subject:** Strongly opposed to Delta Tunnels

Dear Sirs,

I am strongly opposed to the Delta Tunnels. It would be enormously expensive and would be taking water away from the largest estuary on the Pacific coast of both American continents. This would be a short sited solution and would lead to a catastrophic change in the Sacramento River basin's ecosystem . Diverting water from one part of California to benefit another is not a statewide solution to providing "reliable clean water" to all Californians. Southern California should deal with their water needs locally and appropriately for their local environment.

Sincerely,  
Elizabeth Everdell

Marji I. Mullins  
P. O. Box 7793  
Stockton, CA 92567-0793

BDCP/WaterFix Comments  
P.O. Box 1919  
Sacramento, CA 95812


Dear Bay Delta Conservation Committee:

As a resident of San Joaquin County, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my opposition to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix ("Delta Tunnels") proposed project. I am extremely concerned as to how this project will impact the citizens, businesses, and wildlife of the San Joaquin Valley. Under the Governor's plan this project will cause further harm to the unique and fragile Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. It is unbelievable to me that such a proposal is being made when this region has been so severely impacted by the current drought. This project does not provide new water to our region yet it is a plan is to ship the water we do have, south.


Southern California has not placed any restrictions on land development or the giant agribusiness corporations. This harkens back to a similar situation—when Los Angeles in the 1800's outgrew its water supply. At that point, water was diverted from the Owens Valley to Los Angeles via an aqueduct.

The Delta Tunnels Project is simply another grab for our precious resource. We cannot afford to have such a project similarly impact the Delta region. We cannot afford to have it effect the wildlife of the Delta or effect the approximately 4 million people, including 2,500 farmers who contribute \$2 billion to California's economy each year. At an estimated cost of \$15 billion, we deserve a better solution and a more prudent investment to address the state's water supply needs.

I sincerely urge you to reconsider and end this proposal.

  
Marji I. Mullins

OCT 27 2015




SACRAMENTO CA 957

24 OCT 2015 PM 1.1

ASSOCIATION 


**Mr. William C. Nahorn, III**  
 PO Box 7793  
 Stockton, CA 95267

STOCKTON, CA 95267-9013



*BDCP/Water Use Comments*  
*P.O. Box 1919*  
*Sacramento, CA 95812*

OCT 27 2015



95812191919

William C. Nahorn III  
P. O. Box 7793  
Stockton, CA 92567-0793

BDCP/WaterFix Comments  
P.O. Box 1919  
Sacramento, CA 95812

Dear Bay Delta Conservation Committee:

As a resident of San Joaquin County, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my opposition to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix ("Delta Tunnels") proposed project. I am extremely concerned as to how this project will impact the citizens, businesses, and wildlife of the San Joaquin Valley. Under the Governor's plan this project will cause further harm to the unique and fragile Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. It is unbelievable to me that such a proposal is being made when this region has been so severely impacted by the current drought. This project does not provide new water to our region yet it is a plan is to ship the water we do have, south.

Southern California has not placed any restrictions on land development or the giant agribusiness corporations. This harkens back to a similar situation—when Los Angeles in the 1800's outgrew its water supply. At that point, water was diverted from the Owens Valley to Los Angeles via an aqueduct.

The Delta Tunnels Project is simply another grab for our precious resource. We cannot afford to have such a project similarly impact the Delta region. We cannot afford to have it effect the wildlife of the Delta or effect the approximately 4 million people, including 2,500 farmers who contribute \$2 billion to California's economy each year. At an estimated cost of \$15 billion, we deserve a better solution and a more prudent investment to address the state's water supply needs.

I sincerely urge you to reconsider and end this proposal.




