
From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 10:38 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,
I support the Governors's California WaterFix! V.
Spolsky

Sincerely,

Spolsky
12424 Indianapolis St
Los Angeles, CA 90066-
vspolsky@dentistry.ucla.edu
(310) 398-3521

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 5:44 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Corporate Agriculture needs to reform the manner in which water is used i.e. Israel! Our water wasting ways need fixing not just enhancing supply for BigAg!

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Ranz
224 Happy Hollow Ct
Lafayette, CA 94549-
geranz@icloud.com
(992) 527-4905

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 5:52 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

Please do not agree to this quick fix strategy. Re routing water only leads to further environmental destruction of local regions and supplies areas with ineffective water use strategies a temporary short cut that does not address overall water shortages within our state.

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Brawley
5084 Charmian Dr
Santa Rosa, CA 95409-
briebrawley@yahoo.com
(707) 527-2008

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 5:33 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix, which has been marketed as a way to fix the Delta while protecting the water supply,, "is not about, and has never been about saving the Delta. The Delta cannot be saved.", , according to Jerry Merel

It is simply a way to fuel Central Valley agribusiness and Southern California development.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Sharp
333 Waverley St
Palo Alto, CA 94301-
jsharp59@yahoo.com
(650) 327-8979

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 5:18 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will protect the Delta rather than diverting even more badly needed water from the many species of water creatures who are totally dependent upon it.

There are many alternative options including expanded groundwater storage, water re-cycling, and decreasing planting of heavily water-dependent crops like cotton in semi-desert areas, and severely limiting water used for fracking, bottled water production, and other harmful practices.

Thank you for your careful consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,
Sharon Morris

Sincerely,

Morris
23693 Glenbrook Ln
Hayward, CA 94541-
skmorris101@gmail.com
(999) 999-9999

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 5:04 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,
Prospectively another big fix creating as many problems as it solves, the California WaterFix could result with degradation / destruction of the Sacramento Delta and extinction of its endemic flora and fauna.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Haddow
536 Laidley St
San Francisco, CA 94131-
2ianhaddow@gmail.com
(415) 452-9294

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 5:01 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

This is without question one of the most short sighted and environmentally disastrous approaches to California's water issues that I've ever heard of.

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Morey
1201 California St
San Francisco, CA 94109-
gordonmorey@gmail.com
(707) 874-3532

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 6:48 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. Water diversion from north to south is old technology and old mindset. The south of California can develop its own water resources through desalinization, recycling waste water, and cleaning up and reusing polluted groundwater. Please no more water transfer infrastructure. Thank you

Sincerely,

Schaller
4628 Ashton Dr
Sacramento, CA 95864-
chuckws@surewest.net
(916) 390-3465

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 6:39 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Propoments are not allowing this to go to vote so they are circumventing our democratic system. Stop the Tunnels

Sincerely,

Schwertscharf
2273 Cryer Street
Hayward, CA 94545-
tschwertscharf@yahoo.com
(510) 363-2219

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 6:04 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. We can not destroy our environment while not requiring the Central Valley and Southern California to implement a water conservation program that will cut water usage in half (1/2).

Sincerely,

Delgado
12100 Steffs Ct
San Martin, CA 95046-
jdquarterhorses@earthlink.net
(408) 683-4456

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 7:47 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

The South has already stolen more than enough water from us.

Sincerely,

Wieland
206 Compton Cir Apt A
San Ramon, CA 94583-
casper55@hush.com
(999) 999-9999

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 7:32 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Why not dredge current water ways to let more water from the sacramento to flow throught the delta. Still need more storage.

Sincerely,

Fort
2216 Kensington way
Stockton, CA 95204-
wally1660@yahoo.com
(209) 992-9645

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 7:29 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

The Tunnels will deplete the Delta of precious water by changing flows, but will not create any new water for California users. If the tunnels are built, operators will likely pressure the State Water Resources Control Board to maximize exports and cause further harm to the Delta, as they have done during this drought.

The San Francisco Bay Delta is the hub of California's water system. The Delta is a unique and priceless ecosystem that depends on adequate flow through it. Depriving the Delta of flows through a diversion point on the Sacramento River will destroy the Delta habitat and economy.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Hinds
1769 Bishop Dr
Concord, CA 94521-
wardhinds@gmail.com
(425) 335-4351

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 7:14 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

MORE! BIGGER!, GROWTH, USE, CONSUME, ...

