

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1500	1	I am firmly opposed to the State Water Resources Control Board’s Bay-Delta 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.
1500	2	<p>As someone who was raised on a farm and with a family that worked in the fields, I saw firsthand how the water supply is vital to our region. Without a doubt, I also saw its value as an economic base, which includes sustainability, agricultural production, agricultural processing, and for any agricultural business. It’s also vital for the recharge of groundwater and affordable water for the community.</p> <p>Unfortunately, this proposal has not considered the effects and great impact that the water flow increase will have on our community, especially on the agricultural workers who depend on our agriculture roots to provide for our families and the community. As it was stated at the December 20 hearing in Modesto, “No water, no vegetables or fruits... no farmers, no harvest... without field workers... there’s no food.</p> <p>I will not support this proposal that jeopardizes the water sustainability in our region and the future of my children and grandchildren.</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.
1501	1	I don’t think that all of the water should be for farming. When there is not enough water in the rivers and it is hot an algal bloom comes and it might be toxic.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	3	Please help the Delta. We need salmon so please protect the salmon we need it to survive. Tell the farmers to not take water out of the rivers. It will create algae blooms and that’s toxic to the salmon and other fish. It will also affect things in the future. We need fresh water too. The Delta is really important to us. That’s our only water and that’s our only water we will ever have. And if we didn’t have salmon it will affect a lot of things that are in the future. We really need to protect nature so can you help? And the water source needs to be more reliable. And remember to protect the environment.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	4	The whole world is connected. It connects to the Delta. All the rivers in the world connect to the Delta. When you pull out too much water it turns into algae blooms. Then the algae bloom goes into the Delta. We drink that water. So please, please stop pulling out the water and help the Earth.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	5	We can’t let the farmers take all the water. Algae blooms make it hard to drink water and that is less and less 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.
1501	6	The fishermen cannot fish for salmon and the population of the salmon is decreasing.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	7	The farmers are destroying the Delta. We need the water to live and if you choose to let the farmers destroy the Delta you let the farmers destroy a happy living future, but if you [want] a happy future you [cannot] let the farmers suck up 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.
1501	8	Everything depends [on] this choice, the people, the kids, your home, and many others. Your friends depend on that one choice.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	9	I know you think that you will starve but if you don’t buy any farm-fresh foods [and] just buy seeds and use the rain to water your plants you can save the Delta and put [farmers?] out of business. Or you can let them lose the job or use the rain to help the environment.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1501	10	If you care about the environment, the world, fishing, the Delta, the fish, then you will want to choose the Delta. You would want the world to be a better place. The world would be a better place to 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.
1501	11	I'm a kid and you do not want to make the kids angry. Do you? So please don't take more than 40% of the fresh water from the Delta. Do you like all those yummy fish from that Delta? Because when you do that you make all those yummy fish die because they can't have their babies. Because the water is too warm and to lay their eggs they need cold water and in warm water there can even be toxic algae blooms. With [illegible] how much [illegible] water you're taking out of the Delta because when you take water it makes the water warm. That's how algae blooms [are made] and if that happens your crops might die but if your crops have food and you eat that food you and other people might even die from [it]. You know you you're just making it so you can't get the most you can. You know soon you won't have water anymore. Remember everything is connected.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	12	If farmers keep on taking the water from the rivers, in the summer algae is going to bloom and fish are going to start dying and we can get poisoned and could die when people drink the water. Because the algae could still be there.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	13	Please let the water be clean and fresh water. Let less water go to farm. We need more water so the salmon can go through because their levels are going down. If the water gets too shallow the algae will bloom and that can be toxic for the animals and us! It might change the future.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	14	You need to stop taking water from the rivers and the Delta. It can kill the salmon and us! The algae blooms are growing that can poison our water. Remember, everything is connected.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	15	Do you know that the water is going to the farm, not the Delta? I think we should not let the Delta into farms. I think we should put fresh water everywhere.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	16	Do you know that the water is going to the farm, not the rivers and the Delta? And that is bad. We also need water. Because the fish have to swim back to the Delta they have to lay their eggs and then the mother fish has to die.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	17	If the fish die we die! So do not take out 300,62.563 nets of water from the Delta because every pound of water that you are taking out is one step closer to dying. So please help the salmon! Also take less water from the Delta. If you take 300,62.563 water the future will be a disaster but if you net less it will be a big, good, and beautiful world but if you want to trash it do what you're doing. But please do not! So help your salmon and the future!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1501	18	Please help the salmon because when the farmers take the water from the Delta the water is going down and then the salmon cannot swim to the ocean. Also the algae blooms are spreading and it might be toxic and the salmon might breathe it and they will die of breathing the toxic water. Please help the salmon 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.
