
From: Kathy Bunton <kbunton@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:02 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: OPPOSE DELTA TUNNELS

Kathy Bunton

**Concerned Delta resident and small business owner
Antioch, Ca 94509**

10-30-2015

BDCP/WaterFix Comments

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

As a small business owner and resident who drinks water supplied via the Delta, I am opposed to the construction of the tunnels. I fear water quality issues that would impact my business and the irreversible damage that would be done to the delta ecosystem. More of my concerns are expressed below.

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.
- 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 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.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Kathy Bunton

RECIRC 2658

From: Ruth Clark <r2clark@citlink.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:04 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Oppose Twin Tunnels

We have lived in CA for 50 years where our family has boated, camped and fished in the **salt-free delta water**. We have **brought out-of-state family and friends** to enjoy and stay in this beautiful water resource, **which in turn has helped the delta economy**.

In 2000 we purchased property and built a home on the banks of the Sacramento River. We have **noticed big changes** in the last few years **in our delta area** with **less fishermen**, because of less salmon and other game fish and an increase of **huge quantities of warm water plants** (water hyacinth, reeds, invasive grasses and general green scum) **that dangerously clog our sloughs and waterways**.

Our **Sacramento River** is the main supply of fresh water to the delta and bay estuary. The **Twin tunnel project** has the **capacity to take away all the freshwater flow to the San Francisco Bay**. We are **especially concerned** to what the twin tunnels will do to the landscape, **removing 32 miles of soil, destroying present farmlands and old growth orchards**.

Instead we need new sources of fresh water. Let's look at **other alternative plans to bring water to California**: plans that will be **more financially conservative, less disruptive to our beautiful state**, while **protecting our wildlife, our environment** and especially **our water quality**.

Sincerely yours,
Ruth L. Clark
17332 Grand Island Road
Walnut Grove, CA 95690

From: Marcia Briggs <marciabriggsdesign@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 10:50 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: info@aqualliance.net
Subject: Oppose Twin Tunnels

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Marcia Briggs. I live in Butte Creek Canyon, Chico Ca (Butte County) and am writing to oppose the Delta Twin Tunnels project. I am opposed because of the extreme cost of the project, the tunnel muck problem, and the possible threat to Northern California's aquifer systems.

Thanks,
Marcia Briggs
marciabriggsdesign@gmail.com

From: Aleck Dambacher <aleckd@att.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 10:48 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Opposition to Bay Delta Conservation Plan

I am writing to express by strong objection to the so called "Bay Delta Conservation Plan". A title, by the way, that does not even begin to describe any part of this huge water grab.

I have been a resident of the Delta since 1936 and since the mid 80's have been working hard to improve and maintain the levees along the Mokelumne River in the Thornton area. I have seen, at times, more water than the river systems in the Delta could handle and times when there just hasn't been enough to go around. We have a conveyance system now that does the job and with some improvements in the levees and adjusting the flows to the south, could continue to provide those to the south with water.

It is unconceivable to invasion a need for two huge pipes, draining every last bit of the flow from the Sacramento River, just to satisfy the needs of metropolitan areas, some located adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and large farming interest trying to grow crops where nature has never designed them to grow. Any High School Science Student will explain that rain fall is very limited on the lee side of a mountain range, the soil has never been washed of it's harmful salts and other minerals and I ask just what are we doing in the lowlands as these substances rise to the surface?

The San Francisco Bay and the Delta are two jewels of our Great State. I am proud of them as are millions more. Why are we even thinking of plan that could completely devastate the region in time. I have almost completely lost confidence in my government official and see no guarantee of proper flow control.

The wool has been pulled over our eyes. We the people, were never asked if we should spend Billions to transport more water then what can produced. I look at the CVP and Delta Mendota canals and they seem to be conveying water just fine, meanwhile we are limited to the amount we can use to grow our crop, if at all, here where the rain falls.

I ask you please, let's scrap this tunnel idea and develop a plan to improve my Delta, allow us to use water that passes our farms and still provide water to the south when available.

Sincerely

Aleck Dambacher

From: Diana Young <dyoung@comdesworks.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 1:23 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: opposition to Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix

I am writing to express my opposition to the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A) project, which cannot help but have a disturbing impact on the ecological balance in our Delta bioregion and beyond. This expensive and destructive project does not take into account the potential of local projects and educational campaigns that can save billions of dollars while create many new jobs.

Increasing water independence by investing in groundwater storage and other water catchement and storage options will help to recharge our depleted aquifers. Investing in development and promotion of gray water systems is another promising direction to take. We need approaches that will help build long-term sustainability and begin to restore ecological health to our river systems and reduce public dependence on water that should flow through the Delta.

Subsidizing industrial agriculture through mammoth projects like the proposed Twin Tunnels is not only harmful to the survival of the fish and other fauna and flora that depend on the flow of the Sacramento River but it brings harm to the soil and to the health of the those who consume the factory-farmed produce.

I urge you not to permit this dangerous project to move forward.

Diana Young
Oakland, CA 94609

From: Marjorie <damasa@pacbell.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 3:08 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Opposition to the BDCP

I am opposed to the BDCP because the benefits do not outweigh the costs.

These tunnels will be an environmental, economical and social disaster for the state.

I am vehemently opposed to these tunnels.

Sincerely,

Marjorie Brown

Sent from my iPhone

From: Gregory Pruden <gregorympruden@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 7:28 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: opposition to the Delta Tunnels

Dear BDCP,

My name is Gregory Pruden and I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels project.