You KNOW this model is unsustainable. The dire results are showing up all around us to those who are honest enough to see. We are no longer in a "Business As Usual" world. You people (you too, Jerry) are tasked to create solutions - not throw gas on the already growing conflagrations that are our "problems."

FIND A BETTER WAY. Demand conservation (drip irrigation, e.g.) ; Create innovative economies; STOP GROWTH!!

Y'all know the drill. Let's get on it!! NOW!!

Sincerely,

Lawrence
401 Oak Hill Rd Unit 15
Paso Robles, CA 93446-
charlie401@att.net
(805) 227-0588

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:43 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. One such alternative would be to fund water reclamation facilities in local metropolitan areas so we don't waste valuable "run-off".

Sincerely,

Morgen
1156 S Sierra Bonita Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90019-
hjmla@sbcglobal.net
(323) 246-6241

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:42 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta. It is nothing but an extension of the zero-sum policies described so clearly in Mark Reisner's famous book, Cadillac Desert.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Hamilton
738 Point San Pedro Rd
San Rafael, CA 94901-
ogden@johamilton.net
(812) 322-0972

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:40 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix takes water away from where it is intended to be, the Sac delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Steinberg
2346 Marinship Way
Sausalito, CA 94965-
sierraclub@farallon.us
(415) 505-6000

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:37 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will not fix anything... it will break environments that deserve protection including lead to the destruction of the Delta.

The first step needed is to prioritize agricultural water distribution for crops that require less water and to STOP rampant withdrawal of underground water from aquifers.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Allen
660 N Granados Ave
Solana Beach, CA 92075-
bruceallen@roadrunner.com
(858) 259-9458

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:36 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please think very carefully about this proposal that will deplete the Delta but will not create any "new" water.

Sincerely,

Barrett
9519 Carmel Road
Atascadero, CA 93422-
mustang4della@aol.com
805461420

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:32 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. It is a pricey proposition that destroys the natural hub of California's water system while providing no additional water. Not only is it not nice to fool Mother Nature, it is disastrous.

Sincerely,

Jacobson
73 Willowbrook Ln
Walnut Creek, CA 94595-
xtreemlite@yahoo.com
(925) 934-1304

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:24 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta and also punish delta area farmers who use water from the delta to irrigate their nearby crops.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Stoeffler
703 Stewart Way
Brentwood, CA 94513-
dstoeffler@sbcglobal.net
(925) 628=2671

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:14 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. My dad used to work for the S.F. Bay/Delta Water Quality Control Program. He cared about the environment and wildlife, and so do I. You must not divert necessary water from the area needed to keep the delta healthy and keep the fish and birds alive, not to mention supply farmers for their crops. Northern California is so tired of always being expected to supply the needs of southern California at the expense of our own needs. That's one of the big reasons that some people have advocated dividing California into at least two states instead of one. I don't recommend that, but if southern California continues to try to hog our water, that could change. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. The delta needs more precipitation, but otherwise is doing okay. But if the water is diverted, that's a different story.

Sincerely,

O'Brien
5004 Barnaby Ct
Sacramento, CA 95842-
otterbridge@att.net
(916) 962-3128

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 8:02 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will inevitably lead to the destruction of the Delta for absolutely no good reason.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally. CA cannot support massive desert populations using water as if they were in Kentucky or upstate New York!

Please stop the California WaterFix (it's a Fix the same way extinction is a "fix"), and review real alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Koivisto
1556 Great Hwy Apt 101
San Francisco, CA 94122-
offstage@earthlink.net
(415) 555-1212

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 9:54 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. This has got to be the dumbest most ill-conceived idea to solve any water problems in history! CONTROL THE HUMAN POPULATION and come up with a real plan to conserve and protect our environment! Follow the money on this wasteful notion! You can't fool all the people all the time!

Sincerely,

Lawson
61 Mud Creek Rd
Cohasset, CA 95973-
buffalograss@att.net
(530) 343-1479

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 9:50 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

I'm urging the Resources Agency not to go forward with the Delta Tunnels and review alternatives that will actually protect the Delta while increasing local water independence will preserve the environment and our water resources.

