

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1400	1	<p>I urge you to set the flow objective of 60% for the San Joaquin tributaries. Major environmental damage can only be repaired by this quantity of water. A healthy environment benefits us all. All agencies need to cooperate in managing snow melt, installing irrigation systems with drip, growing water efficient crops. Fish, birds, plant life need healthy rivers and marshland.</p> <p>Please set a 60% standard for unimpaired water flows.</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>
1402	1	<p>This is a letter opposing the State Water Control Board’s plan to divert water for Agricultural use to fish.</p> <p>I pray the hearings were not just a formality, another box for you to check in the process, and that you were listening to the many people in agriculture who have spoken or written to you. The way the plan has been presented is that you seem to have no idea how this plan will affect the Central Valley.</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>
1402	2	<p>Reduced or no water to farmers, means reduced income, which will mean reduced expenditures in all areas - employees, services, goods. From there, our land values will deteriorate which will in turn mean our taxes will have to be reduced. Reduced taxes will affect our local schools and, of course, the state.</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>
1402	3	<p>I am part of a fourth generation farming family. We are a small family farm operation – we farm about 200 acres (35 of that is rented ground). This ground supports three households: my husband & myself, my parents who are 95 and 88 and still live on their ranch, and our 25 year old son. If this amount of acreage is what you consider a corporate farm, I do not understand how that can be. Us and the many farmers like us that have less than 200 acres will be greatly affected by this plan. Our son who has an Ag Business degree has wanted to farm since he was very young, has been driving tractor since he was 9, and works with my husband and does custom farm work. Now with this proposed plan, my son’s future is uncertain. There will not be enough custom farm work when there is not enough water. If we have to fallow half of our land to keep the other half in production, it is going to be very difficult for him and us to make ends meet. My son is scared and I am very upset to think of all the other young farmers who are facing this situation due to the water plan.</p> <p>We have done everything we can to be more efficient farmers. We have already had to fallow land.</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>
1402	4	<p>Unfortunately, California is now the laughing stock of the nation. This plan has shown the rest of the country that we have put fish above farmers/people. Within our own state, it is now farmers vs. environmentalists. We need more water storage and people need to work together to form a plan instead of having one side tell the other side this is how it is going to be without any collaboration with the farmers, ignoring research that irrigation districts have been doing because it differs from your research, disregarding what regional economists are telling you will happen, and I could go on.</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>
1402	5	<p>I’m not even going to go into the underlying issue of the twin tunnels and water going down South (because your board denies this) but we all know that is part of Brown’s water grab plan even though we are repeatedly told it is not. We are not the stupid country bumpkins that you think we are.</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
1402	6	<p>We attended hearings in Merced and Modesto. We pray that you were listening and have realized the devastation this plan will cause and will reconsider how you are intending to destroy the Central Valley. Please work with the irrigation districts that you neglected to consult with who have viable plans in place to help the fish. There seems to have been a huge communication breakdown. Since when does a board make a decision like this without consulting the very people it affects before you make the decision?</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>
1403	1	<p>In reference to the proposed Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan SED, I have benefited and responsibly used Merced River water for 66 years. Merced River flow an average of one million acre feet per year. MID diverts five hundred fifty thousand acre feet of which 300 thousand is sold to its growers for use on a hundred thousand acres. Two hundred fifty thousand is consumed by people with riparian rights, system distribution seepage and evaporative loss. Four hundred fifty thousand acre feet continue down the river to the Delta for fish and wild life or other uses thereof.</p> <p>The water is first accumulated in our watershed area. Then contained in our Lake McClure behind our Exchequer Dam, then distributed in coordination with government officials with rules and regulations thereof. Our containment and river rights are Pre-1914 and in accordance with the Law of the Land. You folks want to use the wrong river for quality improvement. December 13, 2016 Merced River flow was 800 second feet at Bagby. Sacramento River at Hamilton was 13,000 second feet and accumulated in a watershed and river with much less surface salt.</p> <p>You are presently, on average, receiving nearly half of the Merced River flow and when you want it. Plus the bottom 115,000 acre feet of McClure belongs to you and we deliver 15 second feet to the Merced Wildlife Refuge.</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>
1403	2	<p>Any alteration in our water supply would be devastating for the entire Merced area and all of its people, fish, wildlife, infrastructure, investments, tax payments, food and fiber production for the People of Merced, California, United States and all over 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>
1403	3	<p>We will resist with a legal battle second to none! There has not been an injustice delivered to you folks. Prior to this day, we have worked together and accumulatively and have continually balanced all inputs of this project for over 100 years.</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>
1404	1	<p>I am concerned that restricting additional water flow to the Delta would put the wildlife I love in jeopardy.</p> <p>I have been made aware of the fact that on average less than 50% of the freshwater flow from the Central Valley reaches the Bay, and in some years less than 35%. Reducing inflows shifts the size and location of the ecologically-important salinity mixing zone, affecting everything from plankton to marine mammals. Between 1975 and 2014, the natural unimpaired runoff in the watershed was only low enough to create a “supercritically dry” year once, but upstream diversions captured so much runoff during those four decades that the Bay experienced “supercritically dry” conditions in 19 years instead of just one. This figure indicates a great effect of the low inflow on all wildlife, like the salmon, a keystone species of the area. Up to one hundred different animals and bacteria depend on the salmon for its ability to provide food and transport nutrients. The flows need to be able to inundate floodplains for the sake of baby salmon and the organisms which these creatures will one day service. I implore you to consider the great environmental benefit of increasing the flow of water to the Delta, I know that many humans and animals alike would be</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
		thankful.	
1405	1	This area has already experienced, due to the last five years of drought, a reduction in farms. Some of the small ones have been forced to stop planting altogether. Some of the larger ones have found it necessary to greatly reduce the number of crops planted or change to a different crop, not always to the benefit of this community. Some have had to look for and drill wells in order to water existing crops. This further reduces our ground 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.
1405	2	A further reduction of our water supply due to any increase flows from our rivers would be devastating to our economy, our drinking water and quality of life in this entire community. I urge you to carefully consider all the ramifications of this plan and stop any further increases of diverting flows 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.
1406	1	<p>My focus today is on the salmon runs in the watershed. If the salmon are healthy, so much else in the watershed will be healthy.</p> <p>A car analogy may help to demonstrate how I view the status of the San Joaquin watershed. Most drivers can sense if their wheels are out of balance, but all too frequently ignore the problem, kidding themselves that they will handle the imbalance later. That same mindset can be seen in dealing with the San Joaquin watershed. Yes, we know things are out of balance, but we convince ourselves we will deal with the balancing problem later.</p> <p>Continuing the car analogy, when we have a flat tire, we know that continuing to drive is not a very good option. So we wisely pull over to change the tire. Sadly, the San Joaquin and its tributaries are not faced with one flat tire. The watershed is confronting a 3-flat-tire crisis where would-be drivers see no need to change their outdated policies. Just look at the Tuolumne River to see the collapse that has taken place. Long ago, the annual salmon run on the Tuolumne was roughly 130,000. From 2009 through 2016, the salmon run has ranged from 301 to 3,744 annually.</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.
1406	2	<p>To put us back on the road to recovery, the Board's proposal to have a 40% springtime flow for the lower San Joaquin is a worthy initial effort, but you really are fixing only one of the flat tires. In 2010, Water Board scientists noted a 60% flow was needed to start a turn around. You must move in the direction of higher springtime flows. 50% is better than 40%; 60% is better than 50%.</p> <p>Your biggest challenge in fixing the San Joaquin watershed will be the political push back from those who presently take the most from the four rivers. You must have the courage to withstand the shouting and political heat. The imbalance has gone on too long. We are in a crisis stage for salmon.</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.
1406	3	Agency experts need to put forth their most innovative ideas. Talk with people like those at XiO, Inc. in San Anselmo, CA about the creative, financially efficient ways they help mutual and municipal water systems throughout California to be better users of water with cutting edge cloud-based controls. In these difficult political times, you, the board, must create a setting for your staff to seek out solutions confidently.	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.
1406	4	We all need to move from an "us vs. them" attitude to one involving the common good. Ultimately, the common good results in a commonwealth, whereby we all gain. In seeking a 21st century solution, farmers and environmentalists must learn to understand the other'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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>situation. Thoroughly examining the fears and concerns of each side will begin the process of finding common ground for a new agreement.</p> <p>Otherwise, the San Joaquin watershed will collapse with policies that are equivalent to four flat tires.</p>	
1407	1	<p>We finally have water in New Melones Reservoir and we want to keep it for as long as possible. Releasing more water into the Stanislaus River for salmon is not a good idea.</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>
1408	1	<p>I am writing in support of the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan. My family lives in Modesto and the response to the plan in our area has been intense and, too often, irrational. People are angry because they fear that less water will be detrimental to our area, so much so that they are unwilling to consider reasonable solutions that bring our water usage into a sustainable balance that protects the environment. But there are many people in our area, my family included, that believe more must be done to protect our rivers for future generations.</p> <p>We're using too much river water. Full stop. At the same time, the state's response to the ongoing drought has shown that California and, importantly, the Central Valley and Modesto, can use substantially less water with limited impact on our way of life or economy. And if Modesto's numerous green lawns are any indication, there's still room for improvement. We can implement efficiency measures and use less water; that there's so much resistance to these common sense measures is a testament to the current power structures that overly rely on water-intensive uses. We must overcome this resistance. If we know we're using too much water to safely maintain myriad aspects of our river ecosystems, and we also know that we can realistically use less water with a limited economic impact, then we should do it.</p> <p>I urge the Board to see through the power-saving efforts to maintain the unsustainable status quo and adopt the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan. The health of the region is in your hands.</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>
1409	1	<p>I'm writing to add my voice to those (a) supporting the State Water Resources Control Board's draft in-stream flow objective for San Joaquin River tributaries of 30-50 percent of unimpaired flow, and/or (b) asking for consideration of raising that flow objective, at least modestly.</p> <p>The need for added water flow to restore the lower San Joaquin River ecosystem, including salmon populations, as well as the farther downstream effect of adding flow to the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta ecosystem, is vital and clear.</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>
1409	2	<p>I don't want to punish hard-working farmers who also use that water, but it has also been clear for some time that agricultural expansion in the Central Valley has led to water needs/demands which exceed what Sierras rainfall and snow can reliably deliver now and over coming decades. We have to adjust agricultural water consumption to fit this reality in order, among other things, to make Central Valley agriculture sustainable.</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>
1410	1	<p>As you are aware, California has experienced severe drought for the last several years. For our citizens, the worst possible water policy to be proposed and implemented is to further reduce what limited amount of water is available for public use. Even in non-drought years, California needs all the water we can store for our long, hot, dry summer season and</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
		<p>for our farmers to produce food that feeds the people of our state, country, and even throughout the world.</p> <p>California has many reservoirs/sites that provide the ability to store our rain water and snow melt runoff and any other precipitation. It is foolish and short-sighted policy to NOT maximize the collection and storage of our short season of water collection. The task of the Water Resources Control Board should be to enact policy that will provide the greatest benefit to, and is in the best interest of, our citizens and facilitating their quality of life. Currently, and in recent past years, the Board's policy has instead made the lives of its citizens more difficult, expensive, and reduced our California quality of life. These oppressive policies have created hardship on our farmers, who we cannot survive without, and on our citizens. This hardship, regulation, and restrictive use imposed by this Board when it need NOT be, is truly without excuse. Water is obviously an essential component of life, and the misguided policies of this agency is severely effecting the quality of our lives.</p>	
1410	2	<p>I love nature and believe we are to be good stewards of it. But to elevate nature above people is priority gone awry. Providing the needs of our citizens, in this case the essential need of good water, should be the top priority. These basic needs can clearly be carried out in a responsible manner that is mindful and respectful of nature and our natural resources. Common sense and wisdom desperately needs to be utilized rather than foolish, short-sighted, politically correct, agenda-driven policies that elevate nature above people and results in hardship and suffering on multiple fronts. I implore the Board to NOT implement the policy of increasing the proposed massive amounts of flows from our rivers or ANY other policy that would reduce our ability to store the maximum amount of water to be used by our citizens and farmers, keeping citizen water costs to a minimum (rather than at maximum & continually increasing cost levels) and plentiful availability of this vital and essential resource. We have always been able to accomplish this in decades past. It is only through poor, mismanaged policy that these objectives are not carried out nor able to be achieved.</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>
1410	3	<p>I want to strongly encourage the Board to adopt wise, common-sense policy to truly enhance the lives of our citizens and farmers while being mindful of and respectful of our natural resources. Rather than one extreme or another, there truly can be a wise balance that is beneficial and healthy for both people and planet.</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>
1411	1	<p>I am writing to encourage the Water Board to set the instream water flows for the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta at 60 percent of unimpaired flow. It is not since 1995 that the water quality standards have been updated, and the native fish have decreased in population along with the water quality.</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>
1411	2	<p>Our environment and the health of the ecosystem is more important than corporations and big agriculture. The water and all the creatures in it cannot protect themselves. We need to do it.</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>
1411	3	<p>Please raise the instream flows to 60 percent as fisheries scientists recommend.</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>
1412	1	<p>This letter is in support of proposed increases in water flows on the Tuolumne, Stanislaus, and Merced Rivers. I commend the changes that the Agency has proposed and hope these changes will be implemented by the Board. I feel that increased flows on these rivers are</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
		the best way to balance the needs of the ecosystem, downstream communities, recreational users, and economic interests.	
1412	2	I feel that this proposal and the decision that is about to be made is the most important one affecting River health to be considered in my lifetime. Though I am only 29, I have been doing light research on the health and development of these three Rivers for some time, and believe that nothing will improve the health of these river ecosystems more than increasing water flows. I would really like to see a healthy, productive, self-sustaining Salmon population exist on these Rivers. Something about the thought of a healthy fishery and ecosystem captivates me. I sincerely hope that we will soon see the day such an ecosystem exists.	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.
1412	3	<p>I believe that the proposal will do a much better job of balancing the concerns of all parties. It seems that the health of the River ecosystem, Agriculture water needs, recreational opportunities, and downstream water quality will all be considered equally with this proposal. With increased river flows, Central Valley Agricultural economies will still function, ecosystem health and fish populations will potentially improve, water quality in the Delta and Bay Area will improve, and recreational opportunities for the public will improve. With a healthy fishery in these Rivers, Coastal fishing economies will potentially improve as well. The benefits to all communities involved offset and justify the economic losses that Central Valley agriculture will potentially face. Increasing flows will have benefits that span multiple regions, from the Foothills, to the Central Valley, the Delta, the Bay Area and out to the Coast. This kind of balance and sustain ability for all regions involved is, in my opinion, sensible, prudent, and justified.</p> <p>Please consider and implement the changes and increased flow requirements that your agency, with all relevant scientific analysis and foresight, has proposed. May the decision that best balances all interests in Stanislaus, Merced and Tuolumne River water flows be made.</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.
1413	1	In regards to the states watershed plan that involves the Merced, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne rivers it looks to me that the Stanislaus River and the OID and SSJID irrigation districts have a solution to protect the fish and the farmers. That plan should be consider for the other two 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.
1413	2	I would like to ask you why more water storage has not been created for many years? We are allowing more people to move into this state all the time, there is more mouths to feed (in the whole world) that requires more farm production. Yet there has been more water restrictions every year.	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.
1413	3	I believe the underground water has been diminishing over the last few years and should be replaced. Could the water that is dumped from a reservoir for over flow safety, in the winter, be filtered back into the ground and not sent to the ocean at a time when the fish cannot benefit from it?	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.
1414	1	<p>I heard that Australia, when they redid their water policy, started with a set-aside for river flow. Makes sense. Keep the rivers healthy, and then all the extra water can be used for other matters.</p> <p>60% of unimpaired flow was what appeared in the Water Board's 2010 report; 40% is what is being proposed. To me, that is very strange math that seems, ultimately, to add up to a</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
		dead Delta. As someone living on the Bay, I don't relish what that might mean to us. Please, 60% is what we need; 40% can only be a starting point, with the aim to steadily increase river flow as ameliorations are found for contracted water users, until we have a healthy river, whose excess flow can then be allocated to other users.	
1415	1	I am very concerned about the drought here in California, and the possibility of not having enough drinking water in the future. I am also concerned about the health of our rivers and the survival of the salmon who depend on them.	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.
1415	2	I know agriculture needs water too, but I think agriculture needs to make some adjustments: like not growing crops that need an inordinate amount of water, like dry-farming when possible, like growing mainly for local consumption, and cutting down on exports.	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.
1415	3	I have been conserving water in my home for years: I save dishwater and use it to water my garden, I never take baths, I don't shower every day, I wash dishes using a minimum of water, I don't wash clothes unless they're dirty or they smell, I only have native plants or drought-resistant plants in my garden, I almost never wash my car, and I have a grey-water system from the washing machine to the fruit trees and vegetables in my garden. I personally am more than willing to conserve water even more if all San Joaquin water users pitch in to bring the state's second-longest river back to life.	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.
1416	1	I believe 100% that your plan to take water from our rivers will hurt our agribusiness, our aquifers, our salmon, steelhead and rainbow trout species, and our economy. It takes a lot and returns very little back. If you divert, you will make us hurt! Leave as is and let us live!	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.
1417	1	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan SED. The proposed Bay Delta WQCP SED will have profound negative effects for my family and other area farmers, as well as most people in Merced County. I am the principal at Livingston High School and my family farms along the Merced River so the proposed SED will affect both me and most of the families I serve. My family has farmed along the Merced River since the early 1930s. My great-grandfather and grandfather rented two ranches next to our current property and used water from the Merced River to farm their crops. In 1939, our current property was up for sale and they rented it until they were able to purchase it in 1946. In 1946, they moved their operations and our family here. When my grandfather passed away, my father assumed the whole farming operation. My father has shared many stories about years where the river was completely dry, years where the river valley flooded, years there there were no salmon, and the basic unpredictability of water flow despite having the dam.	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.
1417	2	I recently attended the State Water Board public hearing at the Merced Theater. I was impressed by the outpouring of opposition to the proposed SED. One of the speakers mentioned that farmers are true environmentalists and they do not want to see our habitats damaged either. This made me think about all the improvements to the ranch that my father has made over the years and what a great steward of the river he has been. He was one of the first people in the area to purchase laser land leveling equipment. He used that equipment to improve irrigation on the ranch and create more farmable land that needed less water. Over the years, he has also helped to improve the habitat along our property adjacent to the Merced River in hopes of restoring wildlife and oak trees. I feel like	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
		the proposed SED neglects to acknowledge input from land owners who might have innovative ideas to help with some of the issues leading to the proposed large water grab; it's a fact that the proposed plan is silent in non-flow options.	
1417	3	One of the other major issues with the proposed SED is the economic impact to our county. The State Water Board presentation acknowledges a huge economic impact. The economic impact is not spread throughout the state though; counties that are already socio-economically disadvantaged will bear the brunt of the impact. It will devastate agriculturally heavy areas and communities that are already struggling due to the drought. Nearly all the families at Livingston High School are connected to agriculture in some way. Whether they work directly as laborers or ag business owners, or they support ag based business, or they work at a local business that exists because of the people of ag based jobs in this area, they will all feel the impact of the heavy water flow regulations in the SED.	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.
1417	4	The unpredictability of water flow in the Merced River Is only one of many reasons why the Bay Delta WQCP SED will have a detrimental effect for the farmers along the river. Recent regulations are already making it difficult for family farms and businesses to survive in our area; a regulatory drought will mean the end for many of them. Taking water hurts farmers working in one of the most disadvantaged communities in the state, taking more will be devastating and have profound long term effects on our community and state.	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.
1419	1	Our community relies heavily on water for agricultural use and I think if this plan truly did devastate our local water supply that it would backfire.	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.
1419	2	My question to you is if your plan is the best plan possible, considering how many lives, both human and animal, are on the line. Is there not a better way to ensure that both groups can have their needs met? I have heard it suggested that there are better plans out there and if there are, please consider them! A decision affecting so many should not be made lightly.	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.
1420	1	To support the salmon populations we need to 60% of unimpaired flow between February and June. Only that level will protect the Bay-Delta that forms the West Coast's largest estuary.	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.
1420	2	Please regulate the water flows for the benefit of all of us, not just agricultural exporters. That means increase water flows to protect the salmon. When salmon flourish so do all of us. Remember that salmon are a keystone species, when they flourish so does our ecosystem, and we get enjoy our fresh 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.
1421	1	Stop the water grab. Listen to what these experts are telling you. Your bureaucratic waste of resources in the name of saving the salmon is just smoke and mirrors. We all know that you want the water to maintain salinity levels in the delta so you can build your tunnels, and steal our water and sell it to Los Angeles. Use the money we already gave you to build more infrastructure. But alas you've probably already wasted that as well.	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.
1422	1	I am fully for giving up more water for fish restoration. For years other interests have gotten water that should have been shared more with Salmon and other species. I think what needs to be done is to time the release in line with the Salmon's life cycle, replicating the flows that would be in the rivers if the dams were not there. I'm for going the whole 60% needed to restore the runs but good luck with that. As far as the salinity issue I am against raising the allowable levels as it degrades The Delta where I live.	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
1423	1	Taking more water away is just WRONG. Letting the quality of the San Joaquin River go bad is JUST WRONG. We already have bad water flow and toxic algae all over the Delta!	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.
1423	2	Salt water encroaching is the next threat. Record low tides over the past 10 years have been seen all over the Delta.	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.
1423	3	The aqueduct is causing enough damage and the LA water District and the RESNICK Family don't need more. Adding Gates and Tunnels and then less GOOD water flow in the San Joaquin River will help to continue the decay.	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.
1423	4	The Delta is like an endangered species on the list to become Extinct. SO PLEASE! Stop the CHANGE. STOP the destruction! Keep the WATER QUALITY in the San Joaquin River good & flowing like it did YEARS AGO!	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.
1424	1	A permanent reduction of exports must happen to protect the Delta. The current level of water exports exceeded the limit in the late 1990's and is unsustainable.	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.
1424	2	I do not want to see a weakening of salinity standards in the South Delta.	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.
1424	3	<p>Water quality standards must be protected for Delta agriculture, for other irrigation uses, and for recreation.</p> <p>This will also decrease mine and other residents of Discovery Bay property values along with other neighboring cities.</p> <p>There is no real positive outcome if this happens.</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.
1425	1	I write to you to voice my strong opposition to the Substitute Environmental Document for the Bay-Delta Plan. Having worked in the agricultural industry in Stanislaus County over the last 40 years, I have no doubt that your plan will have devastating effects on the people throughout our area who depend on the agricultural industry for their livelihood.	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.
1425	2	<p>Your plan will not only hurt local farmers, but will also hurt the thousands of farm workers that work hard to make a living in Stanislaus County and throughout the Valley. Many people have tried to characterize this issue as a fight between corporate agriculture interests and those who are trying to protect our environment. That narrative leaves out not only all of the family farms, but also all of the men and women who depend on farm work to feed their families.</p> <p>In short, fallowed fields mean fewer jobs. An increase of unimpaired flows to 40% will devastate our agriculturally-based economy and put people out of work. I urge you to consider alternative methods to achieve your environmental goals.</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.
1426	1	<p>Lowering water quality standards in order to increase exports and support a project which will NOT produce more water, only move it differently, seems like an extremely poorly designed solution and one that will not provide a long term answer.</p> <p>Water storage at times of high flow is the only way to get MORE water from mother nature who ultimately decides what comes from the sky. Taking more water from existing system won't solve the long term demands for more water.</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
1426	2	<p>Lower water quality standards that allowed increased salinity harm the Delta ecosystem and the bay. Fish, plants, water fowl and water for farming and residential use cannot withstand increased salinity.</p> <p>Lower water quality standards that allow decreased flow of Delta water can lead to toxic algae blooms like we saw last year--harmful to humans and wildlife.</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>
1426	3	<p>More sustainable agricultural practices and human water use are a better focus of long term water plans. Just like reducing our oil dependence helps eliminate pollution and manages depleting supplies, water must be treated in the same manner.</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>
1426	4	<p>The Delta is not just a place, it is an essential natural resource that must be properly, sustainably managed for the health of the whole state.</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>
1427	1	<p>I believe the Bay Delta water-flow needs to be increased to 50%. This would improve the biodiversity of the surrounding area, which in turn, would better the health of the ecosystem and all organisms in it. I support having a healthy environment to live in, as it has a positive psychological effect on humans and can even help with mental health problems. Please consider changing the flow rate to 50% in order to increase the quality of life of both the people and the wildlife in the area.</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>
1428	1	<p>I strongly believe that the Delta flow should be increased to at least 50%.</p> <p>I find that protecting the biodiversity of the Delta is extremely important because its ecosystems are very sensitive and can potentially be indicative of larger issues at hand that otherwise may have passed under the radar.</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>
1429	1	<p>More than 100 species depend on salmon, so it's not just about salmon, it's about restoring our salmon-based ecosystem. If the delta is blocked in any way shape or form, these species will have difficulty migrating to and from their homes and the ocean. This will cause an environmental imbalance which could hinder the health of the ecosystem as a whole.</p> <p>If the use of water is improved, it will improve the surrounding environment as well as provide consistency of water delivered to the citizens.</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>
1430	1		<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>
1430	1	<p>While California has had tremendous rainfall this past season, I understand that the long term distribution of water has been threatened by rising global temperatures and increased pressure on farmers to grow more, to match population. Farmers need water from our storages to grow crops, but it is more important we protect our native species.</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>
1430	2	<p>California salmon have been hit the hardest by our increased draining of natural reservoirs, with numbers dropping to just a few thousand, down from over 400,000 in past years. Not only do salmon provide us with food, they also help determine if the quality of water is good, and transport nutrients around our state. More than 100 species depend on salmon, making it important for us to restore our salmon-based ecosystem.</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>
1430	3	<p>Decreasing water flow makes it harder for these fish to swim, and concentrates pollutants</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>in an area salmon need to live in. Please keep this in mind when you make decisions for water rights, and help protect salmon populations for years to come!</p>	<p>comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
1431	1	<p>Adjusting the water flow of the Delta to 50% would significantly benefit numerous aspects within the environment, the economy, as well as today's society. I am a student studying environmental science in the bay area. Even in the most affluent and busy neighborhood, I, as well as the uncountable species harmed by anthropogenic influence, will suffer the consequences of no action. It is my responsibility, as well as the rest of consumers of water, to be aware and to spread awareness.</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>
1432	1	<p>As a Bay Area resident and concerned student, I feel as though efforts should be made to restore the biological and ecological proficiency of the delta, since the protection of our environment is effectively the protection of humanity</p> <p>The logical procedure would be to examine if there is a relationship between the amount of freshwater which flows through the Bay-Delta and the health and biodiversity of the wildlife native to the Bay-Delta. And so yes, we are now taking the logical step, and after considering the facts which your board has definitely been told many times, we may conclude that there is an inverse relationship:</p> <p>The less freshwater going through the Bay-Delta, the more harm is done to our environment.</p> <p>And the word "harm" here is putting it lightly.</p> <p>What we are doing is playing the fool and hoping that we may continue to exhaust our environment for anthropocentric "success"-- selfish self-destruction.</p> <p>Change must be made, and it must come before we destroy our environment.</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>
1433	1	<p>I am urging you to increase water flow to 50% in the deltas. This would really benefit the local ecosystems as well as contribute to bettering the environment as a whole. It is important that we do what we can and have control over to help with these kinds of situations. With the decrease in flow from these deltas to the bay, there has been increased the salinity as well as other negative impacts affecting marine life. And who doesn't love marine life?</p> <p>I hope that we can start making the right efforts and steps forward to help the environment, and to do so I say we start at the local level and what we actually can control.</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>
1434	1	<p>As a current landowner and stakeholder in my family's almond farming business, I ask that the State Water Resources Control Board (Board) revise its staff proposal to update minimum flow standards for the Lower San Joaquin River. Hastily developed Board proposals, without legitimate and meaningful settlement discussions with all involved parties, cannot fairly assess the impact on our state.</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>
1434	2	<p>I am a landowner and stakeholder in my family's almond farming business. My grandfather immigrated to Turlock and began farming in 1923. My father worked on the ranch as a young boy until he passed away and my mother stepped up to continue his legacy. The farm is a family business her grandchildren would like to manage one day. There have always</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
		been challenges to running a small farm -- market fluctuations, disease, labor issues, but never in the nearly one hundred years our family has been farming, has there been such a threat to its very existence. And the threat is simply a hastily written government proposal to divert 40% unimpaired flows of the Tuolumne, Stanislaus and Merced Rivers.	
1434	3	The real impact of 40% unimpaired flows looks like: \$1.6 billion in economic output lost; \$167 million in farm-gate revenue lost; \$330 million in labor income lost; and 6,576 jobs lost (if SED was in effect in 2015).	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.
1434	4	The real impact of 40% unimpaired flows looks like: Don Pedro Reservoir will potentially be empty one out of every four 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.
1434	5	The real impact of 40% unimpaired flows looks like: In drought years (like 2015) TID farmers will receive ZERO 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.
1434	6	The real impact of 40% unimpaired flows looks like: A significant portion of farmland will be switched to non-agricultural uses.	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.
1434	7	The real impact of 40% unimpaired flows looks like: Groundwater will be significantly depleted.	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.
1434	8	The real impact of 40% unimpaired flows looks like: The quality of water in domestic wells will drop and possibly public water systems.	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.
1434	9	As farmers, we agree the pursuit of better water quality in the Delta and a healthy salmon fishery should always be an objective of the Board. However, we don't agree that increased river flows are the sole solution to fixing these needs, nor should the San Joaquin River tributaries be solely responsible for fixing these problems. Wouldn't it be prudent to consider some of the non-flow solutions such as implementing a predation suppression program on the Tuolumne; implementing river and habitat improvements on the Tuolumne; or restructuring existing river operations? Unfortunately, we know that saving the fish is not the sole motive behind such a lopsided proposal. Our water is needed for the Twin Tunnels to get off the ground. Does the sacrifice of thousands of family businesses and bankrupting the Valley's robust agriculture economy make it worthwhile for this political endeavor?	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.
1434	10	I know that my family's small almond business will cease to exist after nearly one hundred years in business if the Board's plan to divert 40% of unimpaired flows on the Tuolumne. I urge you to take a real look at the well-known fallout as the SED stands now and reconsider. Our affected community will not go quietly.	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.
1435	1	The degradation of the Stanislaus River, the surrounding nature, and the potential hardship to our local farmers and ranchers are among the many reasons I am against your plan to increase river flows for salmon. Please come up with a better way 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.
1436	1	Your plan to increase river flows for fish doesn't make sense. Farmers in this valley need that water as well as for our own homes.	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.
1437	1	We need the water to remain here for farming and drought.	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
1438	1	We need our water HERE! Leave our rivers alone.	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.
1439	1	Let our farmers FARM!	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.
1440	1	In response to current discussion we cannot allow a more water quality reduction on the San Joaquin River or any other that feeds the delta. The priority for over promised water to the myriad of users needs to be 1. Quality water for PEOPLE 2. Water to sustain the Delta fisheries 3. Ag water that is the remainder. 4. Conservation PEOPLE ARE DOING THEIR PART!. We need consolidated management of our water supply system.	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.
1441	1	I am embarrassed by our lack of insight to invest in the future of California. I have heard people state that the main reason for this is that there are no viable watersheds to invest in. Hogwash! We have not invested in water projects because. 1) There are more environmental laws now than before, 2) There are more environmental laws now than before, 3) There are more environmental laws now than before. Why do I say this? There are many existing watersheds in California that routinely wash over 50% of their capacity out to the ocean. The San Joaquin, the Kings and the American rivers just to name a few. Yes, there are dams on those watersheds but 1M acre feet of storage is hardly close to the capacity of the river. All need to do is to look at the CDEC reports and notice how many dams in California this year reach capacity in January/February and then drop back down. (http://cdec.water.ca.gov/reservoir_map.html). There have been proposals languishing for years for larger or secondary dams for these rivers. The last major watershed we invested in was New Melones. The reservoir size was increased to 2.4M AF. But in spite of the investment, the lake is managed (water is released) as if it is still a 1M AF lake. (i.e., the water is released in the name of aquaculture, the theory that the wildlife will be improved if we release water close to the rate of natural flows). If an existing dam can be managed as if it is not really there, is there any wonder that there is resistance to build more dams? I really appreciate the spirit and intent of being a citizen among the state's wildlife. But I think we need to explore all tools in our tool chest (like say, managing predator fish). California has rich natural and people resources. A policy that holds back progress (build more storage) is simply myopic and shortchanges the future generations of Californians.	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.
1442	1	I want to protect our farmland. I think we need to not increase the unimpaired flows on	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the Stanislaus River.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1443	1	The actions taken by our government will cause destruction to wildlife and a great deal of hardship on farmers and ranchers as well as residents.	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.
1444	1	I urge you to increase the water that flows through the Delta to 50%. As a result of low water flows which lead to warm temperatures, lower dissolved oxygen, and disease, the ecosystems that depend on this aquatic environment have suffered.	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.
1444	2	I know the water rights are complicated and dated and that low value crops are being exported, along with the CA water it took to grow them. Wildlife populations in California should not be pushed to the brink of survival because of society's inability to manage water sustainably. Again, I urge you to increase the water flows through the Delta to a healthier level for wildlife.	Please refer to 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.
1445	1	The Stanislaus River is being cared for by OID and SSJD. They have the information to care for the 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.
1445	2	We need the Stanislaus River for our area to maintain our level of agricultural businesses.	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.
1445	3	The salmon may be a great "sport" fish, but they do not impact as large a populace of humans as changing the Stanislaus River flow. Continue restoration and removal of predators, and save the power for times it is needed.	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.
1446	1	What is needed is increased water flows on the San Joaquin River. Last summer toxic algae blooms kept us from swimming in our own back yard, a bay in Discovery Bay. Reduced flows and continual algae blooms in Discovery Bay will not only make the waterways in our community unusable, it will ruin the value of our homes.	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.
1446	2	What is needed is to actually reduce water exports from the delta. Current water exports are already exceeding state limits. A reduction in water quality by exporting more water is not a viable option. That's putting agriculture, people's health, and recreation at risk.	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.
1447	1	We need the water for our crops. We feed the people here and in other areas.	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.
1447	2	Do not force more to be wasted in a futile attempt to help salmon. There are better ways.	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.
1448	1	I just wanted to voice my strong concern and opposition regarding the weakening of the water standards for anywhere in the SF Bay Delta and in particular in the currently proposed area in the South Delta.	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.
1448	2	I fish and spend time there [South Delta] and over the last decade+ (and probably longer before I was there), I have watched and clearly seen an ecosystem in collapse. Fish that were always plentiful are fewer and farther between. Catfish which could be caught in huge numbers have all but disappeared from many areas (I'm guessing that this may have to do with increased salinity driving them away/killing them). Invasive plant issue has ballooned hugely and is an utter mess. This seems apparently to be exacerbated by higher water temps which are caused in part due to lower flows. The only treatment/recourse that the	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
		State has taken is to do extensive spraying of the plants to kill them. Now when I immerse my hands and such in the water for an extended period of time, I get some sort of skin rash which never used to happen until the last few years -- I suspect that this has something to do with the chemicals being sprayed on the plants (and hence into the Delta).	
1448	3	Please do not weaken salinity standards in the South Delta (for so many reasons which I do not need to go into here - agriculture, drinking water wells, fishing, boating, ecosystem health, fish breeding)	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.
1448	4	Please work towards reducing water usage and required exports from the Delta. Currently it seems with the large nut orchards growing in southern San Joaquin Valley, water demands are just going to grow and grow.	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.
1448	5	Please increase water flows on the San Joaquin River, not reduce them. State studies pointed to a need for 60% flows, much higher than the suggested 40%	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.
1449	1	<p>With the low flow of rivers in California, the aquatic wildlife is suffering and unable to thrive. With the failure of population growth of many fish come disadvantages for us as well.</p> <p>Our fisheries are already suffering (and have been for many decades). Without a strong and natural flow, fish, such as salmon, cannot freely move along the river to lay their eggs and increase the population. Therefore, their populations diminish in size. With the low population size of the fish, our fisheries will suffer and so will our economy. It is your responsibility as government workers and simple Americans to do what is right for the people and the environment. By allowing the rivers to stay low and therefore hurt fish populations, you are permitting the collapse of our environment, our economy, and our beautiful society. I implore you to make the rivers flow naturally and strongly.</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.
1450	1	I have boated in this area for many years and the situation there is not good and getting worse. Please increase water flows in the San Joaquin River and do not allow the salinity level standards to be weakened so the water becomes more salty/brackish.	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.
1451	1	<p>Cease and Desist attempting to take our property through your regulatory process. The people of California, through our legislative body, have authorized the State Water Resources Control Board only to regulate water, therefore the State Water Resources Control Board lacks jurisdiction to take my property rights. In the event the State Water Resources Control Board believes that they do have jurisdiction, please provide it.</p> <p>The Supreme Court has identified water rights as belonging to the property and incorporated into the property rights. I have property in both the Oakdale Irrigation District and the Modesto Irrigation District. Your attempts in what is called the "unimpaired flows" to take my property away without going through the Eminent Domain process is constitutionally unlawful. Please see United States Supreme Court case BRYANT v. YELLEN, (1980).</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.
1452	1	I have read the Executive Summary of the amended SED, in which you describe the impact of taking the water that 1.25 million people in the three counties rely on as "significant but unavoidable." That's a shocking dismissal of those of us who live in this area and of the enormous investment we have made here over many decades.	Please refer to 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 refer to the section that acknowledges the concerns of elected officials and community members.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1452	2	<p>The water you propose to take from us is essential to our agriculturally based economy and to our lives. In Stanislaus County, most of us have ties to the land, even if farming has not have been our primary source of income. Traditionally, people here have purchased agricultural land throughout their working years to grow crops to supplement their current income, and to provide income during retirement. My husband and I have done the same. Our tree and vine crops provide a substantial portion of our retirement income, and represent a significant investment which will be lost if the state takes our water as the SED proposes. Agricultural land in our county is worth \$25,000-\$30,000 per acre with water, but \$5,000 or less per acre without water. This proposed loss of water will be devastating to us. The SED's economic analysis significantly underestimates the harm to those of us living in this region.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that make a general comment regarding the plan amendments and general information regarding the economic analysis.</p>
1452	3	<p>We all want healthy rivers and fisheries, but there's no scientific evidence that taking more of our water to release down the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers will benefit the fish. See the long term study by FishBio, reported January 2017, on the impact of pulse flows on salmon. There is scientific evidence that improving the fish habitat and reducing predation in the rivers and the Delta will improve the fisheries. Our irrigation districts have spent millions of dollars on fish research over the past decades, which the State Water Resources Board has ignored.</p>	<p>As described in Appendix C, Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives, and Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, scientific evidence demonstrates that increased and more variable flow is the foundation for survival for fish. Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for additional information.</p> <p>The State Water Board recognizes that non-flow measures have a complementary role to flow-based restoration. Please see Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures, regarding the role of non-flow actions.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding predation, the consideration of other information with respect to predation, and the State Water Board's use of best available data.</p>
1452	4	<p>In a statement at the December 20, 2016, Public Hearing on the SED in Modesto, Chairwoman Marcus acknowledged that additional water alone won't be enough to improve the fisheries and the Delta. She further stated that that regulating the amount of water flow is the only tool the State Water Resources Board has to improve the situation, as if that justifies this plan. That's an outrageous conclusion. The only question seems to be how much more water the state will take. We deserve a more rigorous analysis and thoughtful proposal than this.</p>	<p>Refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, and Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Plan Process regarding the State Water Board authority related to the water quality control planning process. Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, and SED Executive Summary, Chapters 7 and 19, for responses to comments and additional information about the benefits the LSJR flow objectives provide to fish habitat.</p>
1452	5	<p>The SED acknowledges that taking more of our surface water will result in additional groundwater pumping. However, additional ground water pumping will not be possible under SIGMA, which mandates that ground water basins recharge their aquifers and bring the ground water usage in balance with the surface water. The SED fails to consider this conflict with SIGMA. The SED proposal to take more surface water will make it impossible to recharge our aquifers.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, for a discussion on potential increases in groundwater pumping, SED consideration of SGMA, and groundwater recharge. The SED does not contradict SGMA, because SGMA requires local public agencies sustainably manage groundwater basins that are subject to SGMA without causing "undesirable results" (Water Code § 10721(x)). The SED and plan amendments do not require or encourage increased groundwater pumping. The SED analyses reflect that the historical local response to reduced surface water availability has been to choose to increase groundwater pumping; therefore, the SED was required to analyze this reasonably foreseeable action and its impacts on the groundwater basin from this local response.</p>
1452	7	<p>The SED fails to create a viable plan for our precious water resources. I refer you to the letter of our Assembly member, Adam Gray, sent on January 3, 2017, to Board Chairwoman Felicia Marcus. Assemblyman Gray articulately sums up the glaring inadequacies of the SED document. I urge you to take his recommendation to start over, using the information provided in the public hearings and submitted to your Board, and include all stakeholders in the process in a meaningful way.</p>	<p>To review responses to comments submitted by other entities within the comment period on the 2016 Recirculated Draft SED, please refer to the index of commenters in Volume 3 to locate the letter number(s) of interest.</p>
1452	28	<p>We have flood irrigated our small almond orchard for decades with surface water from MID, which has helped recharge the aquifer. Under the SED proposal, there won't be sufficient</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to commonly raised issues and concerns</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		surface water for the trees or to recharge the aquifer, in which case there won't be water to drink either. That scenario is very likely, especially with climate change, another variable the SED has omitted from its analysis. This part of the Central Valley has some of the most fertile soil in the world, and helps feed the world. We cannot let the state turn it into another Owens Valley.	regarding agricultural impacts and economic considerations.
1453	1	I'm writing this email to request that the Board approve a Bay Delta Plan that provides adequate unimpaired flow to reach the Delta between February and June to fully protect the fish and wildlife in the Lower San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries, including the Delta and S.F. Bay.	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.
1454	1	I oppose taking water from our already fragile valley agriculture. And the selling of our water to Southern California. I would rather see desalination plants built in Southern California. And keep our very necessary water resources here. Where they belong.	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.
1455	1	Don't take our water. Don't mess with our water. Don't send our water. Don't destroy farming, ranching, canning, manufacturing jobs. California and the rest of the country is dependent on water to feed everyone.	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.
1456	1	I oppose your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus River because we need the water for agriculture which feeds many people not just in our state but in our country. Not having water to use with prime agricultural land is harming not only our economy but our food supply.	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.
1456	2	Severely limiting watering at residences is impacting the health of family gardens and yards as well. We need to be able to use more water rather than sending it down the 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.
1457	1	Your plan for our rivers and to "save" salmon is not logical. It takes the water from the farmer's in the Valley that they so desperately need for their crops to succeed.	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.
1458	1	How else will California be able to survive? When you take away our water, you take away our rights to good food grown locally AND to be exported to others. Farmers are the backbone of California. Get it right and leave us alone!	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.
1459	1	Don't take our water. Don't mess with our water. Don't send our water. Don't destroy farming, ranching, canning, manufacturing jobs. California and the rest of the country is dependent on water to feed everyone.	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.
1460	1	I am against your plan to 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.
1460	2	We can't live on fish. We need this water to grow crops for fruits and vegetables.	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.
1461	1	Please stop wasting our precious water with these increased water releases and flows.	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.
1461	2	Let's use the dams for what they were intended for: the farmers, the people and to ensure we had water storage in times of drought.	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
1462	1	None of the scientific research supports your proposed method of increasing fish populations by increasing river flows. But, it is proven detrimental to ag, aquifers, tourism, local population water needs. Please use common sense and stop this harmful practice.	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.
1463	1	It is important that 60% of unimpaired flow be the goal for the plan. The Delta area and water flows has been researched by qualified scientists and they have found that 60% of the unimpaired flow to be necessary to maintain reasonable health in the Delta to restore and protect the valuable fisheries and to protect the public value of the Bay-Delta estuary. The current value of 40% in "The Plan" is not adequate to protect this unique and valuable 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.
1463	2	Be noted also that the Phase 1 Recirculated Draft SED does not address the environmental justice communities in chapter 5 and chapter 9 (water quality/hydrology & groundwater). It needs to address 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.
1463	3	The Bay Delta is a unique and important estuary, the largest of its kind on the West Coast of the Americas. Unfortunately, the quality of the Delta has been compromised as a result of taking water away from it to satisfy the thirst of urban an agricultural water users. "Big Agriculture" has been a major reason why this has happened. The growing of water thirsty crops in the semi desert of the south central valley is a big mistake and it is something which should not have grown so large as to put such a demand on Delta water. Those crops should not be grown in that area. It does not make sense and is bad farming, bad economics, and bad for the environment. Maintain the minimum 60% flow and force Big Agriculture to adapt their growing to any water that would not exceed that number.	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.
1463	4	Allowing only 40% of the unimpaired flow thru the Delta to take place increases the Salinity of the estuary. This is not good for the natural balance that was established by Mother Nature. Many systems start to fall apart because of the Salinity; local farming, fisheries, and other estuary life.	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.
1463	5	The value of "at least 60%" must be a permanent value, never to be changed to something lower! The "Big Ag" folks will repeatedly try to change this number to steal more water to water their desert grown crops. This has to stop.	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.
1463	6	There are key points in time that become critical to creating a "make it or break it situation". We are at that point right now. You can respect our important natural resource that is so valuable to the State and its people and its natural environment, or you can ignore the writing on the wall, and choose to let the Delta die. The choice is in your hands. Please do not take this lightly. You have one shot at getting this right and now is the time to get it right. Maintain at least 60% of unimpaired water flow and you will be making a decision that helps to protect this valuable Delta estuary. We are living in a world now that is constantly under attack by people who care only about how much money they make and do not care about the side effects of their actions. This has got to stop. Now is the time to let these people know that they have to change their ways. There are alternatives to their disastrous activities and they have to be taught to change their madness to doing what makes sense.	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.
1464	1	The Delta can't take any more reduction of water flows. Over the forty plus years that I've been using this wonderful water world, I have watched the water quality erode to a point that not only do we need to not allow any more water to be pumped out but we need to find a way to get more flow to our Delta.	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
		The lack of flow has allowed the water to stop moving and the clarity of the water has allowed many species of aquatic weed to grow and this process has also changed the wildlife ecosystem to a point that will take many years to recover. Allowing more water to be drawn from here will destroy what we have and ruin what we all know as home. This winter's heavy rain has had a wonderful effect on the water clarity and reminds me of what this area used to be like twenty years ago. Delta water health is not clear but cloudy and opaque! Stagnant water is clear.	
1464	2	From a salinity standpoint, as the flows continue to weaken, so does the pressure the water flow has on the salt water intrusion into the upper delta. This salinity will have a devastating effect on our farming in this area.	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.
1465	1	I am writing to voice my opposition to Delta Tunnels. First of all this plan will not create one more drop of water. It will be detrimental to the water quality of the San Joaquin Delta, of which, farmers, and the many birds, aquatic animals and fish rely 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.
1466	1	To allow even a slightly higher salinity in the Delta is a lose, lose policy. Data shows Plan will increase it everywhere. The changes in location where brackish water meets fresh water will cause salmonids to adapt their bodies at different points and Plan must predict what the temperatures will be at those points.	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.
1466	2	Glad to see that you recognize the importance of the distinction between hatchery and native salmon. The scientific studies would be much more streamlined if EVERY HATCHERY FISH is marked. Please use your influence to make this happen ASAP.	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.
1467	1	Stop the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced river flow increase.	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.
1467	2	All plans for California waters must be treated as a whole. Separating plans for increased San Joaquin river flow from the Sacramento River/Twin Tunnels delta water diversion plan is ludicrous and deceptive. All California waters are a connected biological system and must be considered in whole. The claim that increasing river flows for the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers 'for the fish' has nothing to do with diverting Sacramento River water from the delta is a transparent attempt to deceive and manipulate Central Valley citizens. All California waters must be considered in one unified 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.
1467	3	Requiring increased flow from these rivers will force increased dependency on our limited groundwater 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.
1468	1	I am a person who has watched the Delta slowly die due to the lack of water and the changing environment. I understand that the too many people depend on water from the sierra (thus the Delta) and that agribusiness in the south has dominated our government with their money and influence. In this era of the purported slow death of the ERA and denial of climate change, I hope that someone (maybe you?) can put a halt to decisions that will change the world that our children will inherit. Please do not let the salinity grow in the Delta and understand that this area is really on its death bed and that the decisions you make should not be dictated by	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
		Metropolitan Water (nor the wet winter we just had), it is the long picture that you must focus on.	
1468	2	We cannot sustain the exports that we now have. We must find a way to make MORE WATER.....not hope that we will have rain....we need to spend the money they state voters voted for in an intelligent way. Old solutions have been debated for decades, and it is up to enlightened people like yourselves (I hope) to say no to this travesty.	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.
1469	1	Anyone that has brains should know that disturbing the natural flow of what has always happened in the San juaquin delta is what needs to be undisturbed. If you do not live her you do not know what is everyday natural flowing water. Let this not be about water and the people who own 4 .4 billion of California water rights. Should I mention their name...	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.
1470	1	After researching the Substitute Environmental Document, I wanted to offer my thoughts on this proposal. If this additional flow of water is designed to improve the fish populations and the general Ecosystem of the Delta, then I feel the same desired result could be obtained by not allowing the towns and cities along the the Sacramento River, and its tributaries including the Delta, to continue dumping their city sewage wastes into these waters. It would seem to me, a much wiser method to dispose of this so called treated waste water would be to find a use for it in agriculture such as irrigating Alfalfa, Corn, Barley, etc. that is used for animal feeds.	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.
1470	2	As far as the declining fish populations, I doubt the Striped Bass is on that list. On the contrary, the non-native Striped Bass is probably the reason that certain species of fish are declining. I suggest removing all fishing restrictions on the size and limit of Striped Bass caught. These predatory fish are eating machines and my guess is that they are eating most of the Salmon fingerlings as they try to make their way to the ocean and most likely consuming what ever Delta Smelt are still alive.	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.
1470	3	The production of food is basic to any advanced civilization. The country of Venezuela is learning this lesson the hard way, as I'm sure you are aware of. California farmers need water to grow the large amounts of food our country demands. Please keep this in mind when making policies that reduce water deliveries to farms 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.
1471	1	It's absolutely ridiculous that you want to send extra water down the river for fish!! We need that water for our agriculture so we can grow food to feed everyone! When we water our orchards and fields, it refills the aquafers. And helps to keep us drought free even when we don't get enough rain! It's normal for fluctuations in river water, the fish adapt!!!!	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.
1472	1	Diverting water from its natural channel endangers the wildlife dependent on the water flow. Taking water from its primary channel removes the cleansing action our waterway needs to maintain a healthy river system. The pollution drained into our rivers coming from farms and irrigation requires a natural water flow to protect and dilute water flowing into the ocean and wetlands.	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.
1473	1	Stanislaus County is the bread basket of the United States. If you take all that water from our rivers, the farmers won't be able to grow the crops that feeds all of us and half the world.	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.
1474	1	Reducing water flows cannot help the Delta and the fragile eco-system that currently exists. We live in Discovery Bay and the water quality now is fairly average even though we have	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>increased flow due to run-off. I know that statistically we are over delivering water to the south by about 20%. In addition, we have put up temporary gates to reduce the possibility of increased salinity. If the Delta is damaged, so is the economy.</p> <p>Again, the tunnels and proposed gates are not a solution. Spend the money on de-salinization and/or infrastructure to capture water so that it will be available when needed to alleviate further levy concerns.</p>	<p>comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
1475	1	<p>Board member D'amato repeatedly complained that she wasn't sure if increasing the flows to 40% would yield more salmon. Well of course she doesn't know because she does not have a background in the sciences. She is a lawyer obviously aligned with the agricultural community. Actually one thing that is known for sure is that when you dewater salmonid habitats there is a decrease in population numbers and we have the figures to prove it. Furthermore she is not aware of the vast stores of knowledge that have been developed in California in the states' own agencies, Federal agencies, the University system, and public and private environmental labs that shows the biological effects on the entire ecosystem not just on salmon. Decreased sources of fresh water for aquatic species cause death across the board. Please listen to the science community even when it doesn't serve the politically powerful.</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>
1475	2	<p>I would like to mention that one of the pro AG speakers said that his region had poverty levels in 1 in 4 persons range. What he failed to mention was that lots of poverty in farming regions is caused by the growers themselves because they fail to pay workers a living wage. Average wages are low and many work long hours at minimum wage or lower. It is no wonder they live in substandard conditions. They do not want to pay overtime wages. It is the same exploitation of the masses that has always existed in California agriculture. They like to drag these poor unfortunate workers out for display if it helps them get some political leverage and immediately abandon them once they have served their greedy purposes. There are many times that I feel that maybe the excessive water use by Ag could be better used in industries that would allow the disenfranchised permanent employment with health benefits and housing. I would implore the board to look into the way that farm workers are exploited and whether water use could be curbed for better uses.</p> <p>Despite what is frequently expounded we are not really an Ag state. We are are a technology state for example one company Apple has \$200 billion dollars in sales in a fiscal year dwarfing agricultural sales. Perhaps that is what we should be concentrating on when we start distributing water. Where is the most bang for the buck? I have seen figures that farms only account for 2-5% of the economy but receive 80% of the developed water. There needs to be a balance established for reasonable uses of water and not just for the enrichment of billionaire farmers. Family farmers should be protected.</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>
1476	1	<p>Reduced waterflow in the delta has had a very negative impact on the Delta. During the drought I saw a significant increase in water hyacinth, egeria densa, and toxic algae. The stench created by the water weeds was disgusting. Residents of Discovery Bay were warned not to allow their pets to drink water from the Delta, let alone swim in it. Flies, mosquitos and gnats swarmed around the stagnant water to the point we were unable to go outside on our back deck for fear of getting West Nile virus from mosquito bites.</p> <p>Wakeboarding and boating were near impossible due to the pollution and obstacles in the water created by the water weeds.</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
1476	2	<p>I've heard that 60% of flows on the San Joaquin are needed as opposed to the proposed 40%, and also the current level of water exports has exceeded previous limits that were set in the 1990's. We need to protect the environment by increasing, NOT decreasing water quality standards. Reduced water quality impacts fish, wildlife, businesses that rely on the delta for their livelihood, local residents, and farmers who rely on irrigation. Pumping more water to the south out will serve to decrease our water quality as the salty water from San Francisco Bay would increase, thereby resulting in more of the dreaded toxic algae which has a negative effect on human life (mosquitos and their bites) and negatively impacting the local economy.</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>
1476	3	<p>The tunnels are a terrible idea. Outrageously expensive and destructive to the delta and it's residents/economy, and the environment Other alternatives need to be considered such as de-salination of ocean water and increased storage of the water we receive from rain and snowmelt from the sierra's. Money would be better spent protecting current infrastructure to avoid catastrophes such as the Oroville Damn and by better maintaining the levees on the delta. Let's focus on protecting what we already have.</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>
1477	1	<p>Increased Water Flow is Necessary to Protect the South Delta : As a long time resident of Discovery Bay (17 years), I have seen first hand that insufficient waterflow in the delta has had a devastating impact on the environment, local business, recreation, and potentially on human health. The last few years during the drought I personally witnessed the proliferation of water hyacinth, egeria densa, and toxic algae.</p> <p>When travelling by boat from Stockton to Antioch, then Discovery Bay to Tracy, there were many waterways where the water was not visible at all due to the overgrowth of water weeds! Further, all sorts of polluted debris was trapped on top of thick hyacinth matt's, including but not limited to telephone poles, bottles, and lumber. I understand that for a period of time ship traffic was stopped in the Stockton channel at night since their navigation system (radar?) could not distinguish land from water. In Discovery Bay and Stockton (probably many other areas but I am speaking from personal experience) the stench was horrible. Flies, mosquitos and bugs were in abundance like never before, and the toxic algae prevented swimming in Discovery Bay and likely deterred visitors (thereby impacting local businesses).</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>
1477	2	<p>I understand that scientists indicate that 60% of flows on the San Joaquin are needed as opposed to the proposed 40%, and the current level of water exports has exceeded previous limits. We need to protect our precious delta by increasing, NOT decreasing water quality standards for irrigation, agriculture, and recreation.</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>
1477	3	<p>How would the tunnels will solve any of our problems? As I understand it, pumping more water out will only decrease our water quality as the saline from SF Bay would increase, resulting in more of the dreaded toxic algae which has the downward effect of harming lives and negatively impacting the delta economy.</p> <p>Please consider other alternatives to the tunnels that make sense and won't destroy the Delta.</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>
1478	1	<p>The State Water Resources Control Board now has the opportunity to update water quality standards that reflect support of the environment and the people rather than continuing to manage our resources in the service of predatory corporate interests.</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
		<p>I watch in horror the disregard for our precious natural resources here in California, North Dakota, Flint, Michigan and around the globe.</p> <p>The new Water Quality Control Plan must raise water quality standards for the delta. Delta water must not become contaminated with high salinity, harmful algae blooms, pesticides, methel mercury, and selenium.</p> <p>I urge the board to undo past practices of allowing deteriorating water quality and environmental destruction in the delta. You can no longer continue to manage these resources in the interest of large agricultural corporate interests in the south state whose products are mostly exported overseas. We must take care of this beautiful state and manage our delta water in the interests of our wildlife, endangered species and the entire delta ecosystem, legitimate small farmers, fisheries and community water needs.</p> <p>Reduce Delta exports and quit honoring special interests. It is imperative to require new and better water quality standards in the Water Quality Plan amendment and SED.</p>	
1479	1	<p>We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Bay Delta Plan Amendment and SED, and thank the Board for extending the comment period to March 17. Having over recent years studied risk factors to the Bay ecosystem, we are convinced of the importance of increasing freshwater flows to and through the Delta. Sufficient flows can help ameliorate problems such as pollution (including pollution from wastewater discharge), salinity, nonnative species, failing populations of native species. We support increasing flows that are critical to aquatic ecosystems like the San Francisco Bay and Delta.</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>
1479	2	<p>State and federal wildlife agencies have made it clear that increased flows are needed for the survival of native fishes. A healthy Bay and economy depend on such flows. Reduced river flows contribute to fish mortality; reduced flows increase and concentrate pollutants and salinity, increase water temperatures (sometimes lethally for young native fish), decrease dissolved oxygen and contribute to overgrowth of cyanobacteria, causing harmful algal blooms.</p> <p>The effects of freshwater starvation can be felt far beyond the immediate Bay and Delta. Lack of sufficient freshwater affects the 500+ species of wildlife that migrate through the region, such as salmon and birds using the Pacific Flyway.</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>
1479	3	<p>Reliable water for California, as called for in the Delta Reform Act of 2009, can be supplied through such programs as recycling, wastewater reuse, stormwater reuse and storage in groundwater aquifers—which programs can supplement ecologically-safe amounts conveyed through the Delta.</p> <p>If jurisdictions - both urban and rural/agricultural - were to work collaboratively to reuse available supplies wisely, imported Delta water would not be needed in such quantities, leaving sufficient for the environment. Higher flow standards (as proposed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in 2013) could increase flows and restore the failing ecosystem.</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>
1479	4	<p>From a South Bay perspective, our Santa Clara County could provide better reuse of its wastewater and stormwaters, lessening the burden on imported water from the Delta.</p> <p>For instance, our POTWs discharged + 218,680 af of wastewater to the Bay in 2015—which</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
		<p>is more than the <173,000 af of water that Santa Clara County/SCVWD's imported in 2015. Although the Silicon Valley Advanced wastewater treatment plant is operating, it recycles only a fraction (~8,960 afy) of what Orange County's Groundwater Replenishment System accomplishes (~103,000 afy). More wastewater reuse would mean less need for imported water.</p> <p>And, currently the wealth of water brought to us by our wet winter is being discharged to the Bay, rather than being used to recharge our underground aquifers via our percolation ponds (as reported by the San Jose Mercury at http://www.mercurynews.com/2017/03/02/water-district-perc-ponds-pass-on-turbid-water-full-of-sediment/.) This is despite the fact that our aquifers provide a significant percentage of our water each year. (The SCVWD reportedly is waiting for the storm season to end to begin filling the perc ponds.)</p> <p>Water left instream can perform the necessary functions of sediment transport, pollution dilution, and helping to meet salinity standards—not to mention providing significant ecological benefits for native species such as endangered salmon.</p> <p>More, and creative, water reuse means more water can be left in streams and rivers to benefit all of California. With an average of only one-third of all waters from the rivers of the San Joaquin basin reaching the SF Bay-Delta, its populations of salmon and other native species have plummeted.</p>	
1479	5	<p>We support higher flows - beyond the 40% UF recommended in Lower San Joaquin River Alternative 3. Please continue working to restore the ecosystems of the San Joaquin River and the whole Bay-Delta.</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>
1480	1	<p>As an interested and involved citizen I am writing this letter of support for the State Water Board's proposal to increase river flows to at least "40% of the unimpaired flows." The timing of these proposed flows causes minimum disruption to agriculture and personal consumption.</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>
1480	2	<p>I believe the overall costs to agriculture, industry and personal consumption associated with these proposed conservation measures are far less than the overall costs associated with the loss of fisheries and increased environmental degradation associated with current practices and/or postponement of the Board's proposal.</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>
1480	3	<p>I urge the Board to stick to its proposal for the immediate and long-term health of our rivers and for the restoration of an important part of our food chain.</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>
1481	1	<p>Please note our request to not implement the proposed Bay-Delta plan which would severely impact the water resources available in the MID and TID water districts. We have read the substitute plan proposed by them and strongly encourage you to implement that plan for our area 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>
1482	1	<p>I understand that this proposed amendment would guarantee adequate flow levels from February to June, specifically 30% to 50% of the "unimpaired flow level". We are strong supporters of keeping our rivers healthy for fish – specifically salmon and steelhead – and of maintaining healthy river systems by guaranteeing adequate flow.</p> <p>We realize that there are many demands for California's decreasing water resources, but</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
		the integrity of our rivers has already been threatened by diversions and we cannot continue down this road causing permanent degradation of these riverine systems and without compromising further the integrity of the salmon and steelhead populations.	
1483	1	As a business person and resident in the central valley, I would like to remind your agency that our businesses, communities, and economies are reliant upon a healthy agricultural environment. I urge the Water Resources Board to consider options that allow for the storage of water and fair distribution of water to all users rather than the unimpaired flow of water to the ocean without regard for the needs of agriculture in California. Please consider the effect that your agency's decision makes on the many people, businesses, and communities that rely on a healthy and sustainable agricultural 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.
1484	1	I am a fly fisherman and an avid supporter of any measures that maintain and or improve stewardship of our unique and precious natural resources. Phase 1 of the Bay-Delta Plan provides such an opportunity by balancing resources between commercial and recreational fisheries.	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.
1484	2	I support maintaining sufficient flow on the lower San Joaquin River and tributaries to provide enough water to satisfy the needs of salmon and steelhead. According to the most reliable studies, new flow standards should be even higher than proposed in order to accomplish a livable habitat for the fish. Again please do whatever is within your authority and power to improve our state's magnificent natural resource. We are facing a huge risk of losing this gift forever.	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.
1485	1	I am a farmer in Stanislaus County. We receive our water from the Tuolumne River (Don Pedro) to grow our crops. We currently employ five full time employees that have sustainable wages with benefits. The average time of employment being 14 years. One employee has been with us for 24 years. These employees are our family. They also depend on this job- they have families to take care of. If the proposal your board is considering to implement is approved, it would necessitate me having to let some of my employees go. Which one or two do I let go?	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.
1485	2	I know that MID and TID have done many studies on this river. They have many options that needs to be implemented that would not require us to let extra water flow to the ocean. I would ask that you FIRST implement proposals that would NOT require more water releases. Please work with our MID and TID 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.
1486	1	We suggest that the Board staff and Board members give greater consideration to the benefits of alternative proposals and alternative ways of achieving the stated goals without creating such a devastating impact on the people of our area.	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.
1487	1	I encourage you to increase the water level in the Delta to 50%. This water increase will help to restore temperatures in the Delta ,which had significantly increased with the low levels of water that have been seen over the past few years; the restoration of the temperature will provide aquatic life with a more comfortable and liveable environment and encourage reproduction in the decreasing levels of fish that have been seen in the Delta in recent years. This reason, along with the fact that increased water levels will help to restore the chemistry of the Delta, which has been altered and allowed cyanobacteria to develop with the decrease of freshwater flow, I urge you to increase the	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
		water in the Delta to 50%.	
1488	1	Your plan regarding river flows would unfairly harm the economy, the agricultural businesses and the environment in Stanislaus, San Joaquin and Merced counties.	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.
1488	2	Additionally, this is a premature move when other viable options such as retaining and saving water have not been explored. During the recent storms, the state really missed out by not saving water. This is irresponsible.	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.
1489	1	<p>Please act to maintain 60% flows in the San Joaquin Basin to ensure the salmon and the Delta ecosystem survive.</p> <p>There is no reason to draw more water. Cities need to adopt the solutions other cities have to localize water and improve water security.</p> <p>It makes no sense to further draw down the rivers when cities are not employing local water-sourcing solutions that have many other benefits.</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.
1491	1	I believe that increased water flows on the San Joaquin River are needed to protect the South Delta as a Place. Scientists say that we need 60% of flows on the San Joaquin River, not the proposed 40%. Lack of sufficient flows will cause more harmful toxic algal blooms such as those that already occurred in the Discovery Bay waterways during 2016, the last year of the drought.	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.
1491	2	<p>A permanent reduction of exports must happen to protect the Delta. The current level of water exports exceeded the limit in the late 1990's and is unsustainable. In 2009 the CA Legislature wrote the Delta Reform Act. That Act established the Delta Stewardship Council and gave the DSC direction to write a Delta Plan based on two co-equal goals: (1) Protect the Delta as a Place. This includes protecting Delta farming, fish, boating & recreation, and communities and on reducing reliance on the Delta; (2) Reliable exports. The Delta Plan was supposed to be based on a scientific analysis of how much flow is required, water to flow through the Delta, in order to protect the fisheries, farms, and communities. In 2010 the Delta Flow Requirements was published by the Bay Institute and the SWRCB. The Delta Flow Requirements said the state was already exporting too much water and needed to cut back. The DSC said that was the wrong answer and threw out the Delta Flows Report, adding a cover page saying the Report was bad. The DSC then went forward writing a plan that had no meat (no measurable targets or quantifiable goals) as how to accomplish goal (1) including reducing reliance on the Delta nor maintaining water quality in the Delta. This was an abduction of duty. This fact was just agreed to in a law suit the STCDA won against the DSC. A new Delta Flows report came out recently from the SWRCB and says the state is exporting too much water. Regardless of how much the water contractors want to continue to extract 5 MAF or more yearly average (not counting a wet year like this one, but normal years and drought years), reduction of exports needs to begin.</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.
1491	3	I do not want to see a weakening of salinity standards in the South Delta. Water quality standards must be protected for Delta agriculture, for other irrigation uses, and for recreation. Discovery Bay is a fresh water community with 2,300 waterfront homes. Our economy and way of life depends on a fresh and clean Delta water flowing through our bays. Allowing salt to intrude would destroy our community's economy, our home values, and our culture.	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
1493	1	I am opposed to your plan to divert more water into the Stanislaus and other rivers because I care about the local economy.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for a discussion regarding comments generally in favor or opposition to the plan amendments.
1494	1	Stop the regulatory drought. Join the online petition to protect 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.
1495	1	Please restore and protect the ecological health of the Delta in your updating of the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control 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.
1495	2	I urge you to permanently reduce water exports, not weaken salinity standards, in the South Delta. Restore 60% of water flows to the San Joaquin 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.
1496	1	I oppose the State Water Resources Control Board's proposal to increase flows on the Merced, Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers, as such an increase will have potentially irreversible negative effects on surface water availability, groundwater sustainability, water quality, jobs, labor income, tax base and the greater socioeconomic backbone of these regions.	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.
1496	2	This proposal has the potential to devastate families, decimate local communities and diminish the varied and vibrant culture that is unique to these areas. Further, I respectfully ask the State Water Resources Control Board staff and board members to give greater consideration to the benefit of non-flow measures before implementing a proposal that has the potential to devastate an entire region 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.
1497	1	As an angler, I am very concerned about the long-term decline of Central Valley runs of native salmon and steelhead. Phase 1 of the Bay-Delta Plan provides a once-in-a-generation opportunity to better balance the way water is allocated so that such fishes - and the commercial and recreational angling economies they support (some \$1.4 billion for salmon alone) - can be restored and sustained.	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.
1497	2	I strongly support boosting flow standards for the lower San Joaquin River and its tributaries so as to provide more water when salmon and steelhead need it most. However, new flow standards should be even higher than proposed. It is my understanding that the most current scientific consensus is that a minimum of 60 percent unimpaired flow is required to recover salmon and steelhead runs in the San Joaquin River system to self-sustaining levels.	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.
1497	3	The water board must objectively consider-the-wide ranging benefits that all Californians receive from healthy fisheries and river ecosystems, as well as the specific requirements of fisheries and anglers. Significant opportunities exist to meet enhanced water quality standards, and to save salmon and steelhead from extinction in California, with minimal impact to the agricultural sector. But these opportunities must be fully considered and supported by new policy.	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.
1497	4	As you are aware, California has already tried or considered strategies for saving salmon and steelhead favored by large water users. None of these strategies have been successful or proven practical. Central Valley salmon and steelhead runs are on the brink of extinction, and our commercial salmon industry is on life support. We can no longer afford to experiment with strategies that don't include more 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.
1497	5	The truth is that fish species, in particular, have been shouldering most of the burden of providing water for California, for decades. Dedication of more water, delivered at key	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		times, must be the primary tactic for recovering fisheries and the Bay-Delta's ecosystem.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1497	6	Please modify your current proposal and sufficiently boost flow standards for the lower San Joaquin River watershed to protect salmon and steelhead.	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.
1498	1	At this time, TLG would like to state that TLG is not opposed to fair and reasonable changes to water allocations provided that (i) long-term historic water rights are both acknowledged and protected (riparian, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, Oakdale Irrigation District, Turlock Irrigation District, Modesto Irrigation District, etc.); and (ii) appropriate mitigation measures are installed to offset any negative impacts created.	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.
1498	2	Further, it is TLG's firm belief that the California State Department of Water Resources and the Arm Corps of Engineers are well aware that silt buildup in and along the San Joaquin River system has affected the total amount of reservoir water releases that Don Pedro, Melones and other reservoirs can safely discharge into the system without creating the potential for San Joaquin River flood impacts to certain urban and rural communities located downstream.	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.
1498	3	TLG requests that any increase in reservoir water releases resulting in elevated downstream river flows during the months being considered be accommodated with mitigation measures requiring and allowing for the creation of (i) additional flow capacity created by means of dredging along downstream river channels; and/or (ii) more flow capacity by increasing channel flow capabilities of current downstream high water flow bypass facilities already in place; and (iii) a method to maintain improved river and bypass flow capacity by taking measures to limit and control future silt buildup.	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.
1498	4	ATT:1 Letter from Terra Land Group, LLC, September 16, 2016 to DeNovo Planning Group 1020 Suncoast Lane, Suite 106 El Dorado Hills, CA 95762 ATTN: Ben Ritchie, Beth Thomson, Steve McMurtry Re: Manteca General Plan Update and Environmental Impact Report as approved on August 16, 2016 by the Manteca City Council (Agenda Item A.4).	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.
1498	5	ATT:1 ATT:1 Exhibits: (attached electronically on enclosed disc)	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.
1498	6	ATT:1 ATT:2 Other Enclosures:	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.
1499	1	I strongly oppose the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) proposed Bay-Delta Plan, Phase 1 Substitute Environmental Document (SED).	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
1499	2	Growing up on a farm and around my family who were farmworkers, I saw firsthand that a reliable surface water supply is the backbone of our region and undeniably brings value to the community--including community sustainability, ag production, ag processing, ag-related business, an economic base, groundwater recharge and affordable 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.
1499	3	It's unfortunate that the Board has failed to consider the effects that an increased unimpaired flow will have on our region. Specifically, the Board has overlooked the impact that this proposal will have on farm workers who depend on our agricultural roots to provide for their families and for the community. As Mr. Denoso stated in the Modesto hearing on December 20, 2016, "No water, no vegetable or fruit, no farmworkers, no harvest, no food . . . without farmworkers, no 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.
1499	4	On top of the impacts that this proposal will have on the agricultural job market (and other areas that several members of the community have mentioned), I won't support a proposal that ultimately puts our region's water sustainability in jeopardy for my kids and future grandkids.	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.