William C. Nahorn III

OCT 27 2015




SACRAMENTO CA 958

24 OCT 2015 PM 11




Mr. William C. Nahorn, III  
PO Box 7793  
Stockton, CA 95267

STOCKTON, CA 95206-7793



BDCP/Water & Power  
P.O. Box 1919  
Sacramento, CA 95812

OCT 27 2015



95812191919

---

**From:** Cynthia Rizzo <avalon4us@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 13, 2015 9:07 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Cc:** Cindi Zanardi  
**Subject:** Save The Delta - No Tunnels

**I am opposed to Delta Tunnels due to the following:**

- Benefits don't match costs, costs are exceeding by \$8 million, California can't afford more debt
- Those paying rate increases need to be notified and there needs to be a vote such as for Rural & Urban rate payers
- Farmers need to pay for more costly water, unacceptable - we need to take care of our own first, and allow jobs in California, next thing you know China will buy all of us & ship our products all over (we are already shipping almonds to Asia) - Californians want fresh healthy products on our table from the state we live in
- Tunnels don't provide additional water when we are in drought situation after water rights & public trusts are met
- California Water fix does not help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by 2009 Delta Reform Act
- Barges & construction for years through recreational waterways is not the way to protect Delta recreation. The route to save the estuary, would be to route tunnels for East, by I-5
- Construction plans include de-watering Delta farmers wells for years, making farming and living in their homes not possible. Yet there is no provisions to provide renumeration to them
- The route selected is the worst route since it DOES NOT protect Delta farm communities and Delta recreation as required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act.

**If you really want to put your energy & efforts to a good cause:**

- Allocations & fees need to be graduated, on other properties, I never use my allocation but get same standard fees. If I could only sell the allocation I don't use
- lets get a pipeline from other states to bring water in - LIKE TEXAS

**From:** Lisa Ray Combs <tolisalisa@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 14, 2015 7:37 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** California Water fix - AKA Delta Tunnels

Hello,

I am writing to you to express my concerns in regards to the possible future of the Delta Tunnels.....

**I am opposed for many reasons below:**

- Benefits don't match costs, costs are exceeding by \$8 million, California can't afford more debt
- Those paying rate increases need to be notified and there needs to be a vote such as for Rural & Urban rate payers
- Farmers need to pay for more costly water, unacceptable - we need to take care of our own first, and allow jobs in California, next thing you know China will buy all of us & ship our products all over (we are already shipping almonds to Asia) - Californians want fresh healthy products on our table from the state we live in
- Tunnels don't provide additional water when we are in drought situation after water rights & public trusts are met
- California Water fix does not help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by 2009 Delta Reform Act
- Barges & construction for years through recreational waterways is not the way to protect Delta recreation. The route to save the estuary, would be to route tunnels for East, by I-5
- Construction plans include de-watering Delta farmers wells for years, making farming and living in their homes not possible. Yet there is no provisions to provide remuneration to them
- The route selected is the worst route since it DOES NOT protect Delta farm communities and Delta recreation as required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act.

**If you really want to put your energy & efforts to a good cause:**

- Allocations & fees need to be graduated, on other properties, I never use my allocation but get same standard fees. If I could only sell the allocation I don't use
- lets get a pipeline from other states to bring water in - LIKE TEXAS

Resident and native of Contra Costa Country and Discovery Bay, CA

Lisa Combs

Reply Reply to All Forward More

Click to Reply, Reply All or Forward

Send

--  
**Lisa Combs**

---

**From:** Cindy Graver <cingofish@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 14, 2015 12:19 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Cc:** BDCP.Comments.copy@nodeltagates.com  
**Subject:** Opposing Delta Tunnels

**I am opposed to Delta Tunnels due to the following:**

- Benefits don't match costs, costs are exceeding by \$8 million, California can't afford more debt
- Those paying rate increases need to be notified and there needs to be a vote such as for Rural & Urban rate payers
- Farmers need to pay for more costly water, unacceptable - we need to take care of our own first, and allow jobs in California, next thing you know China will buy all of us & ship our products all over (we are already shipping almonds to Asia) - Californians want fresh healthy products on our table from the state we live in
- Tunnels don't provide additional water when we are in drought situation after water rights & public trusts are met
- California Water fix does not help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by 2009 Delta Reform Act
- Barges & construction for years through recreational waterways is not the way to protect Delta recreation. The route to save the estuary, would be to route tunnels for East, by I-5
- Construction plans include de-watering Delta farmers wells for years, making farming and living in their homes not possible. Yet there is no provisions to provide renumeration to them
- The route selected is the worst route since it DOES NOT protect Delta farm communities and Delta recreation as required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act.