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta. Please stop the California WaterFix now to save the Delta for the fish, birds and other wildlife. The loss of the largest estuary on the West Coast of North America is not worth a pair of new tunnels.

Sincerely,

Koepp
1550 Benson Avenue
Cambria, CA 93428-
dkoe@roadrunenr.com
(805) 495-7225

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 9:36 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The tunnels are a really bad plan and will shortchange the river, the environment and the State. The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Chadwick
102 W Carlisle Rd
Thousand Oaks, CA 91361-
lisacchadwick@gmail.com
(805) 495-6668

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 9:34 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

The Tunnels represent a 20th century model of delivering water that won't work in the climate-change challenged present. Increasing temperatures will dramatically alter flow patterns as diminished snowpack becomes the new normal. Less water will be available for export at the same time that more water must be held to preserve salmon habitat and Delta water quality. Increased reliance on Delta exports that will not be available run contrary to preserving the ecosystem.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Koepp
2368 Magda Cir
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360-
kathopp@earthlink.net
(661) 536-8303

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 9:23 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

We need to leave Nature the way it IS! Mother Nature truly knows best. We must work in harmony with her, not try and completely change Her course. The water ways need to stay the way they are. Less development and more open space is what California needs. Stop worrying so much about creating a tax base and developing every square inch of California. It is being destroyed. There is not enough water to support all these humans. Stop attracting them with more housing and shopping malls. It is out of control!

Lindy Marrington
Carmel, CA 93921

Sincerely,

Marrington
PO Box 2541
Carmel By the, CA 93921-
lindymarrington@sbcglobal.net
(831) 625-3968

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 10:23 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will destroy the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

How does destroying the Delta benefit anyone ? Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Gaffin
5201 Lincoln Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90042-
ben@bengpiano.com
(323) 254-0562

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 10:55 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,
please please pay attention to the message below. the answer to the water crisis is not by more draining and channeling, it is by reducing global pollution. you are only destroying the earth with your plans for draining the delta even more. please let the creeks, rivers , trees and mountains recover with help from less pollution. That is the only solution

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Wright
308 S Carrillo Rd
Ojai, CA 93023-
hollyjessicawright@gmail.com
(310) 392-9768

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 10:48 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

This plan is counter productive to the health and needs of the Delta and natural flows of the water. It really does nothing to IMPROVE the water's quantity but simply changes directions and destroy the wildlife and the economic factors within the Delta. It is a huge expense and will bring no positive outcome to the Delta. Seems like this might be a pet project for economic enhancement and doing nothing for the water or the people and wildlife that use responsibly that area. Please VOTE NO on this bill

Sincerely,

Doty
662 Estate St
Redding, CA 96002-
corddoty@gmail.com
(530) 722-6688

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 10:37 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Climate Change predicts a continued and increasing drought in California and the whole western North America. We will need massive desalination to meet our water needs, not water diversion.

Sincerely,

Rees
2296 Sun Mor Ave
Mountain View, CA 94040-
trees2296@gmail.com
(650) 965-4535

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 10:35 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. For the amount of money to pay for fighting the opposition against the terribly flawed tunnels plan, the energy and money would be better spent on plans for desalination plants along the coast of California and water conservation measures. Sucking the life out of agriculture (major food producing region) in the north for the benefit of population to the south is certainly a one sided plan. Who will feed our citizens when good fertile land and food producing environment is ruined and made to no longer be able to produce food and crops that help to feed our growing population? It is not acceptable to ignore the scientific community and the need to protect the local economy and environment. The tunnels are not the greater good.

Sincerely,

Wong
10421 Galveston Way
Stockton, CA 95209-
jeri.wong@att.net
(209) 951-8003

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 10:08 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

Here in the Bay Area Save San Francisco Bay has been working hard to restore marshlands and recreate a healthier bay. I cannot imagine, at a time when we are finally reversing past mistakes, you would even consider anything as devastating as the proposed "Water Fix"! What are you thinking???

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

McClain
2828 Monte Cresta Way
San Jose, CA 95132-
gmcinsj@webtv.net
(408) 309-9882

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 10:04 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento Delta, and is therefore a horrible idea. Destroying the largest estuary on the West Coast of North America is unconscionable.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally. Southern California should not be given water at the expense of the environment of Northern California; that is not a sustainable plan-it borders upon corruption.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta and make the entire California water system sustainable for the foreseeable future..

Sincerely,

Poggi
999 C StApt 9
San Rafael, CA 94901-
pietro@musiquetropique.com
(415) 785-4221

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 11:56 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

THIS IS A SHORTSIGHTED VERY BAD APPROACH TO A LONGSTANDING ISSUE. THE DELTA IS AN RICH ECOSYSTEM, BENEFITING MANKIND AND ANIMAL CREATURES. WHAT'S HAPPENING WITH EXPLORATION OF DESALINIZATION.. The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Embree
440 Dewberry Ln
Oxnard, CA 93036-
angela.c.bochetto@gmail.com
(775) 721-6681

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 11:49 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta. I oppose construction of water tunnels that take water away from the delta near San Francisco Bay.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta. Thanks

Sincerely,

Lewandowski
1636 E 20th St.
Oakland, CA 94606-
kentlewan@gmail.com
5107596646

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 11:48 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta. Why, why why do we always have to try to do the impossible. Let Southern California conserve their water down there and stop trying to grt more from up here, What happens when they have disrupted the whole state water flow and we end up with destroyed lands up here? Let them conserve their own water and stop jeopardizing the whole state water supply for their excessive resource use. And why is Brown so accomodating to them this time around? Getting old!,!!! Get a grip for gods sake!

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Cook
155 Belle View Ave
Petaluma, CA 94952-
glenda_cook@yahoo.com
(707) 658-1931

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 11:32 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.. Delta water. It would change the salt flow possibly up to the water fix intakes. This would change the Delta drastically, we don't need it or want it.

Sincerely,

Hall
PO Box 711
Guerneville, CA 95446-
bluwizz@sonic.net
(707) 887-8959

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 11:04 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

I totally oppose the water tunnels as they will ruin the waterways, habitat for fish and other animal life, and it robs much-needed water resources from our area.

Each city, county, and area of California must only build and develop when the water resources are locally available-or DO NOT BUILD. Do not rob from other areas, which are currently under severe drought, such as the Sacramento area. The people of California should SPEAK UP, NOT SHUT UP! Do not "rob from Peter to pay Paul." Peter then dies...

I am a California native, and I am disgusted by this plan.
DO NOT BUILD THE WATER TUNNELS!

Thank you, Susan Dobies

Sincerely,

Dobies
5570 Arcadia Ave
Loomis, CA 95650-
kpsuedob@yahoo.com
(916) 652-0638

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 9:54 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

If this is a workable system which will actually help maintain the Delta, can you please make that clear? It doesn't seem to me, after reading through the materials, that this makes any sense.

I realize that Southern California is also suffering from drought, but since that seems like a long term situation, shouldn't there be more money spent on doing things like transforming sea water to drinking water, instead of taking the water from Northern California?

Is there anyway that you can be sure that those people who are lobbying for these tunnels are actually motivated by what is good for the state rather than what is good for their pocketbook?

Many thanks for your kind consideration.

Sheila Brady

Sincerely,

Brady
44 Skylonda Dr
Woodside, CA 94062-
sheila@alink.net
(650) 529-0922

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 11:20 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Understand we are voting citizens. If this unsustainable plan to steal water and send it South is allowed. you will be responsible for the destruction of the Delta with all that it represents. Damaging one of our state's most needed and necessary water systems is not just foolish, it's damn dangerous. Dangerous to our water system, our wildlife and to us.

Put the short term greed factor aside and do the right thing. STOP this horrible, ill planned boondoggle.

Sincerely,

Morrison
7966 Via Roma Dr
Fair Oaks, CA 95628-
marketmorr@sbcglobal.net
(916) 601-7805

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 12:18 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

We need conservation and grey water use; not tunnels to move water out of our rivers, estuaries and lakes.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

da Silva
153 Vasquez Ave
San Francisco, CA 94127-
peggyda@sonic.net
(415) 759-6702

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 11:20 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

THIS SENIOR CITIZEN VOTER HAS SEEN ENOUGH "WATER GRABS" IN HER LIFETIME, USUALLY BENEFITING SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AT THE EXPENSE OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA'S RESIDENTS - BOTH ANIMAL AND HUMAN.

WHOEVER (SOME GUY, I'M SURE) HAD THIS "GOOD IDEA" IS TOTALLY WRONG!

STOP IT NOW!

Sincerely,

Arvola
PO Box 976
Fort Bragg, CA 95437-
andarin@mcn.org
(707) 964-1945

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Barbara Damion
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 6:07 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 29, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.The extreme pollution from the building of the twin tunnels will supposedly be mitigated by buying credits from another area. What good will this do except put more money into the coffers of the State treasury? The pollution in the Delta will still be there! No mitigation can possibly be offered successfully to those Delta residents who lose the water they now have from their wells, if the massive project commences and the wells are polluted. How can the DWR give them the water they need for daily living, all to send water down to nut trees grown in a desert? The Delta and its residents and its highly productive agricultural economy will pay dearly for this plan.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted

groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Barbara Damion
8741 River Rd
Sacramento, CA 95832-9712
(916) 665-1115
bcdamion@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of David Geisser
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:34 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 29, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.Save the delta for our grand children. It is a resource to valuable to destroy .
David A Geisser

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

RECIRC2918

Sincerely,

Mr. David Geisser
7650 Surrey Ln
Oakland, CA 94605-3815
Dgeisser@sbcglobal.net

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Gwynne Pratt
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 10:35 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 30, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

I am deeply opposed to putting the financial interests of developers and agri-business over the needs of the environment and all its creatures, including we humans who want it to remain in some sort of natural state. Southern California is in large part a desert, the development of which has for many decades been facilitated by diverting numerous sources of water from their natural courses. With this in mind, if those in power insist on continuing to take water never intended by nature for the purposes to which they wish to put it, they MUST give up some of their profits so whatever plan is implemented includes provision for protection/restoration of the areas from which water is diverted.

Gwynne Pratt
1950 Maryal Drive
Sacramento, CA 95864

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta

water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Gwynne Pratt
1950 Maryal Dr
Sacramento, CA 95864-1550
(916) 502-9695
gtpratt@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Martin Garcia
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:34 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 30, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.To divert water from the Delta will further cause irrevocable destruction of productive agricultural land due to salinization.

California must build desalinization plants for major metropolitan population areas. The cost should be funded by State and Federal tax.

We must prepare for the future, our Grandchildren and their Grandchildren.

The San Joaquin Valley is the Breadbasket of America. The San Joaquin Valley feeds the World. The San Joaquin Valley will lose it's ability and title if additional water is diverted from the San Joaquin Delta.

The effects will ripple through the world economy. In addition to California's dependence on the multi-billion dollar agriculture industry, National costs for California's produce will drastically increase (Supply & Demand) if additional land is contaminated by Salt Water Intrusion.

A great deal of produce has started to be imported from China and It's holdings. China has no Food and Drug Administration. China has demonstrated in past products that substances banned for consumption in the United States are exceptable by China's Standards. That is unexceptable.

I am a Native Californian.
Martin A. Garcia

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Martin Garcia
1728 W Shaw Ave
Apt F
Fresno, CA 93711-3431
(559) 350-3700
maxamerican2003@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Mario Priarollo
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:05 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 30, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

I cannot fathom how easy it is to rape, strip, and desecrate a historic Natural Enviromental treasure like our delta for Agribusiness, and the lack of sustainable water conservation from an all read overpopulated, and careless community of our state! The elephants in the room are Agribusiness Greed, and resource needs because of the overpopulation, and it's impacts! If the state can't supply the water they need than pick up, and go somewhere else that can! Rule no.1 you don't set your own house on fire just to stay warm through winter, sooner or later you run out of house! Do we seriously want to suck the life from the entire state to save the interest of business groups, or should new businesses be made that don't effect the houses the live in? If you can't grow a fruit, or vegetable with limited water...plant cactus! Its a metaphor to find better ways instead of squandering resources on stubbornness, and lack of care for the states environment solely for economics, we haven't tried hard enough, if thatsif we've evan tried our best at all? We have the potential to be a more resourceful, and modern figure, and role model for the entire nation, but not at the expense of destroying the very land, and creatures we proudly claim is California! If the farmers can't do it than make the change there, where it's the problem, not with the rest of the state that has its own responsibilities which are being handled on their own, with modernization, and planning. This impact will be irreversible, and a ugh oh, we shoulda, or

im sorry will not be able to fix it! Don't curse our state to guaranteed future hardship, without making changes where they belong, and with every possible effort without having to rob Peter to save paul? I vote No on the tunnels, I do not agree, and I will solidly hold all of those who choose to continue its creation to its disastrous results! No on the tunnels....my choice stands!

