

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Terry Poplawski <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:59 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 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 voters have rejected previous attempts to divert more of the fresh water flowing to the delta and I feel this "twin tunnels" scheme is just an attempt to do an end run around the will of the voters on this issue. In addition I feel this scheme is just wrong at a time when our society should be following a policy of "do no harm" when dealing with such major environmental issues.

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. Terry Poplawski  
612 Walnut Ave  
Ukiah, CA 95482-4239  
[tpop@pacific.net](mailto:tpop@pacific.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Jim Tolonen  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 10:59 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 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.

.please focus on fixing our roads and bridges , not making our water diversion and environmental legacy worse.

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. Jim Tolonen  
PO Box 1119  
Soquel, CA 95073-1119  
[jim.tolonen@me.com](mailto:jim.tolonen@me.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Rev. Jeffrey Womble <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:03 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 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 have submitted another alternative to the tunnels that costs less and doesn't take any more water than is already taken by the canal. I don't know why this hasn't been considered. To cover the existing canal prevents evaporation and eliminates dumping and contamination that has to be dealt with at the other end. Please do not destroy our delta by building the tunnels.

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. Rev. Jeffrey Womble  
11277 N Hwy 99  
Lodi, CA 95240-6810  
(209) 327-1401  
[thirdearlwomble@yahoo.com](mailto:thirdearlwomble@yahoo.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Bob Vasquez  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 10:33 AM  
**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.

.What is the plan for "endangered humans"? All that I see is bickering and taking hard positions with no compromises or working things out for the betterment of our State.

We saw the same attitudes at last nights (so-called) Republican debate.  
It's the same old line, i.e., "it's all their fault and I'm blameless".

You want support, financial and otherwise(?), then, work things out for the betterment of all including the smelt and humans.

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. Bob Vasquez  
PO Box 765  
Imperial Beach, CA 91933-0765  
[ibbobv@cox.net](mailto:ibbobv@cox.net)



**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Martha Swaim <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:32 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 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.

.Why not just make a tunnel out of the existing Aquaduct by installing solar panels on top? That will reduce evaporation and provide some electrical power. Maybe a utility company or companies would take this on. The Netherlands have solar powered bike trails, why not one of those? We need to identify and protect all of our water sources from pollution from fracking and other sources and we need to protect from exploitation by inappropriate uses. Waiting two years to stop frackers from dumping pollution into an aquifer or river is horrid! Once polluted, it may no longer be viable for anything. We can live without fossil fuel more easily than we can live without potable water!

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. Martha Swaim  
2722 5th Ave  
Sacramento, CA 95818-3508  
(916) 456-7699  
[boraxo@pacbell.net](mailto:boraxo@pacbell.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Tracey Sittig <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:01 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 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'm a Stockton native, an birder, and an environmentalist. The governor's plan will waste taxpayer money (for the purposes of lining the pockets of agro-tycoons who should NEVER have planted permanent crops in the southern San Joaquin Valley). The twin tunnels will decimate the Delta. We will lose habitat for fish, birds, and other creatures that were living here in harmony with native peoples until "the rest of us" came west. Trade what's left of a treasure from our Creator so the southlands can have cheap water? No. No. No.

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 Tracey Sittig  
87 W Euclid Ave  
Stockton, CA 95204-3120  
(209) 623-3086  
[tsittig@stocktonusd.org](mailto:tsittig@stocktonusd.org)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of greg simmons  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 4:14 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 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.

While I do support agriculture and the need to provide food and keep our farm economy strong, the BDCP plan goes too far, is too expensive and is going to hurt the Delta environment and hurt the quality of life in Northern California and potentially damage the riverine environment for several rivers. We need fewer dams not more dams. We need to find another way to deal with drought. This plan is not the solution.

Greg Simmons

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. greg simmons  
3208 Susan Ave  
Marina, CA 93933-2617  
(831) 883-9475  
[gregs2001@gmail.com](mailto:gregs2001@gmail.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Monica Padilla <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 6:31 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 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.