**If you really want to put your energy & efforts to a good cause:**

- Allocations & fees need to be graduated, on other properties, I never use my allocation but get same standard fees. If I could only sell the allocation I don't use
- lets get a pipeline from other states to bring water in - LIKE TEXAS

Cindy G.

---

**From:** Laurie D <laa552000@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 14, 2015 2:14 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Cc:** bdcpc.comments.copy@nodeltagates.com  
**Subject:** Save the Delta no Tunnels

**I am opposed to Delta Tunnels due to the following:**

- Benefits don't match costs, costs are exceeding by \$8 million, California can't afford more debt
- Those paying rate increases need to be notified and there needs to be a vote such as for Rural & Urban rate payers
- Farmers need to pay for more costly water, unacceptable - we need to take care of our own first, and allow jobs in California, next thing you know China will buy all of us & ship our products all over (we are already shipping almonds to Asia) - Californians want fresh healthy products on our table from the state we live in
- Tunnels don't provide additional water when we are in drought situation after water rights & public trusts are met
- California Water fix does not help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by 2009 Delta Reform Act
- Barges & construction for years through recreational waterways is not the way to protect Delta recreation. The route to save the estuary, would be to route tunnels for East, by I-5
- Construction plans include de-watering Delta farmers wells for years, making farming and living in their homes not possible. Yet there is no provisions to provide renumeration to them
- The route selected is the worst route since it DOES NOT protect Delta farm communities and Delta recreation as required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act.

Laurie & David Nadelman

---

**From:** Sachau, Robin M. <sachau2@ltnl.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 21, 2015 2:31 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** Delta Tunnels Public Comment

Dear Representative,  
I am 100% opposed to the Delta Tunnels project.  
California needs water storage projects to address the state's water supply needs.

California population has increased dramatically since their water storage infrastructure was built. The Los Angeles basin in particular should not be relying on further siphoning from the Sacramento River.

The Delta Tunnels project is too costly and absolutely does not deliver enough water to justify its price tag. Delta communities will be adversely impacted by this short-sighted plan.

California needs more water storage, desalination facilities, and just plain better options for the water storage in the state. *The Delta Tunnels project is not a Water Fix*. It is just another extreme expenditure which in fact will not deliver a single additional drop of water to our drought ravaged state. We need a better and less costly solution to our water problems.

Thank you,  
Robin Sachau  
14555 Escalon-Bellota Road  
Escalon, CA 95320

---

**From:** Christine Mendenhall <cfmendenhall60@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 21, 2015 4:16 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** Delta Tunnels project

*I am 100% opposed to the Delta Tunnels project.  
California needs water storage projects to address the state's water supply needs.*

*California population has increased dramatically since their water storage infrastructure was built. The Los Angeles basin in particular should not be relying on further siphoning from the Sacramento River.*

*The Delta Tunnels project is too costly and absolutely does not deliver enough water to justify its price tag. Delta communities will be adversely impacted by this short-sighted plan.*

*California needs more water storage, desalination facilities, and just plain better options for the water storage in the state. The Delta Tunnels project is not a Water Fix. It is just another extreme expenditure which in fact will not deliver a single additional drop of water to our drought ravaged state. We need a better and less costly solution to our water problems.*

Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** Dee Simmons <deesimmons@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 25, 2015 5:55 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** STRONGLY OPPOSE Delta Tunnels

Dear Decision Makers,

I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:

1. The **National Academy of Sciences** has already stated that the Delta water supply is overdrawn for the health of the Delta.
2. The Sacramento **Delta is the largest estuary in North and South America on the West Coast and the largest estuary in the United States West of the Mississippi**. It is the fountain of life -- equivalent to Mesopotamia or the Amazon-- for species habitat. The Delta must be protected.
3. The Greater Bay Area threw away over a trillion gallons of treated wastewater last year, which could have been recycled and reused for Agriculture. The shortfall in the Central Valley was 2.1 trillion, according to UC Davis. This "new" water should be pumped to locations where farmers can use it. **Recycled water** is high in nitrogen and phosphorus and is neutral pH, so it is better for Ag than potable or raw water.
4. The Delta Tunnels are predicted to **damage the economies** of the 5 surrounding counties, creating negative economic effects.
5. The United Nations estimates that 40% of our production is lost from Farm-to-Table. At the same time, approximately 1/3 of global warming is due to Agriculture. We have to move as much of our

Agricultural production as possible into urban areas where recycled water is produced and into **greenhouses**. Greenhouse growing increase production, reduces water use, provides a steady supply of locally grown fresh produce with better food safety and smaller carbon footprint and less loss from farm-to-table. It is time to do what Europe and countries in dry climates do and bring more of our production into closed environments.