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Mario Priarollo
1539 Mount Pleasant Dr
San Jose, CA 95127-4834
bunnee.hunter@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of BENECYA JACKSON <info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:05 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 30, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

Plain & Simple,

The principles this country was founded on, the check & balances go right out the window when one of the branches of government is under the control of another instead of all working toward a common goal for the states, united. Creating these tunnels will give far too much power to a very exclusive group of people, only their interests will be represented if the elected officials continue to be persuaded by petty campaign donations and promise of political elevation.

Whatever lies these tunnels derive from, I am not fooled as to their purpose; these tunnels are to exist to subsidize a very expensive, time consuming, labor intensive, counter productive system that spreads our resources too thin just to make life a little easier for agribusinesses that have it pretty good already.

I had hoped that our leadership was one of conviction and purpose, one that could take the mistakes of the past and utilize them to the best of their ability moving forward (hello, pumps? hello, petroleum fire?). When the federal government ties up reserve money in non-renewable resources, it is a very dangerous game (hello, stock market crash?). What happens when the almonds are without fertile soil because of the sediment ripping through the state? Land that is already doing as well as can be expected, shouldn't become barren just so that FRACKING can expand.

Focus those millions and billions of taxpayer dollars toward finding a replacement for those resources, more efficient ways of growing, producing, transporting, etc, then you'll solve more than one problem and promote lasting change in the way America does business. Just because you can do this, doesn't mean you ought to. Just because you don't think it will have consequences felt by you, doesn't mean it should be so easy to sell everyone else down the river...pun intended

Apart from money, we will lose alot of things that bare no dollar value. The joy of teaching a child how to fish, the thrill of getting a bite from "the big one," the pride you get from seeing what discarded pumpkin seeds, sun, and a little recycled water can do, the integrity of democracy, the power of VOTING, the trust we enable YOU with, a warm shower after a long day, the dream that so many others hope to join us in one day, the American one.

Do your jobs and speak for the PEOPLE WHO ELECTED YOU not the few that paid you for favors. Because really, if they are to benefit from our hardwork, if we're supposed to just throw our taxes at them instead, well then technically we're the ones paying you to do the job you swore to do. And that's the way it should be. I don't know about you, but to me, California doesn't sound like the place to go if you want to CREATE enviromental hazards and toxic wastelands.

If frackers want more water, they should pump and treat it themselves with their own tunnels and in their own states. Not mine. Not the one you're supposed to be protecting. Shame on you for letting it get this far, this is going to be absolute anarchy if this is approved. If we no longer have a say in what kind of filth we want in our drinking water, then we really don't have any reason to be proud Americans now do we?

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Miss BENECYA JACKSON
7020 Elvora Way
Elk Grove, CA 95757-5909
benecya@gmail.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Curtis young
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 7:36 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 30, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.you need to build de salinatioj plants in so cal and use water from ocean the north has no water to give you go away greedy people Thank you Cordially Curtis Young

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

RECIRC2923

Sincerely,

Mr. Curtis young
929 E Weber Ave
Stockton, CA 95202-3118
curtzy9r@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Jason Martin <info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:06 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 30, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

I live on the delta and if the tunnels are built my water supply will turn into salt water. If this happens everything I have worked for my entire life will be lost.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

RECIRC2924

Sincerely,

Mr. Jason Martin
4912 South Pt
Discovery Bay, CA 94505-9493
Jaysonmrtn@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Joseph Grulich
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 1:05 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 30, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Dear Senators, Representatives, Governor, State Senators, State Representatives, Honorable Sally Jewell, Secretary John Laird, BDCP Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected simply for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and interests in the southern part of our state.

I'm sure that everyone can agree that the Delta is one of the most important sources of fresh water for Californians across the state. It provides water to several million people as well as agriculture, businesses, and the Delta Ecosystem. Maintaining a healthy Delta Ecosystem is critical to preserving the water quality that so many depend on. The Delta ecosystem has been struggling for many years now due to pollution, water diversions, and crumbling infrastructure. Many plant, animal, and fish species rely on fresh water passing thru the Delta to support a healthy ecosystem. The construction of these massive tunnels at a point upstream of the Delta would significantly reduce the freshwater influx into the Delta that so many species depend and need to support a healthy ecosystem. These tunnels will be able to pull huge amounts of water without any way to verify the quantity being shipped south. The reduction of fresh water flowing thru the Delta will significantly affect Salmon, Smelt, and various other species that depend on this water. This will surely wreak havoc on an already weakened ecosystem. Scientifically speaking, the tunnels do not make any sense for helping the Delta.

The Delta is too important to let an ill-conceived proposal such as these tunnels to be constructed. Little or no information has been presented to the public on the affect of taking huge amounts of fresh water out of the ecosystem. The EIR report released for this was 30,000 pages long! There is no way that anyone can read through or grasp the huge amount of information presented to make a sound public comment.

The length and complexity of this document is a clear sign to me that the administration does not want the public to comment on this document. I feel that the people of California are being ignored and set aside to make way for the decision of a few; a decision that affects the whole state.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers. This tunnel proposal is a way for special interests down south to get all the water they want at the expense of the Delta Ecosystem, and at the expense of the tax payers who are being asked to fund this project.

These tunnels are unnecessary and will only benefit the few who are pushing for this project to benefit themselves.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments

Sincerely,

Joseph Grulich
26 Cherry Street
Petaluma, CA 94952

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

RECIRC2925

Mr. Joseph Grulich
26 Cherry St
Petaluma, CA 94952-2168
(805) 704-0424
jgrulich81@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of James Taylor
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 1:06 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 30, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

As a lifelong resident of California born in 1960, I cut my early political/ecological teeth fighting the ridiculous Southern California water grab that was the "peripheral canal", which was championed then by our youngish Governor Brown. Lo and behold, some 40 years later that same much older (Not wiser) Governor Brown is proposing another massive water grab in the guise of the BDCP supported primarily by the Westlands Water District and its large corporate agri-business interests in conjunction with deep pocketed speculative Southern California property developers.

The environmental damage the proposed BDCP would cause is overwhelming. It would absolutely devastate the fragile environment of one of the largest remaining estuaries in the U.S. and the vast array of unique and threatened species that it supports.

It's been a long time since I've felt so much animus towards a proposed government project but the financial boondoggle that is the BDCP is something I absolutely will not allow to happen on my watch as a native Californian. Foisting this project and its expense on generations of California taxpayers to come for the primary benefit of a limited

number of wealthy individuals is a tremendous affront to the fiduciary responsibilities you each hold as government officials.

I urge you to stop this ecological and financial disaster known as the BDCP in its current form before it is allowed to progress any further.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. James Taylor
10070 Willard Pkwy Apt 128
Elk Grove, CA 95757-8725
(916) 715-0000
jdtaylor68@sbcglobal.net

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Andrew Krcik
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 3:45 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 30, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

Finding ways of making California water sustainable starts with farming. Eliminating the small number of crops that consume massive amounts of water is a start. Especially those that are grown for export.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Andrew Krcik
14634 Ambric Knolls Rd
Saratoga, CA 95070-5702
andrew@krcik.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Jennifer Kardos <info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 4:37 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 29, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.The San Francisco bay estuary is too important too lose. Diverting more water for the south is not the answer. Conservation, drip irrigation and other measures should be used instead. How about water waters. Let go after them. Don't kill an ecosystem with millions of people who live around the SF Bay. Don't turn it into an over salted polluted destroyed landscape.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jennifer Kardos
33 Lindbergh St
San Mateo, CA 94401-2014
jen94401@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Richard Morgan Taylor <info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 6:35 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 29, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

It's time to develop our technologies! Develop cost effective de-salinization and far more efficient use, of what water we already have! We will save more money and construct healthy habitatt for all of us creatures. RMT

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Richard Morgan Taylor
1540 W Willow St
Stockton, CA 95203-1538
(209) 948-3518
richardmorgantaylor@yahoo.com

From: KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 12:32 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix Won't! This expensive disaster in the making is the wrong solution for California's water issues. Enhanced local storage, wastewater recycling and better agricultural practices should be our ambition. The tunnels are a terrible idea with grave and costly consequences!

Sincerely,

Preisner
36 Montego Ky
Novato, CA 94949-
mfaith2@verycoolstuff.com
(415) 382-8038