This project does not meet the statutory requirement of being co-equal to both a more reliable water supply and protecting and restoring the Delta. The project is strongly balanced in favor of water contractors and other users against the needs of the Delta. The fact is that all healthy delta estuaries require water, and the California Delta is already severely oversubscribed. This project exacerbates this current predicament which will only hasten the Delta's demise. Furthermore, this project ignores many other methods, such as conservation and water recycling, that are much cheaper and less damaging to the environment.

Shelve this project. Do not give in to hubris. Have the moral and political courage to revisit this project. To do otherwise is to attach your name to a catastrophic legacy. Do you want to be known as being part of the effort that destroyed one of the most ecological important areas in the world? Or do you want to help save it? I urge you to reconsider this project.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Gregory Pruden

From: Jay D <jaydd1960@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 2:01 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Opposition to the Delta tunnels!

I adamantly oppose the misdirected efforts to sustain Southern California development's demand for water through suckling our San Joaquin delta to destructive levels, and further fostering an entitlement mentality towards Northern California water resources! Salt water intrusion is already jeopardizing habitat and species! California Teamsters Who Votes :
JAY DOMENY

From: Fisher, Jennifer <Jennifer.Fisher@morganstanley.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 4:40 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: tygerfisher@gmail.com; Katie (ktygerfisher@gmail.com)
Subject: Opposition to tunnels

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan. I have objections to the environmental, economic, and quality of life impact these tunnels will create. These tunnels may cause increased contamination of municipal and private wells for inhabitants of the Delta region and beyond. I am very concerned about the impact rising salinization rates will have on native salmon, and other species that rely on the availability of fresh water coming through the Delta from the Sacramento river. The Delta is a fragile ecosystem with many native fish, birds, and mammals that rely on the availability of the fresh water which will be compromised by this plan.

The estimated high costs for the tunnels make it an economically unsound project which bears little fruit except for a few large corporate farm entities. I think it is unfair to ask the taxpayers of this state to foot the bill for such a large and ill-conceived idea as these twin tunnels which benefit so few. Why does the Governor think it is ok to ask California taxpayers to foot the bill for a project that benefits large industrial farming entities and privately owned water districts in the Kern County district? Especially when these farmers are growing water intensive crops such as almonds and nuts? In the end the small family farms in the Delta region will be harmed by this project if not completely decimated by it. The economy of the region which is built on small family farming, fishing & sport fishing, and other Delta area services that are dependent on the fresh water flow will most certainly be hurt by these tunnels. I urge you to vote against this project.

Jennifer H. Fisher

Important Notice to Recipients:

Please do not use e-mail to request, authorize or effect the purchase or sale of any security or commodity. Unfortunately, we cannot execute such instructions provided in e-mail. Thank you.

The sender of this e-mail is an employee of Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC ("Morgan Stanley"). If you have received this communication in error, please destroy all electronic and paper copies and notify the sender immediately. Erroneous transmission is not intended to waive confidentiality or privilege. Morgan Stanley reserves the right, to the extent permitted under applicable law, to monitor electronic communications. This message is subject to terms available at the following link: <http://www.morganstanley.com/disclaimers/mssbemail.html>. If you cannot access this link, please notify us by reply message and we will send the contents to you. By messaging with Morgan Stanley you consent to the foregoing.

From: Douglas Main <sageman37@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:43 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Pipe dream tunnels!

Scientific knowledge is being trumped by a political pipe dream. The destruction of the San Francisco Bay Delta will be the result of corporate greed and a leader bent on misguided legacy.

Who is picking up the tab allowing salt water intrusion? Could it be Westlands Water District or the tax payers of the state?

Some legacy!

Doug Main

From: Michael Doyle <MichaelDoyle_4@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 2:40 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the Tunnels!

I am opposed the Delta Tunnels. This proposed project will decimate an already fragile habitat and be devastating to the environment.

:Stop sending Northern California's water South

:Building tunnels has nothing to do with Earth Quake upgrades or preparedness. That is a marketing sham/joke! It has everything to do with exporting more water South.

:Draining the Delta is not a solution to the declining Delta Bay environment. Wild life and fisheries, particularly Salmon need more water and run off in the Delta Bay system. Not less!

:Stop building so many new homes in communities where there is no water. New house production in communities such as Indo Valley, Chowchilla Valley etc. are irresponsible and all new home development should find alternative sources for water. Not destroy other parts of the State.

:Northern California residents have been on strict water rationing while Southern California has not.

:Stop planting water intensive crops in the Tri Valley. Almond and rice farm production should be curtailed or stopped. These farmers should plant more responsible crops that are more drought friendly and use far less water.

:I live on the water in Discovery Bay Ca. This is my home and back yard. Property prices, water quality, recreation quality will all be dramatically degraded if the tunnels are built. It is outrageous and unfair that Politicians, mostly from Southern California get to decide and dictate what is best on this matter. All the while not having a clue, or any idea what damage will occur. They should at the very least visit the Delta Bay area for themselves be for making such detrimental policy.

Sincerely,

Mike Doyle
4032 Newport Lane
Discovery Bay Ca. 94505
michaeldoyle_4@hotmail.com

From: Linda Miller <lsm221133@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 6:56 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Water

I oppose the building of the Delta tunnels.

From: Nancy Girard <nancygirard930@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:56 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Water fix

I am opposed to the Ca water fix idea. Nancy Girard Garrison

Sent from my iPhone

From: Lawrence Horn <larryhorn@citlink.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 3:46 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Water Fix?

When does the public get to vote on this? If we don't get to vote on it then why will we have to pay for it? Don't tell me the public won't pay for because we both know that is a lie. Water fix is a bad idea.

Larry 🙄

From: sash2000@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:01 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Water intakes on The Sacramento River

We are in total opposition to the idea of having water intakes installed on the Sacramento River. There is no reason for these water intakes as they will deplete the river that we need for Northern California economy. If you install the water intakes and the tunnels The Delta will not function properly and the Delta will have salt water that will damage all the land. Do not install the water intakes on the river and do not build the tunnels

WE ARE NOT IN FAVOR OF THIS USLESS ACTION.

Salomon LeChuga

From: David Dixon <david@premierfinishing.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 2:06 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Waterfix Comments

FROM:
David Dixon
11332 North Alpine Rd
Stockton, CA
95212

TO:
BDCP / California Waterfix Comments
PO Box 19
Sacramento, CA 95812
Re: RDEIR/SDEIS
BDCPComments@icfi.com

Dear Sir,
I am a private Citizen and resident of Stockton, CA
I would like to make a comment on this proposal that I believe is important.

Water Quality Impact of Delta Water.

BDCP Draft EIR/EIS has showed significant and unavoidable impacts of the water in the delta if this project is to go forward. The RDEIR/SDEIS has concluded that the project "would not causecontaminants to be out of compliance" because "staff from DWR and Reclamation constantly monitor Delta water quality"

This means nothing due the fact when in the past when contaminants, are "out of compliance", the Bureau of Reclamation and Department of Water Resources petition the State Water Resources Control Board and exports are allowed to continue, even when water quality is deemed "unacceptable".

Mitigation measures which have been proposed, Chapter 8, only ask for "more evaluation and modelling". I cannot understand how "significant and avoidable" impacts can be mitigated by further research. The research needs to be done BEFORE the EIR/EIS, not after.

I believe strict water quality limitations need to be set and these MUST be adhered to. The excuse of "there is a drought" or "we forgot this" needs to be part of system of water quality control. There needs to be a change where the Delta is not looked upon as the first party to give way when considering how to save water. This last summer, some people believe that if they purchase the water, they can use it how the please. You can tell by how many green lawns there still is. The delta needs water to survive. There are no written protections in this RDEIR / SDEIS.

It is now time to place the Delta as a priority.

The west coast of the USA set a precedent nearly 100 years ago, when the Colorado River Delta became a completely dry waterbed. This destroyed that delta area. We can see what happens when we do things wrong. The excuse was that we did not know better. We do now. We cannot allow a repeat under the disguise of "we need it". There must be written, cast iron protections for the delta to survive.

Water Quality of the Delta Water must be a Priority. The Plan must be changed to reflect this Priority.

David Dixon
Cell: 209-662-4908

From: Graham Connor <gdconnor@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:58 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: WaterFix Comments

We have many concerns about the BDCP/CA Water Fix plan. Our family has owned a farm in the North Delta for 6 generations and have experienced the effects of salt-water intrusion and degeneration of water quality over the last 50 years. The health of the whole bay-delta ecosystem is in jeopardy due to the drastically reduced water flow from drought and aqueduct diversions. Rather than mitigating this threat to the delta, the plan you propose will increase it by sending more water south to irrigate orchards planted in sodium, boron, and selenium salts-laden, non-draining and unsustainable soil. The plan EIR/EIS report ignores the requirements of Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act as well.

Since the CA Water Fix does nothing to produce more reliable quality water supplies or improve conditions for sustaining the health of the bay-delta ecosystem and flagrantly side-steps the requirements of the Clean water, Delta Reformation, and Endangered Species Acts, we are opposed to the Delta Tunnels/CA Water Fix (alternative 4A) Plan.

Graham and Charlyn Connor

From: James Quirk <jhquirk@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 2:03 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: Margaret Quirk; James Quirk
Subject: We Oppose the DeltaTunnels "Solution" To California's Water Shortages

Dear Gov. Brown: Although we have voted for you twice, we think this huge project to ship still more of the Sacramento River and other Northern California water resources to Southern California is a TERRIBLE IDEA. Please go back to the drawing board on this proposed project, and start BROADCASTING all further proposals on this subject TO THE PUBLIC. Thank you in advance for seeking more reasonable water- conservation solutions for this obvious problem. Jim & Peggy Quirk, Orinda, CA

From: Henry 1 <henrygo@citlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:13 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Why I oppose the tunnels

My home is on 17 acres on Scribner Road. The tunnel project proposes to move the State Scenic Hwy 160 over across my holdings so that the road can be cut to install the tunnels. It is a callous and insensitive idea, completely disregarding our history of place. This is not fly over country. People live here, American was born in rural circumstances. This is not just a piece of dirt, it is Holy Ground. My wife died here, my daughter nearby. It was to be my legacy gift to my children and grandchildren. This notion of land ownership should not be taken lightly. It is part of the American Dream, a final repository of the idea of ownership of land, as embodied in the spirit of the Homestead Act and Kindcaid Act that drove the Westward Ho movement. In that part of the American Experience, land was bought by sweat equity, so many years you improved it, and title was yours. In the history of the Western World it was never done before. It became a lynchpin of the American Century. So, my equity was work to pay the mortgage, which I did. Some of my neighbors have invested *five* generations to bring the land to bear fruit and fiber. On my side of the fence, one generation ago, as an immigrant family we were not allowed to own land because of ethnic barriers. But goodness and justice prevailed, history blessed, and now I am faced with a sense of despair thinking of a future of Silent Springs which will fall on this land, never to enrichen the lives of my children and their children.

Henry Go M.D.

From: Thom & Kathy Quinn <thomkathyquinn@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:19 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Tunnels

I object to the proposed "tunnels" in the Sacramento Delta. This is just another attempt to build the peripheral canal. Governor Brown's Father (Pat Brown) tried to get the PC built and twice we voted it down. Jerry Brown tried in his first administration to get approval for the PC. Now he has the "brilliant" idea of building it underground. Does he really think Californians are that dumb, that we wouldn't recognize the PC in this form. Stop trying to kill the Delta and STOP trying to ship more water to your friends in So. Cal. If they want/need more water, they can build some more reservoirs in So. Cal.

Thom Quinn

From: Victor Rosasco <vrrosasco@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 7:30 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Fwd: tunnels

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

From: **Victor Rosasco** <vrrosasco@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 30, 2015 at 6:49 AM
Subject: tunnels
To: BDCPComments@icfl.com

I am strongly against the Tunnel project because I live in the Delta and for the last 50 years I have seen firsthand the devastation to the Salmon, Striped bass and other species of fish that the Central Valley Water Project has caused. This tunnel project is just an extension of that destruction because whatever environmental benefit claims made eventually will be outdone by water greed. Just look at the amount of water diverted from the delta on a year to year basis and compare this with the numbers of spawning Salmon for that year. Water allocation in California needs to be corrected so that the Delta stops being degraded from insufficient flows, these tunnels just create a avenue for greater amounts of water to be diverted. Where this water goes is not to sustainable agriculture, look at what the farming practices have done to the aquifer and at the problems caused by run-off from irrigating land poisoned with selenium. Permanent crops were never to be irrigated with Project water but look at the amount of new orchards in Kern County alone in the last 5 years. This tunnel project will not benefit Californians in general, just a small group of rich corporate farms and water districts.

Before any water project is completed the problems of ground water depletion, wildlife destruction and water allocation have to be solved.

Victor Rosasco

From: Rick Dougan <blackbassrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:53 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Tunnels

Please don't let the Tunnels get built I as the majority of voters voted against the Tunnels and I don't understand why the governor thinks he knows best. We the people decided no and no means no. Jerry Brown has disappointed me as a registered voter. Please help to stop the Tunnels from being unfairly built.

Rick Dougan
(925) 337-7314

From: Janet Willett <jaynut@velociter.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 6:14 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Tunnels

Our planet is in peril because of ideas like this. The Delta is a system that cannot survive if we make these kinds of changes. We have an ecosystem which man made tunnels may harm forever. NO TUNNELS!

Janet Willett

From: Robert Eberhardt <chicobob007@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 4:24 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Re: Tunnels

You want us to believe that this is in the best interest to the state to build these tunnels. I didn't know a handful of special interests mega-agafarms were called a state. Secondly how can we believe anything you say when laws were passed to conceal the identity of all the farmers and irrigation districts, G C I D in Northern California who are lining up to suck-up, sell and transfer groundwater the the highest bidder south of the delta. I believe one of them, who is supposed to represent us in northern California is our congressman Doug Lamalfa. If this is true that he is in line to sellout his neighbor to the west who relies solely on groundwater, I would like to know how transferring water out of Butte county benefits Butte county.

On Oct 29, 2015 3:36 PM, "Robert Eberhardt" <chicobob007@gmail.com> wrote:

Why should the entire states taxpayers be required to fund such a huge project that will only benefit a handful of corporate farms in the central valley? Will central valley big-ag continue to deplete Northern California's groundwater and transfer it south through these tunnels? Our groundwater levels here in Chico are at historic lows, our ground is also sinking and wells are going dry! Will these big-ag water buyers in the south compensate our homeowners and farms in the northstate whose wells go dry as a result of these groundwater transfers? Will these water buyers in the south compensate the northstate people who could be flooded as a result of groundwater transfers and the resulting subsidence and lowering of the sacramento river levies that protect us during floods?

From: Robert Eberhardt <chicobob007@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 3:37 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Tunnels

Why should the entire states taxpayers be required to fund such a huge project that will only benefit a handful of corporate farms in the central valley? Will central valley big-ag continue to deplete Northern California's groundwater and transfer it south through these tunnels? Our groundwater levels here in Chico are at historic lows, our ground is also sinking and wells are going dry! Will these big-ag water buyers in the south compensate our homeowners and farms in the northstate whose wells go dry as a result of these groundwater transfers? Will these water buyers in the south compensate the northstate people who could be flooded as a result of groundwater transfers and the resulting subsidence and lowering of the sacramento river levies that protect us during floods?

From: vfirstclass <vfirstclass@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 3:10 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Tunnels

Please do away with this nonsense and cut all the bureaucratic bs and build dams to save new water instead of taking away existing water that will only destroy the delta region. It would sure be nice to see common sense be the norm in government instead of stupidity. Thank you for hearing my opinion. Harry

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S® 6, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

From: Frank Rehermann <rehermann@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 5:54 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: tunnels, my view

I am adamantly opposed to the twin tunnels in terms of being a fix for California's water shortages. The scenarios I see are as follows:

- 1) The cost of the project is being grossly understated. This state never builds projects on time or on budget, to wit the Oakland-San Francisco Bay Bridge.
- 2) I see Northern California, the origin of the water to be transferred in the tunnels, becoming a wasteland without agricultural prosperity. Our water will be used to fuel rampant development in the south, transferred through the tunnels with little or no consideration as to origin water rights.
- 3) Many families who depend on delta agriculture for their living will be dispossessed and it will be impossible to compensate the affected parties. We will have built an enormous project at the expense of generations who have chosen the delta as a place to live and thrive.
- 4) Export of Northern California surface water to the arid and overdeveloped Central and Southern parts of California will cause even more pumping of groundwater in the north, leading to subsidence. Has everyone forgotten about Owens Valley? The Sacramento Valley is not exempt from devastation.
- 5) Building the massive tunnel system does nothing to increase water storage in Northern California.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Rehermann
FJR Farms
Live Oak, CA

From: Carol Haig <carolhaig@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 2:35 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Twin Tunnels

I am opposed to the Twin Tunnels project.

Carol Haig
Sent from my iPad

From: Dave Hawke <annedave2000@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 1:28 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Twin tunnels

To Whom it May Concern:

This is a plea to the committee studying the twin tunnels project NOT to go through with the plan. The twin tunnels would be a disaster not only for the Delta, but also for those of us living in northern California. In point of fact, the cities of Davis and Woodland, as well as the University of California, Davis, have water rights now to draw water from the Sacramento River for their drinking water. The pipeline to syphon that water is being laid as I write this plea. One can only imagine how two mid-sized cities and a large university draining water from the River will impact the Delta; if the twin tunnels are built, drawing even more water from the Delta, it will absolutely devastate what is left of that essential ecosystem. The salmon run already is immensely diminished due to the 4-year draught. In addition, the water released from Shasta Dam is too warm -- about 58 degrees -- when salmon need the water to be no warmer than 56 degrees. These factors, too, impact the Delta.

Please consider the above facts when decision-time arrives. I beg you to forget the idea of twin tunnels for the sake of the State of California.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

Yours truly,

Anne Hawke
3011 Mallorca Lane
Davis, CA 95618
(530) 756 9214

From: Nancy Schleiger <nativespringsnursery@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 3:05 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Twin tunnels project

Please do not proceed with the twin tunnels project. It will have very negative effects on the Bay delta and the economic and environmental health of Northern California. I understand that Southern California wants more water, but there is much more that could be done to ease their situation. The culture of SoCal depends on a steady supply of water from the North, but that's not sustainable. Our culture must change to deal with reality. That means a growing population must use less per person to make the supply equal demand, or create more usable water. Desalination, drip irrigation, low-water use landscaping, roof rainwater collection, recycled waste water: all these and more have to become part of our culture. Draining the resources of one area, to satisfy the needs of an always-growing other area won't work in the long run.

We are deeply opposed to this project, both for its huge cost and environmental irresponsibility.

Nancy Schleiger
Durham, CA 95938

From: Judith <judith.rubin308@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:11 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Update

Do not proceed with the Twin tunnels project. It is not good for the people of this community.
Don't let greed be your primary motive.
Judith

From: Steve Schramm <reelsafari@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 6:40 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Terrible plan

To whom It May Concern:

The current BDCP is a rehash of the old peripheral canal plan. I oppose it and want to see genuine consideration to a plan that draws water west of the Delta.

Sincerely,

Steve Schramm
Petaluma, CA

From: ED BASSI <ecmbasi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 2:31 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: The Bay Delta Conservation Plan Water Fix "Making My Voice Heard"

I am strongly against the Twin Tunnels, which from what I understand is now a proposed triple tunnel due to the fact they can't take away enough of Northern California's water with just two tunnels.

This all started decades ago when our politicians decided that the best thing for the Northern California Delta was to ship as much water as they could down canals to Central and Southern California. This alone was not a good idea for Northern California as our Delta has suffered since and so have Northern California farmers and inhabitants who have had to accommodate and cutback on their water usage for many decades.

And now our current Governor would like to divert all this clean water from the north end above the delta into these tunnels to the mouth of the canals that flow to Southern California so that all of this clean water bypasses the Delta. By keeping the clean water out of our Delta they want us to believe that this is what is best for the health of our Delta?!

You have got to be kidding me!! Who in their right mind would believe that this would benefit or be healthy for the Delta and the inhabitants of Northern California?

We have voted on this before and vetoed the twin tunnels and I can't believe that the politicians are going to push this through without the approval of the inhabitants of Northern California. I am appalled, disappointed and extremely concerned about what is to become of our Beloved Delta..

I hope my voice is heard
Edward Bassi, Manteca California

From: Daniel B. Hrdy <dbh@citrona.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 10:22 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: March, Andrew
Subject: The tunnels are a bad idea

Dear BDCP,

I am surprised that someone has talked Governor Brown, who is usually admirably fiscally sensible, into supporting this plan. It is bad for the ecology of the Delta without creating any new water.

More importantly, it ultimately takes resources away from creating new storage, which is what is needed in times of diminished snowpacks, severely fluctuating rainfall, and growing water demands. Even if the era of big dams is over, there are many opportunities for medium and small sized reservoirs that could capture water in normal and wet years.

Daniel B. Hrdy
Citrona Farms LLC

From: brcarr10@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 7:22 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Strong Objections to the Bogus Twin Tunnel Idea

BDCP,

Scientists have made clear and will continue to make clear to California that extracting any additional water from the Delta will collapse the fragile Ecosystem. Instead, Kern County needs to find its own water through desalination or making more realistic choices on what crops its attempts to grow.

Instead of trying to push this fatally flawed and illegal plan through, we as a state need to focus on self sufficiency, and not pull huge amounts of water to barren waste lands to supports crops like almonds that take a gallon of water for each almond produced.

The California Public and Delta community will not accept the Twin Tunnel idea and we need to think of environmentally acceptable methods as an alternative. Please contact me directly to ensure you received this formal objection.

Thank you,

Bryan

Sent from my iPhone

From: jeanieg@sonic.net
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:45 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop The Twin Tunnels from the Delta

I was shocked to read in Tuesday's SF Chronicle that we voters would not have a chance to vote on this issue as we did in 1982. I had read about the proposed tunnels for some time, but I assumed that the voters would be able to make the final decision. It makes me feel as though I do not live in a democracy at all.

Please submit this issue to the voters of California.

I think these tunnels are total folly.

Thank you.

Jeannette C. Grant
415.928.4612
1020 Union St.
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: Ruth Henrich <rmh1508@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 3:18 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the twin tunnels!

to: Bay Delta Conservation Plan

Please rethink the Twin Tunnels project. The water that will be sent to Southern California is needed to protect the Bay's wildlife, wetlands and recreation. We must keep fresh water flowing into the Bay and stop the Twin Tunnels. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ruth Henrich

From: Alan Lilly <ABL@bkslawfirm.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 10:43 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Request to be added to service list

Please add me to the e-mail service list for all BDCP, Cal Water Fix and Cal Ecorestore documents.

Thank you,

ALAN B. LILLY

Bartkiewicz, Kronick & Shanahan, P. C.

1011 22nd Street

Sacramento, CA 95816

Tel: (916) 446-4254

Fax: (916) 446-4018

e-mail: abl@bkslawfirm.com

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT: The information in this electronic transmission (e-mail) is confidential and may contain privileged attorney-client information or attorney work product. The information is intended only for the use of the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or the agent or employee of the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any, use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone at (916) 446-4254, or by reply e-mail, and delete this e-mail from your computer. Thank you.

From: Jacklyn Shaw <jjjjshaw@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:32 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov; BDCPcomments
Subject: Restore Delta River dredging, Antioch Bay Bridge to Sacramento City; Also, promote RESERVOIRS (percolation); REFORESTATION (snow); DREDGING (smooth flow); DESALINATION and jobs with basins and coastal cities.

From: Jacklyn Shaw <jjjjshaw@verizon.net>
Subject: Amend Delta Levee Dredging for Antioch Bay to Sacramento City (not part way)
Date: October 23, 2015 at 12:53:10 PM PDT
To: [Representatives; agencies; etc.]
Reply-To: Shaw Jacklyn <jjjjshaw@verizon.net>

on 10/23/15 from jjjjshaw@verizon.net

RE: Restore Delta River dredging, Antioch Bay Bridge to Sacramento City;
Also, promote RESERVOIRS (percolation); REFORESTATION (snow);
DREDGING (smooth flow); DESALINATION and jobs with basins and coastal cities.

AMEND: Please add amendment for DREDGING to Antioch Bay Bridge from Sacramento City (not just to Clifton Bay Court, near Tracy).

HALFWAY? We appreciated USACE petition for Delta Levee Maintenance (*). However, partway is not fully cost effective. It could cause salt backup for vineyards, with drought in aquifer for wells and quality water for our health*.

ALGAE: Stockton Record reported photos on algae growth from warm waters.

DISB (Delta Scientists) enumerates environmental and economic impacts to oppose underground twin tunnels, 40 foot wide, 35 miles.

AQUIFERS/reservoirs? Drought affects our health, 20 miles from Rio Vista (heart of Delta River with San Joaquin COUNTY, of 28 in Central Valley).

Please advise before winter El Nino. Thank you for opportunity to express concerns and observations.

Regards

Jacklyn Shaw, Ed.D. Zin grower, Lodi, CA 95242

cc: others

From: Jacklyn Shaw <jjjjshaw@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 2:19 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: RDEIR/SDEIR Executive Summary? RJ brief: Real Jobs in business development or unending fixit revisions at government cost?

On 10/1/15 from jjjjshaw@verizon.net (via websites and email contact; with Milo Frank, 60 Second Message, continued):

Dear USA/CA elected legislators:

OBJ: Please reappropriate funds to USACE/Engineers (with 100 year Delta maps). Most vitally, it is for annual DELTA DREDGING from ANTIOCH BAY BRIDGE to Sacramento City! That is before EL Nino heavy rains this winter. The Army Corps petition was encouraging, but Delta Dredging needs to include the main river ways of Sacramento City to Antioch Bay Bridge. Thereby they are assisting the PORT of STOCKTON (algae from warm waters).

APPROACH: On July 10th at CVFPB/flood workshop, data was 80% NON-COMPLIANCE for Delta Levee maintenance. In 2014, Senator B. Boxer sent LEVEE FUNDING for USACE to Washington State. That means (hopefully) she can "reappropriate", that is restore the Delta Levee repairs, before heavy rains of winter El Nino.

HINT: A petition was sent by the USACE, but it only said from Sacramento City area to Clifton Bay Court.

KEYS (with respect to your time):

1: PORT of STOCKTON with Navy ships has ALGAE overgrowth from warm waters ([stocktonrecord](http://stocktonrecord.com); and [awc/sjcgov.org](http://awc.sjcgov.org)).

2: Many EXPERTS GIVE ALARM on destructive Delta Twin Tunnels:

2a: Reports are projected to have "occasional reverse flows" (Corwin, WB).

2b: That means taking fresh water near Sacramento City, causing SALT BACKUP to food crops and ground water, natural aquifers, like in San Joaquin COUNTY (farm bureau, sjfb.org).

3: USGS, B2 shows San Joaquin County as mediterranean subtropical, and counties southward as semi-arid in Central Valley (of 28 counties). Delta counties have the most FERTILE SOIL in the Americas.

4: The FINANCIAL impact/damage can be DEVASTATING as more communities in the Delta counties report their PRODUCTIVITY (6th or 7th in the world, with California as #1 for USA): FOOD CROPS; FISHING; RECREATION; TOURISM, etc.

CLINCH: How can we encourage USACE/Sacramento [and private dredging] to continue to maintain Delta levee repairs in all of the islands? Soil purifies (by aeration and absorption). Silt can be realigned. DREDGING NEEDS TO BE DONE FROM SACRAMENTO CITY ALL THE WAY TO ANTIOCH BRIDGE.

Please reply. Best to Congressman's local meeting Oct. 5 on the California Fix

CLOSE: Waste of Twin Tunnels "for not a drop more" -- can be better spent for continued prosperity, with restoration.

1: That is by OPTIONS for JOBS IN BUSINESS not bureaucracies (in water and land grab):

1a: DELTA DREDGING (U.S.A.C.E./ engineers);

1b: 26 testing points for coastal DESALINATION (like do Navy ships; for three times more water; and ongoing business job developments);

1c: Thanks to Senator Feinstein's on 26 testing points for California Desalination, in the Senate bill.)

1d: 90% of all Californians live 30 miles from the coast (Cwinn, supervisor, sjcgov.org)

2: WORDING becomes general (on water districts) and meaningless to locals, without town, city and county maps: elected in counties or appointees by agencies? San Joaquin County or Central Valley (28 counties); pump use adjacent property values near rivers; region diverters; or divestments for housing taxes (with no water); hydraulic mining with basins for desalination options; etc. conveyance (siphon pipe or 35 mile destructive twin "channels". Would M. Twain note a literal coverup of beautiful, historic Delta rivers of proven beneficial use?)

3: GROWERS measure water by observation for results; electric bills for emitters and sensors, etc. Destructive twin tunnels (size of channels from Britain to France) -- would DEVALUE THE PROPERTIES of California citizens. (Bipartisan Representatives like Garamendi, resident near Delta Rivers, wrote against Twin Tunnels.)

WE AGREE with you that continued prosperity means better more pragmatic OPTIONS. (That includes expenditures for productive jobs; and for natural river water recycle with regional benefits in restoration)! God bless USA and Delta Rivers, too.

Sincerely,

Jacki Lauchland Shaw, Ed.D., Zin grower, west of Lodi (and 15 miles from projected 35 mile coverup in Delta).

P.S. Directors of irrigation districts told me that growers need to go to water board meetings or we'll have a dust bowl. (So on to "waterboarding" I go.)

P.P.S. Motivation of 20 year mortgage to pay off younger sisters: We saved late Dad's ranch house he built and the Old Vine Zinfandel vines that his five daughters helped him graft, prune, etc. Delta sunsets are breathtaking wonders of beauty! Delta and Sierra are real places, not just book volumes. Visit us all.

From: sash2000@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 10:58 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: River intakes on the Sacramento River

I believe that the twin tunnels, removing water from the Sacramento River with three giant intakes, transporting the water under the delta to Los Angeles is filled with long lasting problems. We have just experienced one of the longest water shortages that I can remember in my lifetime. We, in Northern California, are under strict water rationing. Our family lives on a small ranch with a well that supplies our water. We have let our pastures dry, our lawn dry, did not plant a garden this year, are feeding our animals every day with expensive grain and hay, and we are praying daily for rain. How will it help Southern California to send what little water we have left down there? If it is for the few wealthy business men who have large walnut and almond orchards that need lots of water--let them dig wells as our farmers have done.

Governor Brown has said that we should be ashamed of ourselves for asking that this "fix" be stopped. The billions of dollars involved in executing this "water fix" should be enough to give some people pause. How can we afford this when we have already started the bullet train to nowhere. Further more when someone did question the vast amount of money this water project would cost, Governor Brown took out of the budget the money to take care of the environment, the wildlife and people who farm and live in the communities in the delta.

Once the Sacramento River is diverted from washing through the delta we will experience salt water intrusion in our wells. What do we do then Governor Brown? Oh, that will no longer be your problem will it. You will be somewhere else in retirement. The huge canal you now have running through Northern California to Southern California, transporting much of our water, even though we are in a four year drought, is ENOUGH. YOUR "WATER FIX" IS NOT WANTED HERE IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA.

From: Lisa Wilhelm <lisa@globalpayexperts.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 2:51 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: FW: Please Join Me-Oppose California WaterFix (Twin Tunnel project) Send Opposition today - Friday 10/30

I am vehemently opposed to the "California Waterfix" aka Twin Tunnels project, for all of the reasons stated below.

Lisa Wilhelm, Founder & Managing Partner
 Global Payments Experts LLC.
 10 Hickory Avenue
 Corte Madera, CA 94925
 Office: +1 415-927-7746
 Mobile: +1 415-806-3948
 email: lisa@globalpayexperts.com
 LinkedIn profile: <http://www.linkedin.com/pub/lisa-wilhelm/6/0/59b>

The Governor's "Waterfix" has dropped its original environmental mitigation requirements and now is pushing ahead to start construction early next year with no consumer or legislative approval needed. Only approval by federal authorities is required. Caught in the balance, is the ecological health of the SF bay and wetlands, fish species, thousands of threatened Sandhill cranes and other sensitive species that travel the Pacific fly way. Residents, all those who derive their work from the waters, tourists, and future generations of Californians will not know the pristine and vibrant ecosystem we enjoy today for commerce, recreation, and fish and wildlife habitat.

Synopsis/facts

- 1) Recent History - The Delta Tunnels Project formerly known as the Bay Delta Conservation Project (BDCP) included \$8B for construction, mitigation and habitat restoration, in addition to \$17B for tunnel construction. The stated purpose of including migration was to comply with legal requirements to meet co-equal goals of 1) water supply reliability and 2) ecosystem restoration. In Fall 2014 the National Academie of Sciences and the EPA, and US fish and Wildlife Service, and several other agencies disputed most of the plan's claims of environmental benefits and the EPA would not grant the project the 50 year protection from environmental lawsuits it sought. In response, the Brown Administration did two things:
 - a. Reduced funding for mitigation and restoration from \$8B to \$300 Million.
 - b. Split the project in two
 - i. Delta Water Tunnels construction project called the "California Water Fix
 - ii. The mitigation and restoration project dubbed "California Eco Restore."
 - c. This separated the construction project from any restoration work and abandoned the pretense of meeting co-equal goals of supplying water to farms and municipalities, and protecting the water quality and natural habitats.
- 2) Governor Brown has altered his original proposal that provided for the protection of water **and** the preservation of habitat. This Protection was dropped in the fall of 2014 and now the project has **no** requirement to preserve the ecosystem already at the breaking point. It also omitted any reference to an impact to San Francisco Bay, a tactic that the National Academie of Sciences

cited as one of the BDCPs critical scientific gaps. Additionally Governor Brown has asked President Obama to tell the federal agencies officers to give the Water Fix Tunnel project a pass on the adherence to laws concerning the endangered species and water quality.

- 3) The two tunnels will each be 40 feet wide and 30 miles long and run 150ft below the surface. They will begin at the Streamboat Slough a major channel of the Sacramento River and divert water to the central valley via a pumping station in Tracy. They will run directly under rich Delta farmland (300 farms estimated to be acquired by imminent domain but no communications to farmers yet), and Staten Island – the winter home of the Sandhill Cranes that use the Pacific flyway. A map of the project is attached below.
- 4) The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Met Water) supplies water to 17M Californians. It obtains most of its water from elsewhere, Colorado River, and 19% from Sacramento River in wet years. Met water has not waived in its support of the tunnel project. They are currently suing the Delta area farmers for using Sacramento River water to irrigate their crops.... water to which the Delta farmers have the highest legal right. In addition documents came to light in Sept 2015 that appear to outline a plan by Met water to buy Delta land in the path of the tunnels without publically disclosing that they would be the purchasers.
- 5) Equipment is already being positioned to begin work on the Waterfix site beginning early 2016.
- 6) The Waterfix project is a reincarnation of the peripheral canal project defeated by voters in public referendum in 1982. It is a 20th century large infrastructure project that doesn't match up to 21st century issues like global warming and drought (i.e. shrinking snow pack in the Sierra). The project will not create one additional drop of water for Californians, will cost and estimate \$15B up to \$67B and take 10-15 years to build...making drought relief a moot point.
- 7) Impact - The diversion of greater amounts of fresh water from the Sacramento River will result in more intrusion of salt water into delta farmland and ecosystems. It will render natural fertile farmland useless, eliminate populations of native fish species; change the ecology of Delta waterways, the Suisun Marsh, San Pablo Bay, and San Francisco Bay. Some Fish biologists believe that the project will wipe out all 21 native fish species. The slowing currents and increased toxin laden San Joaquin river water, and increased salinity will turn sloughs into weedy polluted marshes with blooms of toxic algae to injure humans, pets, and wildlife. This will impact regional and commercial fisherman, marine owners workers farmers, and people who live and work in the Sacramento and San Francisco Bay area. Tourists and future generations of Californians will be deprived of the natural beauty of the vibrant ecology of the largest estuary on the west coast of the Americas. Many of these forecasted "waste land areas" are lower income.
- 8) The tunnels are vastly larger than needed and current flow of the rivers and could hold 2/3 of the average river flow of the Sacramento River. San Jose Mercury News columnist Paul Rogers said that it is "like building an 8 lane highway and only two lanes would ever be used." Additionally no operating guidelines or governance plans in place to regulate the WaterFix.
- 9) The Environmental Water Caucus has proposed a comprehensive water plan to meet California's needs including more investments in water conservation, groundwater replenishment, storm water catchment, and water recycling. Californians have already stepped up and have conserved 25% through simple low cost strategies in a short amount of time.
- 10) The beneficiaries of this project are not the citizens of CA but corporate fruit and nut tree farm interests in the arid region of central California (historically less than 6 inches of water per year). These interests have seen margins in the 30% range using water at subsidized rates. Product is often exported, and tree farms cannot fallow their fields during drought years. Paradise Foods (owned by Stuart and Lee Resnick) currently have 188 square miles of farms of high margin nut crops that use more water than 9 Million Californians. The Resnicks (multi-billionaires) have increased their acreage of water guzzling crops: walnuts 30%, almonds 47%, and pistachio 118% over the past ten mostly dry years. Recently they have said they will increase the almonds 10% annually. They are consistent political financial campaign contributors.
- 11) The governor has used criticism of the Delta levee system in event of earthquakes as justification of moving the water. Geological experts have said the threat to the levees is blown totally out of proportion and any leaks have been prior to 1972 since no funds were allocated for upkeep of the levees. Federal monies have since been allocated and since then there have been no levee failures.