Please STOP THE TUNNELS. Stop this environmental and economic disaster.



---

**From:** carolynphinney@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 24, 2015 10:28 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** STRONGLY OPPOSE Delta Tunnels

Dear Decision Makers,

I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels.

1. The **National Academy of Sciences** has already stated that the Delta water supply is overdrawn for the health of the Delta.
2. The Sacramento **Delta is the largest estuary in North and South America on the West Coast and the largest estuary in the United States West of the Mississippi**. It is the fountain of life -- equivalent to Mesopotamia or the Amazon-- for species habitat. The Delta must be protected.
3. The Greater Bay Area threw away over a trillion gallons of treated wastewater last year, which could have been recycled and reused for Agriculture. The shortfall in the Central Valley was 2.1 trillion, according to UC Davis. This "new" water should be pumped to locations where farmers can use it. **Recycled water** is high in nitrogen and phosphorus and is neutral pH, so it is better for Ag than potable or raw water.
4. The Delta Tunnels are predicted to **damage the economies** of the 5 surrounding counties, creating negative economic effects.
5. The United Nations estimates that 40% of our production is lost from Farm-to-Table. At the same time, approximately 1/3 of global warming is due to Agriculture. We have to move as much of our Agricultural production as possible into urban areas where recycled

water is produced and into **greenhouses**. Greenhouse growing increase production, reduces water use, provides a steady supply of locally grown fresh produce with better food safety and smaller carbon footprint and less loss from farm-to-table. It is time to do what Europe and countries in dry climates do and bring more of our production into closed environments.

Please STOP THE TUNNELS. Stop this environmental and economic disaster.

10/20/2015

Dear Bay Delta Conservation Committee:

As a resident of San Joaquin County, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my opposition to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix (“Delta Tunnels”) proposed project. I am extremely concerned as to how this project will impact the citizens, businesses, and wildlife of the San Joaquin Valley. Under the Governor’s plan this project will cause further harm to the unique and fragile Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. It is unbelievable to me that such a proposal is being made when this region has been so severely impacted by the current drought. This project does not provide new water to our region yet it is a plan is to ship the water we do have, south.

Southern California has not placed any restrictions on land development or the giant agribusiness corporations. This harkens back to a similar situation—when Los Angeles in the 1800’s outgrew its water supply. At that point, water was diverted from the Owens Valley to Los Angeles via an aqueduct.

The Delta Tunnels Project is simply another grab for our precious resource. We cannot afford to have such a project similarly impact the Delta region. We cannot afford to have it effect the wildlife of the Delta or effect the approximately 4 million people, including 2,500 farmers who contribute \$2 billion to California’s economy each year. At an estimated cost of \$15 billion, we deserve a better solution and a more prudent investment to address the state’s water supply needs.


I sincerely urge you to reconsider and end this proposal.

Mary Shaw

P.O. Box 7702

Stockton, CA 95267

OCT 27 2015



SACRAMENTO CA 957

22 OCT 2015 PM 11

Mary Shaw  
PO Box 7702  
Stockton, CA 95267

BDCP/WaterFix Comments

P.O. Box 1919

Sacramento, CA

95812

958121919

OCT 27 2015

RECIRC 2867

2965 Hazelwood Way  
Lodi, CA 95242  
October 25, 2015

BDCP/WaterFix Comments  
P.O. Box 1919  
Sacramento, CA 95812

To Whom It May Concern:

As a young boy in the 1960's, I remember my father was strongly opposed to the building of the aqueduct, under Pat Brown, which stole water from Northern California to supply the water hungry citizens and farm conglomerate in southern San Joaquin county and Southern California. Now his son, Jerry, is trying to do the same thing.