Please let us leave nature the way it is meant to be. Every time we try to fix something in the natural environment, we're more likely to make conditions worse. It is so important that this habitat be protected and maintained. I am totally against these tunnels. I think it is a bad idea. Maybe well intentioned, but bad none the less!

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. Monica Padilla  
6193 Baltimore Dr  
La Mesa, CA 91942-4236  
[apad885334@aol.com](mailto:apad885334@aol.com)



---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Forrest Oldham  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 5:31 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 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.

There is an alternative I believe to better serve the people and resources of this great state put forth by Greg Coppes, the Tulare project. It would cost less and be implemented faster with much less negative environmental impact.

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. Forrest Oldham  
1008 Sherman St  
Woodland, CA 95695-5536  
(530) 723-4341  
[forrestoldham55@hotmail.com](mailto:forrestoldham55@hotmail.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of pam nelson  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 5:35 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.

.I live in SoCal and the use of recycled water should be increased.

Residents are doing a good job of conserving, but the Water Districts are raising rates to cover salaries. Attention to groundwater is lagging.

Why pump more water south to be mismanaged?

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. pam nelson  
38723 Highway 79  
Warner Springs, CA 92086-9275  
[pamela05n@yahoo.com](mailto:pamela05n@yahoo.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Carol Nelson  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 11:01 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 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 the BDCP plan to build tunnels, because of the drastic effect it would have on the Delta. We need more wetlands all along the Coast to prevent flooding. We need wiser means of collecting and storing rainwater -- as serious storms are predicted and can be expected as a result of climate change. We do not need costly tunnels that take water away from the habitats that need and rely on it, in order to create thirsty developments in dryer parts of the state. True, agriculture needs more water, and it is for agriculture that we must develop wiser means of collecting rainwater and distributing it to agri-business. But also, let agri-business work on a solution to this problem and pay for at least part of it, as it will be the main beneficiary.

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. Carol Nelson  
427 Miller Creek Rd  
San Rafael, CA 94903-1317  
[calmcats4@comcast.net](mailto:calmcats4@comcast.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Eugenia Larson <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 1:01 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 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 Bay-Delta is a unique place here in the San Francisco Bay Area!

The water located in this region MUST REMAIN HERE for the aquatic fish, birds, and other animals that live in and around the Bay! Also, the water is essential for various agricultural needs as well as supplying the water needs for the Pacific Flyway during migration and over the winter! WE DO NOT NEED TO BE SUPPLYING MORE WATER FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TO WATER THEIR LAWNS AND GOLF COURSES! Southern California residents and businesses need to learn how to conserve their limited water resources, not steal water from others!

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. Eugenia Larson  
160 Canyon Green Pl  
San Ramon, CA 94582-4614  
[eklarson@comcast.net](mailto:eklarson@comcast.net)



---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Danielle Katz  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 11:01 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 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 that we looked at larger holistic solutions-turn to places that have implemented conservation, education, and new technologies successfully (like in Australia). If we've learned any lessons in CA it is that the system we currently use of moving water around the state and over-allocating our rivers is NOT the solution. Let's start setting the precedent for the forward thinking state we are and not move backward in time, the overdevelopment of our resources.

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 Danielle Katz  
PO Box 1103  
Bollinas, CA 94924-1103  
[daniellekatzis@gmail.com](mailto:daniellekatzis@gmail.com)

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Donald Jepson <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:59 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 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 BDCP will destroy the delta and the wildlife in it. This is nothing more than a bypass to take north water and move it south.

The delta will not survive having the water diverted to tunnels and bypass the habitat that you are claiming to improve and save. You are telling us a lie pure and simple. I have read the environmental impact surveys done by UC Davis. They have written a report that is absurd.

The UC system is being bought and paid for with the promise of getting ten years worth of research grants to study the effect of the BDCP on the species present. They are going to be nothing more than the expert wittiness to the death of the delta bay environment. We will have nothing more than a swampy cesspool instead of a thriving delta.

