

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1032	1	<p>I support the minimum level of higher flows proposed under the draft Substitute Environmental Document (SED). Based on the information provided by fisheries experts, I would urge the Board to consider the 60% level of unimpaired flows, as more likely to provide the necessary changes in the ecosystem.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please see Master Response 1.1 for responses to comments that generally support the plan amendments, a specific percent of unimpaired flow, or an LSJR alternative.</p>
1032	2	<p>I have attended four SFPUC meetings to discuss the SED. Based on SFPUC’s public comments, it appears that SFPUC opposes the higher flows proposed in the SED. Further, it appears that their opposition is based on outdated or inaccurate information.</p> <p>Given the lack of scientific and economic rigor in their public materials, I would urge the State Water Resources Control Board to exercise a very high degree of skepticism regarding any statements submitted by the SFPUC regarding the SED. I would also urge the Board to insist that the SFPUC support all of its positions with accurate, peer-reviewed information, research and scientific analysis.</p> <p>I would also like to remind the Board of the passage of Measure AA, on the Bay Area ballot in June 2016. This ballot measure imposed a \$12 parcel tax for San Francisco Bay wetlands restoration. San Francisco voters approved Measure AA by 77%. Bay Area voters overall voted 69% in favor.</p> <p>In my view, the SFPUC is ignoring the will of the voters in their opposition to the SED. The increased unimpaired flows will benefit San Francisco Bay’s ecosystem, increasing the return on the dollar for the future restoration work funded by Measure AA.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to general comments on the plan amendments. Additional responses to comments regarding the City and County of San Francisco are provided in Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System.</p>
1032	3	<p>Following are my responses to some of [the SFPUC] public statements.</p> <p>Title of document: Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and the San Francisco Regional Water System</p> <p>Presenter: Steven R. Ritchie, Assistant General Manager, Water</p> <p>Date presented at SFPUC meeting: 2/28/17</p> <p>Quote from Slide 8:</p> <p>"Unimpaired flows are not a useful mechanism in a heavily modified environment. Specifically, 40% unimpaired flow on the Tuolumne River in February-June is unlikely to achieve significant fishery benefits on the River."</p> <p>Response: The evidence from SED Appendix C, p. 3-21 directly contradicts this statement. That page has a graph showing salmon escapement from the three tributaries, from 1952 to 2010. The pattern is crystal clear: during periods of high precipitation, when the entire estuary experienced significant unimpaired flows, we see higher salmon escapement from the three tributaries, including the Tuolumne. These periods had significant unimpaired flows, similar to what the state of California is experiencing this year.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the need for increased flow and justification and description of the plan amendments, including the unimpaired flow approach.</p>
1032	4	<p>Following are my responses to some of [the SFPUC] public statements.</p> <p>Title of document: Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and the San Francisco Regional Water System</p>	<p>The commenter is summarizing responses to SFPUC “public statements” associated with a presentation given by Steven R. Ritchie on February 28, 2017. This comment does not make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Presenter: Steven R. Ritchie, Assistant General Manager, Water</p> <p>Date presented at SFPUC meeting: 2/28/17</p> <p>Quote from Slide 10: "Reducing the number of non-native predators through barriers, active removal and higher bag limits should benefit fall-run Chinook and O. mykiss survival, leading to greater production of salmonids."</p> <p>Response: On August 26, 2010, Peter B. Moyle and William A. Bennett of the Center for Watershed Sciences sent a letter (attached) to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (then Fish and Game). In the four-page letter, the authors summarize scientific research demonstrating the perils of non-native predator removal [ATT: 1].</p> <p>The authors state, "For example, Mississippi silversides are important in the diets of 1-3 year old striped bass, so bass predation could be regulating the silverside population. If true, then relieving silversides from striped bass predation pressure is likely to increase their numbers, which could have negative effects on delta smelt through predation on eggs and larvae (Bennett and Moyle 1996). This strongly suggests that any proposal to initiate a control program for striped bass should carefully consider the likely consequences, as well as involve an intensive study effort on the impact of program to make sure the alleged cure is not worse than the supposed disease. The take home message from all this is that reducing the striped bass population may or may not have a desirable effect." (p. 3)</p> <p>From pp. 4, "Overall, the key to restoring populations of desirable species and to diminish populations of undesirable species (Brazilian waterweed, largemouth bass, etc.) is to return the Delta to being a more variable, estuarine environment. This is likely to happen naturally with sea level rise interacting with levee collapses (Lund et al 2007, 2008), but the populations of delta smelt and similar fishes may not be able to last that long. We stress that attempting to reduce striped bass and other predator populations is unlikely to make a difference in saving endangered fishes, and will serve only to distract attention from some of the real problems."</p> <p>Please note that the full citations are provided on p. 4 of the letter [ATT:2].</p>	