Having fished the Delta for many years now, I have seen the decline of the striped bass, shad, and smelt because of the lack of fresh water flowing through the Delta. Now you want to take more fresh water and pump it through the twin tunnels. It makes absolutely no sense to do this. How is less fresh water going to restore the Delta, as salt water intrusion is already a serious threat to many of the farms and fisheries located in the Delta region. This is just a water grab by Southern California politicians, citizens, and business interests and I have no interest in having my tax dollars to be used to pay for the building and maintenance of the tunnels.

I oppose any project/plan that would take any additional fresh water out of the Delta. Perhaps you should tax the people of So. California and start building your own dams. When it rains in Southern California, all the water runs out to the ocean.

You represent me and others who oppose this and need to stand up against the BDCP/Twin Tunnels.


Sincerely yours,



Barry Clark

RECEIVED  
OCT 29 2015

2965 Hazelwood Way  
Lodi, CA 95242




SACRAMENTO CA 957

26 OCT 2015 PM 5 L

BDCP/Water Fix Comments  
P.O. Box 1919  
Sacramento, CA 95812

OCT 29 2015

95812191919



RECIRC2868



October 27, 2015

**VIA US MAIL**

Ben Nelson  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Bay-Delta Office  
801 I Street, Suite 140  
Sacramento, CA 95814-2536

Secretary Jewell  
Secretary of Department of Interior  
Department of the Interior  
1849 C Street, N.W.  
Washington DC 20240

Estevan López  
Commissioner  
Bureau of Reclamation  
1849 C Street NW  
Washington DC 20240-0001

Hilary Tompkins  
Solicitor, U.S. Department of the Interior  
Department of the Interior  
1849 C Street, N.W.  
Washington DC 20240

Jennifer Gimbel  
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Water and Science  
Department of the Interior  
1849 C Street, N.W.  
Washington DC 20240

757312

OFFICE OF THE  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

2015 NOV -2 AM 11:22

RECEIVED

**Re: The Center for Environmental Science Accuracy and Reliability (CESAR)  
Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the  
Coordinated Long-Term Operation of the Central Valley Project and State  
Water Project  
Docket No.: RR02800000, 15XR0680A1, RX.17868946.0000000**

Center for Environmental Science,  
Accuracy & Reliability  
2014 Tulare Street, Suite 423  
Fresno, CA 93721  
Phone: 559-554-2947

October 27, 2015

Dear Secretary Jewell,

The Center for Environmental Science, Accuracy, and Reliability ("CESAR") is a non-profit, public interest conservation organization whose mission is to ensure the efficient and effective enforcement of environmental laws, fulfill the educational goals of our members and provide educational information on environmental statutes and their application to the general public.

Our review of the draft EIR identified a number of serious omissions and errors. The document is fatally flawed both from the perspective of its compliance with both the District and Appeals Court direction and with respect to its compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA).

The major shortcomings of the document include the following:

**1. The EIR fails to follow the direction of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals that,**

*"...Reclamation must conduct a NEPA review to determine whether the acceptance and implementation of the RPA actions cause a significant effect to the human environment...."*<sup>1</sup>

Reclamation completely sidesteps the effects of implementation of the RPA actions by defining the baseline as operation of the project with the RPAs in place. This results in there being no alternative considered that does not include all or some of the RPAs. By defining the 'baseline' as project operations with the existing RPAs in place, Reclamation avoids ever having to address the catastrophic consequences of the unilateral adoption of the Services' RPAs. On its face, this is inconsistent with both the text and the intent of NEPA, does not comply with existing case law regarding consideration of "baseline" or with the March 13, 2014 decision of the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit order.

Reclamation justifies ignoring the court's order by explaining that because the RPAs were provisionally accepted (before the court order that defined the mandatory scope of review required under the law) and the No Action Alternative represents a continuation of existing policy and management direction, the No Action Alternative includes the RPAs. This circular logic ignores the reality that under no circumstance could Reclamation adopt such far reaching and fundamental changes in operation of the projects without a NEPA review. Just because there was a temporal lag between implementation of the RPAs, and the Court's decision, doesn't mean that Reclamation can ignore the requirements of the law.