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,

Dr. Donald Jepson  
3824 Ambrosia Ln  
Modesto, CA 95356-1348  
(209) 529-7812  
[d.jepson@sbcglobal.net](mailto:d.jepson@sbcglobal.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Charles Hammerstad <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 6:05 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 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.

.More dams and water storage projects are not going to add a significant amount of "new" water and economically unfeasible. I strongly oppose building tunnels to move more water from Northern California to the south and have a severe impact on our endangered salmon and steelhead.

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. Charles Hammerstad  
780 Portswood Dr  
San Jose, CA 95120-3334  
[chamerstad@aol.com](mailto:chamerstad@aol.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Patricia Hamilton <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 5:35 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 becomes more obvious every day people in powerful positions are making misinformed decisions on life threatening issues like our need for clean water. Since you show you do not know what you are doing and the damage you are wrecking on the planet you need to step back from pushing any more for this plan. To continue the push is pure evil and anti life.

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. Patricia Hamilton  
100 Locust St Ste 9  
Sausalito, CA 94965-2900  
[nada@eelriver.org](mailto:nada@eelriver.org)



---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Mark Flatter  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 7:59 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 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.

Rather than sending more water south, it seems wiser to control growth in the south for the limited water supply that the south already has access to. The Delta habitat should not be made to suffer due to uncontrolled growth. The Delta is the lifeline of our ecosystem for California. It already is on the edge of ruin. Do not support more destruction just for the sake of more water going south.

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. Mark Flatter  
210 Mill St  
Nevada City, CA 95959-2419  
[fishnslt@att.net](mailto:fishnslt@att.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Thomas Coss  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 5:06 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 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.

I firmly believe the tunnels project will kill what is left of the Delta. Government stewardship of this precious resource to date has been negligent to criminal. This needs to stop. Start serving the people you are supposed to serve instead of the water magnates.

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. Thomas Coss  
2707 Cathedral Cir  
Brentwood, CA 94513-5154  
(925) 699-1699  
[tomcoss8@comcast.net](mailto:tomcoss8@comcast.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Paola Berthoin  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 9:29 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 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.

This proposed plan is outrageous especially in this time of history when we have already seen and experienced consequences of poor river stewardship across the state! After the fifty years of this proposed plan, then what? Even more extensive damage will have been committed to the state's river ways, tributaries and deltas and more!

Please vote the twin tunnels and new diversions down!! Dams are disastrous to the health of rivers and all who depend on them, including humans. I have recently witnessed the removal of the San Clemente Dam on the Carmel River. That is history in the making as the largest dam removal in the state of CA so far. Let that set a precedent to allow rivers across California return to their natural flow.

Conservation-oriented alternatives exist! We must learn to live within our means.

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. Paola Berthoin  
25440 Telarana Way  
Carmel, CA 93923-8414  
[valentine1661@yahoo.com](mailto:valentine1661@yahoo.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of L. BARRETT  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 10:03 AM  
**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.

Dear Governor Brown,

It is imperative that we preserve the nature areas that remain in this overpopulated state. PLEASE let the natural, fresh water habitat of the Delta remain intact. It is our responsibility to protect wildlife habitats for future generations.

Thank you for considering my wishes,

Lynne Barrett  
Teacher- K-12

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. L. BARRETT  
PO Box 19032  
Sacramento, CA 95819-0032  
[whiteseaglass@yahoo.com](mailto:whiteseaglass@yahoo.com)



---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Frank Ackerman  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:31 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 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 can't create water by building tunnels. You can't store more water in dams if there is not water to put there. The California drought makes these tunnels useless except to cause more environmental degradation.

This attempt to get more water is a fairy tale, what are you smoking?

Follow the Science NOT the Dirty Money.

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. Frank Ackerman  
1232 Leisure Ln  
Walnut Creek, CA 94595-2935  
[ackermanjay@juno.com](mailto:ackermanjay@juno.com)