1501	19	The Delta has less water because people are taking water from the Delta. If there is not enough water there are going to be algae blooms and that is bad for the environment. The salmon number is going down because of how much water we were using from the Delta. The salmon now do not know where to lay their eggs because the farmers are taking 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 from the Delta.	
1501	20	Please have 60% of the water from the [illegible] [so it] can get to 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.
1501	21	Please, please save the Delta water! Because if there is not a lot of water in the Delta it can warm up and there can be an algae bloom. So help the Delta 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.
1501	22	Please, please protect the fresh water flows. If we don't the salmon cannot lay their eggs. The Earth is very, very important. If you keep pulling the fresh water out the water will get warmer and cause toxic algae blooms. The blooms might cause the salmon to die! We need the salmon to eat. And they are very fun to catch.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1502	1	This [Bay-Delta SED] is simply unacceptable. We respectfully request you consider implementation of the Merced Irrigation District's Merced River S.A.F.E Plan, which seeks a multi-benefit approach to addressing salmon lifecycle challenges along the Merced River near our community. In short, our way of life - our water quality and economy - should not be harmed as a means of improving water quality for the benefit of others elsewhere in the state. As we are proposing, there are alternative solutions- which can be approached collaboratively- ensuring more permanent improvements to the salmon lifecycle.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1502	2	As you are likely aware, Merced Irrigation District recently conducted an analysis of the impacts to our local economy with the implementation of the Bay Delta SED. The study was completed through reviewing dozens of existing reports and analyses: these included state Economic Development Department data as well as local agriculture reports. That analysis determined losses to our economy could reach as high as \$231 million and cost nearly 970 full and part-time jobs. According to data from the State Employment Development Department, Merced Metropolitan Area has a current unemployment rate of 10.5 percent. That's nearly double the rate of the rest of California. It is unthinkable that a state agency would implement a plan further harming our economy when other approaches can be taken.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1502	2	If too much water goes to the farms the water will get low and warm then the salmon cannot get through. Salmon is also one of my favorite foods. Since the water is low and warm is will cause algae blooms. That can be toxic and can kill salmon. The good thing is that it will create nutrients for nature but if you let it lay their eggs then it will provide nutrients and a lot more salmon. We can even take half of the salmon and it would not harm the salmon. Just keep the fresh water for the salmon.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1502	3	Although the Greater Merced Chamber of Commerce does not claim to have expertise in water policy, common sense would suggest that our community is being asked to bear the burden for others' "sins of the past" in and around the Bay Delta nearly 100 miles away from our community. The Bay Delta floodplain habitat has been reclaimed for agriculture and urban development. Levies and channels have carved up natural habitat. Non-native bass continue to consume both Delta smelt and juvenile salmon.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1502	4	The Merced River S.A.F.E. Plan intends to immediately increase flows to the Delta above the existing flows requirements, restore more than five miles of riverine and riparian habitat to support juvenile salmon and spawning. Finally, it supports improvements salmon production on the Merced River by funding improvements at the Merced River Salmon Hatchery. This is	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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>a moderate and common-sense approach to protecting our community while meeting your objectives.</p> <p>The Greater Merced Chamber of Commerce believes this is a moderated and beneficial plan: it is a win for salmon and water quality, while minimizing the harm to our local economy. We strongly and respectfully urge you to support this alternative approach.</p>	
1503	1	<p>After listening to several speakers and presentations at the Stockton, Merced and Modesto meetings, it seems to me that the State Water Resources Control Board should take all of the entities up on their offers to work together to create a plan that is sustainable and workable. Rather than putting out a disastrous plan and then seeking settlements from affected entities, I believe the Board should work with the entities up front and implement a plan that does not require “one-off” settlements for compliance.</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>
1504	1	<p>I write to urge you to set flow objectives for the San Joaquin tributaries at 60% of unimpaired. Your own 2010 flow criteria report concluded that level was necessary to restore the health of our riparian, Delta, and SF Bay habitats. Clearly healthy rivers need to have adequate 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>
1504	2	<p>I believe flows at lower levels will not reverse the substantial damage done to our aquatic environments with many years of excessive diversions. I support the Board's draft proposal as a step in the right direction and strongly urge you to hold firm to a minimum of 40% of unimpaired 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>
1504	3	<p>I have a personal concern about sturgeon, who are very vulnerable to reduced flows. These ancient beings are threatened by extremely low flows due to: reduced oxygen, increased pollutants, and inappropriate temperatures.</p> <p>I use anywhere from 11-20 gallons of water per day and am committed to using as little water as possible. I also work in the water conservation field, educating about greywater and rainwater re-use. I am also committed to working on behalf of composting toilets so we stop wasting water to flush. So there are many things we can do to use less municipal water. Fish are important!</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>
1505	1	<p>I strongly oppose the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) proposed Bay-Delta Plan, Phase 1 Substitute Environmental Document (SED). This proposal will undoubtedly create significant, unavoidable and lasting impacts to my husband and I, our kids, our grandkids and our entire community.</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>
1505	2	<p>Throughout the various presentations and comments that I've heard from the SWRCB, it's proven that the Board has failed to truly analyze the effects that an increased unimpaired flow will have on our region. The socioeconomic impacts are brushed over, the groundwater impacts are almost non-existent, and the SED hardly addresses other important issues such as future city growth, schools and the disadvantaged communities in our 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>
1505	3	<p>The Board has also failed to work with the local cities and irrigation districts who will be most affected by your proposal. No one else knows the water and economy better than the ones who live and work here every day.</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>
1505	4	<p>As an employee of the Modesto Irrigation District, it's also important for me to note that MID treats, delivers and wholesales clean and reliable drinking water to the City of</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
		Modesto. The City receives the same allocation as MID’s agricultural customers. Therefore, any reduction in MID’s surface water will proportionally affect the City’s residents. This will leave more than 250,000 people and 6,000 businesses without a sustainable water supply.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1505	5	I can't support a proposal that will harm the people, economy and water sustainability of my community.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1506	1	I wanted to weigh in on the issue of fresh water entering the delta. I strongly believe that it is our duty to allow more fresh water to flow through the delta. I realize that all water is vital and we are just beginning to exit one of the most serious droughts in state history but the effects of limiting the water that leaves through the delta is incredibly serious and just beginning to make itself known. Among these effects are the increased growth of cyanobacteria and with it the neurotoxin that kills both plants and animals in the region, and the lower flow levels of the rivers are leading to increased concentration of pollutants as well as lower levels of decreased oxygen. I believe that we could balance the offset of less water available to the people by increasing the amount of drip irrigation and other smart water practices on farms and in households. I understand this is a very complex issue but I hope you sincerely consider allowing the delta and many of the species there like the salmon, a keystone species, to rebound.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1507	1	I urge you to implement a 60% unimpaired flow of freshwater through California into the San Francisco 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.
1507	2	The San Francisco Bay and Delta were named an estuary of international importance. It is home to 400 species. It is an important stopover for migrating birds. It is the largest estuary on the west coast of the Americas. We must not let these ecosystems collapse.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1507	3	It is unfortunate that some folks use a lot of water benefiting a few, while the State must deal with the needs of the many, as well as wildlife. While the State struggles to improve water availability and security, wildlife cannot wait any longer. Please adopt a 60% unimpaired freshwater flow, in order to avoid ecological collapse on your watch. Eyes around the world are watching.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1508	1	I am no expert and I only know what I read in the Modesto Bee regarding this topic. From what I can tell, you could help the salmon in more effective ways than increased water releases, which could have more devastating effects on jobs, water quality and our agricultural economy. I respectfully request your authority to explore other options.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1509	1	I am a lifelong resident of California and really appreciate all it has to offer, not only us residents, but the entire world. As such I recognize the value of it’s resources and my research shows that the State Constitution requires our representatives to look after it’s resources for current and future generations. Often these resources have small voices when compared to financial interests that while not meaning harm will sacrifice the resources for their interests. It is with this in mind I am writing to encourage you and all your fellow lawmakers to do what needs to be done to preserve not only the physical, but the intrinsic resources in this state with such legislation as I have been made aware of herein, that protect the waters, the geology, the flora and fauna, as well as the beauty of many of our streams. I realize we must have infrastructure to maintain human civilization, but believe we	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
		can carefully choose which of these resources is more useful in the long run. For instance I advocate for the Sites/La Doga water project as it is in a part of the state that really sees little more use than other such places as the Tuolumne, American River, Smith, and others that need the protections of the proposed bill.	
1510	1	I agree that you increase the amount of water in the river because families will be able to swim in the river and our young people will be more occupied and not be exposed to illegal activities, like being in gangs. Also, by having a healthy river, the families of this community will learn more about nature and the wildlife and because it is important that we take care of the Tuolumne River and the nearby parks.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1511	1	I think that increasing the water level can help us in the activities we mainly have in the summer because it helps us with the activities of our children during their vacation. These activities include canoeing, swimming and fun games for all. As a mother, I feel so happy when I am able to take my children to 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.
1512	1	The number of fish in the San Joaquin River Basin has been massively reduced in the past few years. The numbers of salmon, especially, have taken an extraordinary hit. Spawning salmon numbers had reportedly previously reached upwards of 400,000 and we are now seeing significantly decreased figures - to the few thousands. For me this comes as a massive wake up call, given the importance of fish in our environment. We must restore our ecosystem and to do so salmon must be conserved.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1512	2	I argue that the proposal of at least 30% of the flow of the San Joaquin reaching the Delta to be insufficient. It would be an insufficient amount to restore the salmon and consequential habit and ecosystems of the Bay-Delta. I suggest that this amount should be increased so as to aid the fish habitat and industry in the Bay. This would see benefit in other areas of fish related activities and industry.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1513	1	<p>I do not agree with this water grab. Our water is much too precious and necessary to our farmers and our livelihood. Our farmers need water to produce food! They are already struggling and now you want to provide them even less water, all to save salmon? How about fish hatcheries and produce salmon and release them. \$260,000 per salmon does not make sense.</p> <p>Not to mention the effect on our energy produced.</p> <p>No on the water grab. Save the water for the farmers for our food and energy.</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.
1514	1	<p>I'm writing to express my concern about the Water Board's proposal to require water flows in the lower San Joaquin river be 40% of the natural unimpeded flow. I am very concerned that your plan perpetuates the starving of these rivers and the species and ecosystems that depend on them.</p> <p>I strongly encourage the Water Board to reject this proposal, and insist on a plan that follows your own science and require a sufficient amount of water to keep our native species thriving.</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.
1514	2	I'm sure you're aware that a mere 6 years ago, the Water Board itself published a study showing that at least 60% of unimpeded flows were needed to completely protect wildlife	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
		populations in the lower San Joaquin basin. Why isn't the Board following its own science?	
1514	3	Too many local native species are unnecessarily endangered by the current ridiculously low river flows (smelt, sturgeon, salmon, etc.). You and everyone else associated with the Board have a choice: you can be remembered heroically as having saved these iconic species; or your own grandchildren will shake their head wondering how could this board be so short-sighted and irresponsible as to allow so many species go extinct.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1514	4	We need much more than 40% of unimpeded flows to restore the salmon runs that once featured 100s of thousands of fish, but have had no fish return in recent years. We need much more than 40% of the water in these rivers to support the millions of birds migrating to and through the Bay, Delta, and Central Valley 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.
1514	5	Here in the Bay Area, we have dramatically reduced our household, commercial, and industrial water use. It's far past times to demand much more reductions in usage by our largest water users: the agricultural water districts. With conservation akin to other water-challenged areas like Australia and Israel, and switching away from thirsty crops (like Alfalfa) and crops that require year-round, every-year watering (like vineyards) and crops primarily for export (like almonds) we could easily allow more than 60% of unimpeded flow without harming our 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.
1514	6	Please make sure the Board rejects the current proposal and insist on restoring flows to at least 60% of natural, unimpeded 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.
1515	1	This is to urge the Board to set the instream flows at 60% to ensure the salmon and the Delta ecosystem survive! I for one value our environment over corporate subsidies to big agriculture.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1516	1	The draft of the new in-stream flow objectives proposes a range of between 30% and 50% of unimpaired flow, which is an improvement over the status quo, but falls short of the target of 60% needed for ecosystem health. Please set the in-stream flows at 60% to ensure that the salmon and the San Francisco Bay/Delta estuary ecosystem survive.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1517	1	I feel that there can be better agriculture water conservation, drip irrigation, crop rotation and replacement and other measures--which reduce the need of river diversion.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1517	2	The salmon in our life support over 100 species and are an important part of the salmon industry--so jobs! I urge you to set the new flow objectives at 60% of the unimpaired water to maintain our riparian, Delta & SF Bay. This would mean so much to 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.
1518	1	We are writing to support your recent letter to the State Water Board on the minimum flow standards on the lower San Joaquin River to the Delta and to take action to protect our region of nearly 1.8 million people from the dangerous water policy proposed recently by the State Water Board. They will damage all of us in the seven-county region. The very idea of nearly doubling the amount of water used for fish flows from our rivers and lakes is disastrous for the economy, ecology and community. We are pleased that you have	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
		recognized the concerns of communities throughout .our region about the negative impact these policies that put fish first, people second. In 2015,fish flows continued even though we were in the middle of a serious drought and had serious ramifications.	
1518	2	State policies have also serious compounded the potential of increasing the salmon population. The Striped Bass was planted in the deal and are devouring salmon as predators. We just learned that the planted Stripe Bass has now been declared as a native fish. This is crazy !Now state regulators want to punish agriculture, our communities, and region for bad 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.
1518	3	The Lake Tulloch Basin in Tuolumne and Calaveras Counties is home to about 10,000 people. f we do not have heavy snows in the Sierra, we are threatened as we were last year with the draining of our lake which is our sole source of water. New Melones Reservoir above us was drawn down to just 10% of its capacity in the middle of the drought last year. Ironically, independent research found that 80% or more of the fish died because the water was too warm. The fish flows don't work too. In May of last year 30,000 acre feet of water valued at \$21 million was released to move a total nine fish down stream.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1518	4	We urge you to take action to ensure that you and your agencies have a complete understanding of the impact of these policies on seven counties with a population of 1.7 million people with major agricultural production. These counties include Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Merced, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador and Mariposa 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.
1518	5	We request that three public hearings be held in Modesto, Stockton and Merced which provide for public comment from these seven counties (Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Merced, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador, and Mariposa).	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1518	6	According weather experts there may be limited precipitation this year continuing the drought. .f draining of our reservoirs continues and we have inadequate precipitation to fill them, the policies of the State Water Board will make a bad position even worse.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1518	7	On the long run, we need to build additional surface and underground storage. The population of California has grown by 42% since New Melones was built and we have only increased surface storage by 3%.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1518	8	We urge you to take action in suspending anymore water releases for fish enhancement until we know if there is adequate precipitation this winter in order to substantially refill the reservoirs. I further would urge you to ask President Obama to have their Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture and Commerce use their power to suspend the use of the Endangered Species Act until we have refilled our reservoirs and have developed a workable and balanced 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.