The implementation of the RPAs requires a NEPA review of that 'provisional' policy and management decision. Despite the clear order of the court, such a review has not been completed, and this EIR fails to complete such a review.

**2. The EIR fails to consider the effect of the adoption of the RPAs on the 288 listed species in California.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the Coordinated Long-Term Operation of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project, page ES 6.

October 27, 2015

The Coordinated Long-Term Operation of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project provides water from Trinity Dam all the way down to Imperial County in Southern California. California has experienced longer and deeper droughts than the one currently being experienced. However, until adoption of the RPAs in the Services 2008 and 2009 Biological Opinions, the projects have never allocated zero deliveries. There have been delivery reductions, but not a cessation of deliveries.

In the past, when drought occurred, the OCAP provided substantial supplies of water for listed species. This water, delivered in the form of irrigation water, was used directly by species both listed and unlisted. The water supported crops which provided habitat and food. The crops supported pollinators which pollinate listed plants and help sustain seed bank creation. The irrigation water provided crops such as alfalfa, nut crops, field crops which ensured populations of prey to sustain listed predator species, and reduce pressure on listed prey species. The water supplied by the OCAP blunted the devastating effects of drought on the natural world as individuals, cities, and farms sustained plant and animal life through irrigation. The EIR must consider the effect of reduced carrying capacity of the lands formerly irrigated in both the northern and southern portions of the state, on listed species both directly through reduced food and water supply, and indirectly.

**3. The EIR fails to consider the disproportionate effects on low income and protected classes of people.**

Reclamation's implementation of the RPAs, and its failure to consider an actual No Action Alternative as required by the court had the direct effect of immediately reducing economic activity in the service areas south of the Delta. Local counties saw unemployment rates of as much as 40% as a result of the provisionally adopted RPAs. The effects were almost exclusively visited on those populations living in rural areas, with few economic opportunities. The effects of the BiOp were not evident in any urban area or urban minority populations. Some of the towns and cities in these rural areas even suffered loss of public water supplies. The EIR must consider the disproportionate effect of the implementation of the RPAs on these populations.

Reclamation's adoption of the RPAs, which have been demonstrated to be based on little to no science, and which have subsequently been proven to have had disastrous effects, are subject to NEPA. This draft EIR does not comply with the requirements of NEPA. Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Yours Truly,



Leah Zabel  
Staff Attorney

Center for Environmental Science, Accuracy & Reliability

---

**From:** Banonis, Michelle <[mbanonis@usbr.gov](mailto:mbanonis@usbr.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 06, 2015 1:00 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** Fwd: DCN: BOR0005602 - Comments on the DEIR on the coordinated long-term operation of the Central Valley Projects and State Water Project  
**Attachments:** Comments on the DEIR.pdf

**Michelle Banonis, J.D., Special Assistant (Acting)**  
**Bureau of Reclamation**  
2800 Cottage Way  
Sacramento, CA 95825-1898  
(916) 978-5198  
(916) 397-4914 (cell)

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** <[SHunt@usbr.gov](mailto:SHunt@usbr.gov)>  
**Date:** Fri, Nov 6, 2015 at 12:35 PM  
**Subject:** DCN: BOR0005602 - Comments on the DEIR on the coordinated long-term operation of the Central Valley Projects and State Water Project  
**To:** [MBanonis@usbr.gov](mailto:MBanonis@usbr.gov)

FYI



**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
**TASKING PROFILE**

ACCN #: ESO-00066389    Status: Closed    Fiscal Year: 2016  
Document Date: 10/27/2015    Received Date: 11/02/2015    Due Date:    Action Office: BOR    Signature Level: AA    Doc Source: ENV

To (Recipient): Jewell, Sally

From (Author): Zabel, Leah

Staff Attorney  
Center for Environmental Science, Accuracy, & Reliability

Subject Text: Comments on the DEIR on the coordinated long-term operation of the Central Valley Projects and State Water Project

Req. Surnames:

Mail Carrier:

Mail Track #:

Cross Ref:

Copies To: SIO-OES

Status Tracking:

Correspondence Specialist and Phone: SIO-OES Nicole Dinkins-Brown 202-208-7612

Closed

Comments:

Signed: