
From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Margaret Adam <info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 6:35 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.

.We know better than to risk destruction of a critically important habitat and the species it supports in the interests of making money. I firmly believe that Southern California residents and Central Valley farmers need to find a solution to their water problems in efficiency and recycling. Thus the major benefit of this proposed project will be the transfer of billions of taxpayer's dollars to the builders and operators. That would be beyond scandalous.

Too many people in a desert is a problem we don't solve by destroying a river and delta.

This plan is too expensive and too costly to our environment. There are many associated costs not included in the proposal.

Worst of all, we don't have the scientific analysis to show whether the project can be built without destroying the delta. Obviously, sensible people do not proceed with a project under these conditions.

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. Margaret Adam
972 Acacia St
Corona, CA 92879-2601
mararet_adam@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Bob Blackmoore
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:05 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.

No more fracking. Charge Nestles to pay for the water they steal and sell. Save Lives not farms in the desert.

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,

RECIRC2995

Mr. Bob Blackmoore
8707 Wight Way
Kelseyville, CA 95451-9229
robertblackmoore@me.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Linda Degelman
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:16 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 31, 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.

.After 4 years of drought, water is more precious than gold. We need to plan the use of our water resources very carefully.

The cost and so called benefits are unwarranted.

The giant agribusiness corporations will be the beneficiaries at the expense of the public and the environment.

Please abandon this program. It is very dangerous 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. Linda Degelman
PO Box 127
Camino, CA 95709-0127
degelman90@hotmail.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Linda Downing
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 4:35 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.

.There are alternatives for water conservation and usage that would not be so destructive. Are you familiar with the work that is being done by Columbia College? We need a revised, updated, innovative water usage plan that does not include dams, tunnels and California habitats.

I am totally opposed to 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. Linda Downing
154 Olive Springs Rd
Soquel, CA 95073-9643
linda@got.net

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Jay Doane
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 11:35 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 think this kind of project is exactly the wrong approach to be taking. The planet is making it clear that we are not being good stewards.

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. Jay Doane
604 Vermont St Apt 5
San Francisco, CA 94107-2660
friendsoftheriver@almery.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Ronald Forbes
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:37 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.

.As Conservation Chair, I and the over 100 members of the Delta Fly Fishers unalterably oppose the "California Water Fix".

It will destroy the Delta .

It will only continue public subsidizing wealthy S San Joaquin Valley Corporate farms in an unsustainable arid area.

Public debt will be huge . Just remember Cal Trans say the retro fit on the Bay Bridge would be only 1.5 billion dollars. It was \$6.5 billion and still has issues that will cost us more

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. Ronald Forbes
132 S Crescent Ave
Lodi, CA 95240-3412
(209) 368-5767
bluse03@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Deborah Gonzales <info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:05 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.

.Please consider the impacts to our Eco system. Our Northern California wild life, people, and waterway are already terminally struggling under the impacts of the drought! It is not right to only consider the needs of only half this State. We have reservoirs that are nearly empty, rivers that now could not even classify as streams. Our natural water resources are nearly depleted.

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. Deborah Gonzales
1606 Gloria Dr
Stockton, CA 95205-2694
dgonza3364@yahoo.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of aaron girard
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 1:36 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.

.stop the tunnels.. Dont steal our water or our fish... It will only make it harder on us fisherman and women... We need our water and our fish dont take either of them from us... Aaron girard. 1701 marshall rd... Vacaville ca 95687

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. aaron girard
1701 Marshall Rd Apt 302
Vacaville, CA 95687-5984
(530) 488-8589
aaronchapman32@gmail.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Diana Haslam
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:15 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.

.We should be able to find a better solution to California, especially South California's water shortage. Perhaps it's time to consider an evaluation of growth vs infrastructure and quality of life for all.
This is way too destructive!

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. Diana Haslam
20 Kevin Ct
Walnut Creek, CA 94596-5427
(925) 932-8993
dianahslm@aol.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Judy Johnson
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:36 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.

.please, please, these tunnels would be a disaster fo.r callifornia!

We need a very different plan, one that will not cause so much destruction for the temporary benefit of just a few.

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. Judy johnson
1530 Woodman Cir
Placerville, CA 95667-4929
jujojo43@hotmail.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Emily Luscombe
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:05 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.

Please do not take more water from the ailing, but vitally important Delta system. There needs to be more conservation and are thinking on crops that are grown and farming practices, not more water diversions to Southern California. Save the Delta it is vitally important especially in the face of climate change.

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. Emily Luscombe
PO Box 1284
Laytonville, CA 95454-1284
emmalee.charlotte@gmail.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of kirk mccabe
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:45 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.

It appears that the purpose of this plan is to drive the remaining Salmon, Smelt and other endangered or threatened species into extinction!

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. kirk mccabe
25 Palm Ave
San Rafael, CA 94901-2221
kirkmccabe7@mac.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Doug Olson
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 6:36 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.

.This is the worst idea ever !!

The delta does not belong to Los Angeles and the corporate Almond farmers.

The tunnels will destroy the quality of life in the area they are built in.

It is a huge expense. Some estimates exceed \$50 billion in total costs. And we get no new water from that. The idea that the tunnels will protect the water supply in the event of an earthquake is spurious at best. The delta would continue to flow after an earthquake and why would we expect tunnels built on a flood plain to survive a quake centered there?

PLEASE DON'T RUIN THE DELTA WITH THESE 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. Doug Olson
PO Box 1041
Aromas, CA 95004-1041
(831) 241-8158
doug@completeproduce.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Francesca Reitano <info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 10:36 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.

These tunnels are nothing, if not a water grab. The federal government and the state currently allow cheap water for wasteful farming on arid land, of year-round crops, and stick the people of California with the price tag. Now that Delta restoration is off the table, we see this project for what it truly is.

This is our water. I do not need farmers in Westlands (i.e. Wastelands) to be growing year-round crops that are sent to Asia. We do not need corporations bottling our water for profit. We don't need hydraulic fracturing.

If the state and the federal government managed the public's water properly we would not need these costly diversions that are not equitable, and are not beneficial to the places from which the water is taken, or where the dams are built or raised.

Stop the madness. Do not build these costly, wasteful and destructive tunnels. The science is NOT on your side.

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. Francesca Reitano
2500 54th St
Sacramento, CA 95817-1633
freitano@gmail.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Sarah Ryan
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 7:35 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.

The project's EIR suggests that with climate change, the increased exports of Delta water will further drain Northern California waters.

Listed species will be impacted, as water stores continue to be robbed.

This is not sustainable. It is hard to believe this project is consistent with the Governor's SGMA legislation.

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. Sarah Ryan
PO Box 838
Kelseyville, CA 95451-0838
sryan@big-valley.net

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of David Ryan
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:36 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.

.I vote, and I will not be voting for those who authorise this. That simple. No to shipping more water to so cal. They must keep growth tied to local water. Period.

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. David Ryan
14930 Saroni Pkwy
Clearlake, CA 95422-8841
davidryancmt@gmail.com

From: Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Alex Watts-Tobin <info@friendsoftheriver.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 6:35 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.

On a recent visit to the Bay Delta area using highway 12, I got a closer look at how valuable the ecosystem is. As THPO for a northern California Tribe, and one which has had good recent interactions with the Governor, I would implore you to listen to the voices of the Delta area Tribes, who have the incomparable knowledge of the area and whose voices should be heard in future management plans.

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. Alex Watts-Tobin
PO Box 282
Orleans, CA 95556-0282
(909) 283-5583
googs800@gmail.com