1032	5	<p>Following are my responses to some of [the SFPUC] public statements.</p> <p>Title of document: Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and the San Francisco Regional Water System</p> <p>Presenter: Steven R. Ritchie, Assistant General Manager, Water</p> <p>Date presented at SFPUC meeting: 2/28/17</p> <p>Quote from slide 7: "Our Level of Service objective for water supply (adopted in 2008) is to survive a specific drought planning scenario (1987-92 followed by 1976-77) with no more than 20% rationing from a total system demand of 265 mgd."</p> <p>Response: This policy needs to be revisited. It's almost ten years old. Demand is currently running at 175 mgd. Bay Area water users have conserved, and conserved at rates higher than 20%. Studies of water conservation indicate that a large portion of these savings are permanent; that is, demand will not rebound to previous levels. A more realistic, long-term</p>	<p>The commenter is commenting on public statements made by SFPUC February 28, 2017, and is not making a general comment regarding the plan amendments or raising significant environmental issues. Therefore, no further response is required.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		drought planning scenario would include flexible bands, with increasing levels of rationing as the lengthy drought deepened.	
1032	6	<p>Title of Document: Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan Proposed Amendments (PDF attachment linked to Meeting Agenda) (attached)</p> <p>From: Steven R. Ritchie, Assistant General Manager, Water</p> <p>Date of document: 2/23/17</p> <p>[ATT: 3]</p> <p>Quote from p. 2: "At the SFPUC, we pride ourselves in relying on the best available science. We do not support the notion that the State Water Board is using the best available science, particularly when it comes to management of the Tuolumne River and producing positive environmental outcomes there."</p> <p>Response: In contrast, the SED contains 24 chapters and 11 appendices, and is over 3000 pages in total. It also contains hundreds of peer-reviewed citations. SED Chapter 19, focused on fish, had 11 pages of published, peer-reviewed research articles. The studies the SFPUC has provided to me do not include any peer-reviewed research published in a scientific journal. In addition, the SFPUC has not provided me with any direct evidence that the science used to develop the Bay-Delta Plan draft did not use the best available science. Nor have they provided any scientific evidence that predator reduction is a viable alternative.</p>	<p>The State Water Board uses the best available science throughout the SED. The various data sources for the water quality planning process include: quantitative data from peer-reviewed published literature on topics specific to the plan area; peer-reviewed published literature outside the plan area but on topics relevant to the plan amendments; unpublished quantitative data from within the plan area and from outside of the plan area; qualitative data or personal communication with topical experts; and expert opinion if no other sources were available. The plan amendments are based on nearly eight years of study and analysis on what actions would provide greater protection of fish and wildlife. The overwhelming body of evidence—as explained in Appendix C, Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives; Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection—demonstrates that increased and more variable flows is the foundation for survival for fish. Please also refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments regarding the substantial evidence standard and its application to the SED.</p>
1032	7	<p>[ATT 1: Letter dated August 26, 2010.</p> <p>To: Mr. Jim Kellogg, President, Fish and Game Commission</p> <p>From: Peter B. Moyle and William A. Bennett, Center for Watershed Sciences</p> <p>Re: Striped bass predation on listed fishes: can a control program be justified?]</p>	<p>The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.</p>
1032	8	<p>[ATT 2: Citations used in ATT 1]</p>	<p>The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.</p>
1032	9	<p>[ATT 3: Letter dated February 23, 2017.</p> <p>FROM: Steven R. Ritchie, Assistant General Manager, Water (SFPUC)</p> <p>RE: Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan Proposed Amendments]</p>	<p>The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.</p>
1033	1	<p>Your proposed flow plan won't work. It only waste's precious water & will cause catastrophic economic results to the San Joaquin Valley and agribusiness, which will affect the entire state! The wildlife/fish preservation agencies already know how to help the salmon habitat without flushing precious water away and making the problem even worse. There is absolutely no sound reason for this flow plan ("wasteful water flushing plan") unless its purpose is to intentionally cripple the citizens of California</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
1034	1	<p>Farmers depend on surface water. I was born and raised in an ag family. Fanners in the valley depend on surface water to grow food for the world. If we don't have enough water</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		to grow our crops, the economic devastation would be far reaching.	
1034	2	Pumping water is depleting our aquifers and the consequences of this practice is going to be felt by generations to come because when aquifers collapse they cannot be restored!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1034	3	Please Save the Stanislaus for us and future generations!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1035	1	People in rural areas ran out of drinking water during the drought! Let the aquifers refill and the farmers produce food before sending the water to the ocean.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1035	2	Require desalination of ocean water from San Diego to Santa Barbara. Build more reservoirs.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1036	1	Your proposal in increase flows in the Stanislaus and other rivers is counterproductive! Do we really want to destroy agribusiness in this area and make our nation dependent on other countries for food? This "flow plan" makes no sense at all! Why not listen to the local agencies that already know how to help the salmon? Why destroy this valuable agricultural area with this agenda-driven plan?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1037	1	Water is a universal resource needed by us all. This area is big in agriculture! The water you want to take goes against one group over the wants of another simply over money! That is evil thinking! This plan is short-sighted! It is outright evil and could destroy habitats where habitats need to be enhanced and thriving!!!! Please use your brain and your hearts to come up with a better plan for ALL of California!!!!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1037	2	Technology is available to build desalination plants and provide water for people who need it and with simple science the water could be enhanced with minerals to aid agriculture, and communities without taking away from other communities. There is also technology that can pull water from the air! Basically there are plenty of technologies and ideas that are beneficial!!!!!! These technologies can create jobs and sustain lives for centuries!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1038	1	The state is eroding the local valley economy by sending the water downstream in the name of being environmentally conscious, but in reality they aren't helping the fish population -- only harming the farming and other industries and using them as a scapegoat once again for their frivolous plans to make money elsewhere. Please be smart store the water for when it's needed and use it responsibly.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1040	1	<p>The state's plan isn't the best plan. There are other ways to restore the fisheries and the state knows that. Sending more water down our rivers will destroy the economy of the state's most depressed regions. There is no plan to help the economy here from the water you are taking. Just take it and screw the valley. It's truly disgusting. Already unemployment rates are almost double here than they are in the Bay Area and Southern California. If we won't sell it, you take it. Awful and shame on you.</p> <p>No to twin tunnels and no to sending our water to Southern California under the guise of environmentalism. This is pure snatch and grab.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1041	1	To take away our agricultural water is absolutely ridiculous for fish! I have thought it's more important to feed people. The fish will survive without our help. Please do not waste more water in our rivers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1042	1	We have only partially recovered from a drought that has affected the valley area for five years. During this time, more people have moved into California; more people means more mouths to feed. Due to lack of water, more fields are fallow, which in turn means higher prices for groceries and higher water prices for farmers trying to meet the demands for produce. Stop penalizing farmers and stop taking our water!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1043	1	As a wholesale customer that purchases 100% of its potable water supply from the SFPUC's San Francisco Regional Water System, water supply available to the City of Brisbane under the SED proposal could be reduced more than 50% under drought conditions for multiple consecutive years.	Please see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding the State Water Board's evaluation of potential reductions in water supply and associated economic considerations and other impacts within the SFPUC Regional Water System (RWS) service area with implementation of the plan amendments. The master response identifies the main points of disagreement or differing assumptions between the SED and the comments. As described in Master Response 8.5, the SED identified reasonably foreseeable actions that could be taken by affected entities to comply with the plan amendments and in response to reduced surface water supplies. These actions did not include the severe mandatory rationing described by SFPUC because it was not reasonably foreseeable that a water supplier would impose drastic mandatory water rationing on its customers without first attempting other actions to replace any reductions in water supplies with alternative sources of water, such as through water transfers.
1043	2	The City of Brisbane has been known for our low water consumption since our incorporation in 1961. Residential gallons per capita per day (R-GPCD) is presently fifty (50). A 50% reduction would lower that number to twenty-five (25) R-GPCD. This reduced value is approximately 95 liters per person per day! Please note that 100 liters per person per day is considered "...necessary to provide for some minimum acceptable quality of life..." [Footnote 1: M. Falkenmark, quoted in "Basic Water Requirements for Human Activities: Meeting Basic Needs", by Peter Gleick, page 87 of Water International, Vo. 21, No. 2 (1996)] in water-scarce regions. Without exaggeration, a case can be made that the reduced water available under the SED could force the City of Brisbane residential water customers to lower their usage to values defined as the bare minimum for basic human rights in developing countries.	The State Water Board acknowledges the City of East Palo Alto's water conservation efforts and ongoing commitment to demand management of its water supply. Please see response to comment 1043-1. Please refer to Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, regarding Water Code section 106, minimum health and safety needs and a broad discussion regarding conservation. Please refer to Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, for additional discussion regarding health and safety and the emergency provision.
1043	3	Notwithstanding the important objectives of the Bay Delta Plan to establish water requirements to protect fish and wildlife uses of the Bay-Delta's waters, knowingly imposing flow regimes on the Tuolumne River that during drought periods will mandate a R-GPCD of 25 for the City of Brisbane water customers is unacceptable, and would abdicate responsibility for establishing an appropriate Bay-Delta objective for human uses of its water.	Please see responses to comments 1043-1 and 1043-2.
1043	4	In lights of these aforementioned impacts as well as those articulated in the BAWSCA and SFPUC comment letters incorporated here by reference, the City of Brisbane requests that environmental, economic, and human impacts of any shortage on the San Francisco Regional Water System be fully and adequately analyzed as part of the SWRCB's proposed flow alternatives. Such full and adequate analysis should be given at least equal weight with all other elements of the SWRCB's subsequent deliberations and decision making.	Please see responses to comments 1043-1 and 1043-2. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, for a discussion regarding economic considerations, growth effects, environmental effects based on a rationing-only approach, and demand management. To the extent that this comment letter raises similar issues or the same issues raised by SFPUC or BAWSCA, please refer to letter 1166 or letter 1191 to review responses to those letters.
1043	5	The Governor has indicated his strong support for negotiated voluntary agreements to resolve these issues. The City of Brisbane requests that the SWRCB provide adequate time	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for information regarding voluntary agreements and

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		for voluntary agreements to be reached amongst the stakeholders prior to any action on the SED. Please give this settlement process a chance for success instead of expediting implementation of the current proposal. The City of Brisbane shares BAWSCA's commitment to continue working closely with the diverse interests and stakeholders to develop that shared solution.	collaboration with agencies.
1044	1	Demand for water exceeds the inflow of New Melones Lake. Please be more reasonable with your water allocations than increasing flows out of this beautiful lake. We as taxpayers have spent plenty building it and we deserve to be able to use it for recreational purposes as well as agricultural. There are other sources for your intended flows. Please utilize them also. Let's be fair about this.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1045	1	We need to conserve our water. For that reason, I am opposed to any plan that would increase how much is sent down our rivers for fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1046	1	<p>Knock your BS off! You're not smarter than anybody else. You're not even more informed than anybody else. You need to cut out the crap and let the local districts run our water programs.</p> <p>You are a bunch of unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats that really, honestly, truly, need to just go away.</p> <p>Don't come into my neighborhood. You won't be happy if we happen to meet up.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1047	1	<p>New Melones Reservoir is currently sitting at only 51 percent of its historic average for this time of the year and 29 percent of its total capacity, the 2nd lowest of any reservoir in California, even after all the rain and snow this winter. Melones is in bad shape storage-wise due to the previous 5-year drought because it is severely over-allocated with demands downstream that well exceed the inflow.</p> <p>Most California reservoirs readings are now above average. An alternative solution protecting the fish and conserving precious water resources for multiple benefits, instead of flushing them downstream, has been presented, which as a taxpayer and resident of Tuolumne County I think would be the wisest choice for New Melones.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1048	1	I'm tired of seeing New Melones Reservoir less than half full. Back off and let it get back to at least 75% capacity before you think about increasing how much water goes down the Stanislaus.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1049	1	It's a dangerous plan- dumping water into the ocean. Not only has it not increased the fish population, it is endangering the lives and livelihoods of thousands of people. It could drive up food prices and create great hardship for lower income families.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1050	1	I am against your plan to take more water from our rivers. Southern California needs to find its own water. Try an osmosis plant.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1051	1	It's beyond time to recognize that humans are important and that our growing population needs to have a growing water supply. We have not built any new supply since New Melones Reservoir more than 30 years ago and upon its completion it was taken over by faulty environmental concerns.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Please decide this issue with concern for our need for more water.	
1052	1	<p>Adding more flow to the Stanislaus when the fingerlings are coming down is nothing but a wake up call to the stripers in the Delta. They sense that fresh water flow, and know it's time to chow down! I know because I grew up 1/2 mile from the Stanislaus River, I am 60 now and have fished the Stanislaus and San Joaquin a lot. We have the technology to catch the young salmon and transport them past the predators! That would give us a 4 to 6% return rather than 1%. This increase in flow actually does nothing to increase the chances of baby salmon making it out to the ocean! FishBio has proved that with their research!</p> <p>And please don't tell me about the so called steelhead run! That's a joke! I grew up on the river and your idea of more flow is more water being sent south! More flow equals more Tracy pumps filling up San Luis and going south! Catch the fingerlings and transport them past the predators! Or build hatcheries like the Sac system has!</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1053	1	<p>I called and talked to John McManus, the head of the Golden Gate Salmon Association, after he made a comment about more water equals more fish. And he rescinded his statement in the newspaper after realizing what was going on in this neck of the woods! Of course the GGSA wants more fish, but let's get a better idea of what's going on!</p> <p>This proposed increase in flow actually worsens the salmon fry chance of survival!</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1054	1	I am opposed to your plan to increase unimpaired flows in the Stanislaus River. I feel it would cause water problems for our future crops and farmers in the Valley. The plan is poorly written. Farming is a vital part of our community and taking our water is wrong. I am not opposed to conserving and doing my part, but this plan is just plain stupid! Go back to the drawing board!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1055	1	Scientific studies have found that pulse flows from New Melones have had minimal (if any) benefit to the fish population downstream. I do know that the pulse flows have affected us recreational boaters directly. When full or near full, New Melones is one of the most beautiful lakes in California. We have refrained from taking our boat out on the lake the last few years not only because of unavailable launch ramps but mainly because it's too dangerous to ski on the lake because of submerged trees that are close to the water's surface. I hope the state board will reduce its planned future "pulse flows" and allow the lake to fill once again.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1056	1	<p>Good science that demonstrates decreasing predators and adding the right amount of river flows at the right time must be part of the technical discussion and used to achieve the balance we all want.</p> <p>Increased flows at all times must be shown to have the desired benefits of helping all. If not, don't chance it. Habitat restoration and control of predators should take precedence over just sending more water down a hostile river environment.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1057	1	I oppose an increase in unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River because it's time you guys stop pissing away our water.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1058	1	I do not support your proposal to raise unimpaired flows in the Stanislaus River. Legislators have already demanded local entities set up water management plans. We don't need this	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		bogus plan.	
1059	1	There are better ways the help the fish than to take a vital resource from communities and agricultural. Water is needed to allow Humans to survive and perhaps it is forgotten that Humans are more important that fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1060	1	I oppose an increase in unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River because for one the drought isn't over, the valley is not caught up and won't be anytime soon. Releasing more water from our lakes such as New Melones, which has suffered drastically during the drought, makes no sense. Once we release that water, it's gone and there's no guarantee of another rainy winter. We need to conserve. Second, the reason for flushing water that should be stored in the reservoir down the river to promote fish habitat is proven to not help by two decades of scientific research in the Stanislaus River. Bottom line, it's time to stop flushing the valleys water straight through to the delta and wasting our natural resources.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1061	1	Your misguided plan to take more water from our reservoirs and rivers is not being decided at a local level and the people making these decisions don't have a stake in living here or farming. Stop and review this decision with local experts.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1062	1	Don Pedro produces a great deal of clean pollution cheap electric power. This system serves the TID and MID communities very well and is well managed.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1062	2	The water in the Melones Dam is generated in Tuolumne County. So, the first priority of the water use should be for the Tuolumne County residents. The second priority should be for the communities adjacent to the Stanislaus River to be used for domestic use and irrigation. Some of the dam's capacity should be reserved for seasonal flood control.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1062	3	The water level behind the dam should be kept at its highest level so the maximum electric power can be generated. Remember, electrical energy produced from this installation is carbon free and is renewed every year. If any water is left over, it can be used for the fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1062	4	Look at the 150-year history of the Stanislaus River flow on a monthly basis. I think this data will show that the Stanislaus water flow in the spring is very high (sometimes causing a flood in the valley) and water flow in the fall is often very low. The fish must have survived this high and low flow runoff.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1062	5	You must check to see of the design requirements of the New Melones Dam would allow the current maximum water level behind Melones Dam be raised to hold more water (Don Pedro is designed for a higher water level). Why can't the Stanislaus River and New Melones Dam be managed similar to how the Tuolumne River and Don Pedro Dam are managed?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1063	1	The scientific data does not support your approach to improving the spawning of salmon on the Stanislaus River via greater spring flows. Recently released data developed by FISHBIO points to different methods, e.g. amount of water released and the pattern of releases as well as temporary rock barriers at the Old River which provide improved outcomes with less water wasted. It is time that regulatory actions integrate scientific data into management	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		practices.	
1064	1	<p>I am opposed to your plan to increase unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River for many reasons:</p> <p>Personal; as we are almond farmers who work hard and depend on the income and contribute to the local economy.</p> <p>Agricultural devastation across the board; we feed the world with the best soil anywhere.</p> <p>Our economy will tank.</p> <p>I also feel this is very political for obvious reasons which are very clear. I can't believe it has come to this.</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1065	1	I am opposed to your plan to increase river flows on the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1065	2	Your plan is bad news for agribusiness. A quarter-million or more acres could be fallowed -- using your own estimates -- and tens of thousands of jobs could be lost. It would devastate our regional economy.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1065	3	Hypocritically, your plan suggests that farmers will make up for lost access to surface water by pumping more from already stressed aquifers. That makes no sense, especially at a time when the Legislature already has demanded local entities come up with Sustainable Groundwater Management Plans. River Stewards.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1065	4	You continue to ignore the science that clearly shows that "more water does not equal more fish." OID and SSJID have given you empirical data; so have TID and MID. Why won't your people pay attention to it? Is it because their work in the river doesn't meet your assumptions and preconceived ideas?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1065	5	Why won't you support efforts to reduce predation and restore natural habitat in the rivers to help fish?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1065	6	Your plan would force too much water to be released in the spring, which undermines its hydroelectric value. It makes much more sense to save that water to make cheap power in the summer, when demand is highest.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1066	1	Since 2011, more than 500,000 acre-feet of extra water that could have been stored behind New Melones Reservoir has been sent downriver instead. That's enough to meet the combined agricultural needs of SSJID and OID for an entire season. Please do not continue to waste additional water by increasing flows in the Stanislaus River.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1068	1	Your unfair water grab has potentially devastating consequences for people and the regional economies in the valley - where agribusiness directly contributes more than \$6 billion annually to Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties - as well as the foothills - where New Melones and Tulloch reservoirs are located. Your estimate the economic blow to the region could be \$260 billion a year; but most of us down here think it could be much, much worse. Please don't take more water from our rivers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1069	1	I believe this solution will cause more harm to the already taxed freshwater supply in the Central Valley. Please have more vision for this problem and not quick-fix solutions that sacrifice the important concerns of farmers, residents (albeit middle to lower income), the dwindling salmon population which is part of a greater ecosystem. Instead, develop long-term solutions such as desalination for freshwater. We should expect droughts to be more common if you diligently look through scientific data supporting climate change, which means desalination and not water grabbing is the answer to this problem.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1070	1	The water needs to stay here in the valley to support our agriculture, maintain the economy and protect the natural fish and wildlife that depend on it. Other options must be sought as there are too many questions and problems with the proposed plan.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1071	1	Our economy depends on farming. Your plan to increase river flows will have a negative effect on our operations, our employees, the consumer; and the list goes on and on!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1071	2	The municipal water supply will be cut back, causing cities to rely on pumping. The SGMA complicates and limits this pumping.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1071	3	It is proven that the unimpaired flow plan is ineffective. It's a waste of the precious resources our livelihoods depend on!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1072	1	New Melones Reservoir is much too valuable a recreation center for Central California to let it be drained. Two years ago, I witnessed the most shocking site, seeing the old Parrotts Ferry Bridge completely out of water. You people should actually visit this site from time to time and look at the effect your decisions have on our pastime activities.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1073	1	I cannot understand why you want to increase flows in our rivers. It would harm agriculture, ground water and business in the Central Valley. To dump water for the possibility of aiding a fish species which would absolutely infringe on my ability to enjoy the "fruit" of the land (Central Valley produce), commerce (recreation, landscape, etc.), and the ability to water my plants and drink water from my faucet without financial penalties and infringements is absurd.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1074	1	Think of the food we all need. Your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus and other rivers essentially would waste precious water in a multitude of ways. This valley is huge resource for food all over the world, a multi-billion dollar industry that should not be relying on pumping our already overstressed aquifers in order to continue providing the food our world needs. That threatens the very life of the communities that support this industry.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1074	2	The research shows that simply flushing water down the river does not really work, and that finding ways to reduce predation would be a more effective way to increase fish populations. I urge you to put your resources toward that avenue, if truly your goal is to encourage more salmon.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1075	1	I am a small business owner upstream from New Melones (fly shop), which depends on the Stanislaus River having enough water for people to be able to fish in the spring and summer. Increased releases mean that more water is released from upriver, which hurts the upstream trout fishery. The drought has greatly impacted the fishery upstream, which in turn hurts my business as well as the other business that rely on fishing tourism in the spring, summer & fall.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1076	1	<p>There needs to be water kept here in the valley for the people and the farms. We work hard to establish the Central Valley as a growing agricultural area, yet the water needed to farm has been scarce and now that we've gotten a descent amount in New Melones Reservoir to help, it's being diverted. Keep it here, keep it where it is and where it belongs for the people of the Central Valley to use.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
1077	1	<p>We need to conserve our discharge in the rivers to a minimum while building up our reservoir levels to insure we are able to supply down stream flow to the environment, wildlife and agriculture that will accommodate everyone and everything. By keeping our reservoirs low and continually depleting our inventory, we will be in the same situation we been battling for years. And everyone -- including the environment -- loses!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
1078	1	<p>Since a child, I have watched mismanagement of California's most valuable resource, Water. I am tired of seeing Water resources literally being flushed down the drain by our managers. What California's water board does is let our excess water to flow away unabashedly and sell our resources to other areas. The ultimate slap in the face is that the cost of your mismanagement is passed on to us as citizens. These managers increase water rates and force water rationing on California citizens directly due to their mismanagement.</p> <p>What is even worse is when water returns by the grace of God; the water board refuses to decrease rates and continues to focus rationing and cost increases on the state's citizens. All the while, they continue to squander our resource unchecked. I don't understand how this continues year after year with Californians standing by letting this happen.</p> <p>California's water board needs to increase storage, limit outflows and do its job by managing our most critical resource -- water. Knowing this state for the better part of 50 years, nothing will happen, and things will continue to run the way the water board bureaucracy sees fit.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
1079	1	<p>I am opposed to losing more water from out of New Melones Reservoir and our other foothills lakes. We have studies and habitats and people up here, too. There needs to be more conservation of surface water for other projects down river.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
1080	1	<p>We still need our water for agricultural and human use than for fish! Fish that are not even native anymore. Most of the fish are from hatcheries anyway, anyone with a lick of sense knows what this is all about money.</p> <p>The water you want to send down the Stanislaus River will be sent south so that people in LA and San Diego can continue to enjoy our water. Let them find alternatives, build their own damn dams or pump it from the Pacific Ocean. We have the richest soil in the world here in the San Joaquin Valley. We need this water for jobs & food for the world!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
1081	1	<p>New Melones reservoir needs to be filled before we can release a bunch of water down the Stanislaus River for fish. Fill it first!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
1082	1	<p>Many homes and businesses will be affected by loss of water and recreation while very few fish will be saved, if you follow through with your plan to unfairly divert more water from the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers. Please rethink what you want to do and how</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		much harm it would cause.	
1083	1	Taking more water from our rivers will have a negative impact on the economy and not help the salmon. Please rethink your proposal.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1084	1	We the people need the water for farming, agriculture, pasture irrigation for beef cattle and other stock, and crops! Please do not require more to be sent down our rivers for fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1085	1	Recent studies haven't shown that increased river flows would positively lead to a significant increase in the fish population. In turn, wasting water by sending more down the rivers could potentially damage local economies, harm family farms, and even worse leave constituents without water in future drought years.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1086	1	It would be a shame if the salmon continued on their pathetic path to extinction as essential river water continues to be diverted for cotton to be made into t-shirts. Accordingly, please heed the SWRCB's 2010 report that 60% (or more) of the Sacramento/San Joaquin Rivers' water must reach the sea. As you know, water flowing out to sea is not wasted.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1086	2	Salmon is one of the valuable species that depend on sufficient flows. There are jobs here on the coast that depend on salmon fishing. Remember when there was 100% unemployment in that fishery when the season was closed?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1086	3	Perhaps because farm water is inexpensive, it has not been deemed cost-effective for some farms to install water-saving devices.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1086	4	Please support 60% river flows to the ocean.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1087	1	Our agriculture is a very important part of California Please save the water for the future. Fish have always found a way to survive without government's help. SAVE OUR WATER.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1088	1	I want our water rights protected. Especially for Northern California. Water is the most important of the issues.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1089	1	I oppose your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus and other rivers because it will adversely affect our ag community. Please keep in mind that we are the almond capitol of the world. We grow 75 percent of the produce for the U.S.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1089	2	It [the Plan] also would affect our homes and adversely affect water sports that our children and families enjoy in the hot summers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1089	3	Let us appreciate our water. We just had a season of flooding damage, now you want to take the water we need. Be serious!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1090	1	Unfairly requiring more water to be wasted in the rivers is not going to do the salmon and other fish any good, as studies have shown! It's better to hold back water until late in the year to produce hydroelectric power in the summer when it's needed more and it's better for the water users for agricultural crops and recreation. The releases you propose would be	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		enough to last two seasons of water for irrigation districts and other users.	
1091	1	Your plan to push more water down our rivers doesn't make common sense, but that's hard for government to understand.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1092	1	Your river flows plan is bad for the valley's economy and will not restore the fish habitat as you envisioned. Save the Stanislaus River.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1093	1	The water you want to irresponsibly waste from our rivers is needed for crops, trees homes, yards and farmers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1094	1	It is imperative that farmers receive the water they need to provide food for all of us. The salmon are not endangered, and increasing river flow has been proven to be useless anyway. Listen to the scientists, not the environmentalists.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1095	1	Your idea about unimpaired flows is an unfair water grab from just 3 rivers that will adversely affect their local economies. Why not take say 5% from many rivers? I have a hard time believing this water is for fish with the twin tunnels lurking.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1096	1	If there were no dam on the river in the spring, the flow would be enormous. It would gradually diminish until winter when it would be a trickle. That's the natural way. We should be imitating that.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1097	1	Please hold the water because this is the first really wet winter in 20 years. Don't waste this precious resource.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1098	1	Please, use your brains and keep the water here!! Remember, we're providing food!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1099	1	As a scientist, I found the research and study, including the Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem compelling: the unimpaired flows of during the critical spring months should be at least 60% of unimpaired flows. Whether or not one "cares" about the ecosystem, it is simply not prudent to allocate all water narrowly for human uses- doing so leaves absolutely no margin for error.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1099	2	Farmers need water, but farms also have an obligation to use water wisely and not to treat water as essentially free. While we need farm products for local consumption, use of underpriced water to product export crops is simply mining by another name. There is no legitimate reason to subsidize exports of water-intensive crops such as alfalfa, or to use underpriced water to produce low-value products available elsewhere, such as cotton.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1099	3	As an urban consumer of water, I have personally invested to reduce my water consumption by over 50% during the last 15 years. I obtain water from the San Francisco Public Utility Commission through the City of Palo Alto. The wholesale price of this water is roughly \$2,000 per acre foot. In contrast, the wholesale price of the same Tuolumne River water from Modesto Irrigation District is less than 1/100th the cost (\$15 l acre foot). Clearly	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		such pricing leads to economic inefficiencies.	
1099	4	The current allocation practices have resulted in sub-critical flows in 19 of the last 42 years. In contrast naturally such sub-critical flows would have occurred only once in that time period. Climate change is ushering a new era, and now is the time to improve our discipline as humans, especially with the increase of California's population. The doomsday economic stories of disaster if water isn't fairly allocated are simply not true. The doomsday scenario occurs if we don't manage our water wisely, with a balanced allocation between "narrow" human uses and allocating water for the environment.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1099	5	Please adopt a requirement for 60% unimpaired flows during the critical spring/ early summer months. People can and will adapt, and with only minimal pain.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.