1519	1	If there were ever time to consider the effects upon jobs, labor, tax base, and more this would be it. Regulation has killed small business. Unless you want to continue battling larger and larger corporations, including "big Ag", I would suggest you oppose this proposal. The passage of this proposal will not only hurt jobs, but our industry will be further consolidated into the hands of too few. Large Agricultural Corporations will be your new enemy. They will be far more wealthy, stubborn, and influential than the people that write you now.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1520	1	It is our belief that the proposed policy of withdrawing double the water from our rivers and lakes to assist in fish flow, if implemented, will result in enormous negative consequences	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
		for the 1.8 million people living within the seven affected counties. Furthermore, this would have a great impact on the agriculture supported by these bodies of water.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1520	2	We hope that you would agree with Governor Brown's suggestion of a more comprehensive solution to the situation. We fervently hope that you will suspend anymore water release for fish enhancement and that you will give more opportunities for public awareness and comments. We ask that the federal government also needs to consider a more suitable solution.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1520	3	We would like to see the building of more surface and underground water storage.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1521	1	I am a fisherman and am very concerned about the long term viability of Central Valley runs of native salmon and steelhead. Our waterways have been manipulated for the past several decades to provide for agricultural and municipal uses, with severe negative impacts on our native 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.
1522	1	<p>Your article Fri on regulations on water for the Delta fish got my blood boiling.</p> <p>This is why I voted for Trump, for he would of give the water to the farmers, for food and employees to work the land and feed their families.</p> <p>Putting water into the ocean for orca and whales, they have ocean full of it. Duh!!</p> <p>Calif needs to tar and feather every environmentalist and regulator (like the old days) and maybe California would get some where, people first.</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.
1523	1	<p>I believe that the water flow should be increased to 50% to help the biodiversity thrive around the Delta.</p> <p>The Bay-Delta is home to over 500 species of wildlife, yet they are struggling to grow and live with the decreased water flow. Steelhead, Sturgeon, and Salmon are unable to stop in the Delta during their migration, which harms the other species that depend on these fish. With low level of waters, plants do not have what they need to grow and survive, and with plants dying, animals and other organisms lose their food source. This disrupts the entire food chain. If water flow is increased to 50%, than the organism could once again thrive and provide a strengthened habitat for the Bay Area. I once again urge you to change the water flow to 50% for the good of the organism and species that are being harmed because of people's inability to conserve 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.
1524	1	I oppose the water plan! Plenty of problems going on. We do not need this. Don't mess with 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.
1525	1	I am in favor of incrementing the river flows between 30-50%.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1525	2	The low levels of water and the hyacinth plan does not allow our youth to swim in the river. Also, the river and nearby parks are dirty because of the low levels of water. Something we are doing as a community together with the school and other organizations like TRT (Tuolumne River Trust) is to participate in monthly cleaning activities.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1526	1	<p>The folks I trust at the Sierra Club feel that instream flows of 60% should be left in the San Joaquin River. Hey, look at that, they based their percentage on a 2010 report by the State Water Board!</p> <p>I'm hoping you can strike a better balance than somewhere below 40.</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.
1527	1	I am a member of the EcoGreen Group of Silicon Valley, and I am deeply concerned about the future of the Bay Delta. I urge the Board to fully protect fish and wildlife in the San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries by requiring 60% unimpaired flow, in accordance with your 2010 report Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1527	2	The Bay Delta has been suffering from inadequate flows, resulting in unfavorable conditions for the spawning of salmon. As the salmon population plummets, jobs and revenues from salmon fishing are lost. Moreover, salmon brings nutrients from the ocean to inland rivers, and more than 100 species depend on salmon. Protecting salmon means protecting an ecosystem that has sustained both wildlife and us. In addition, reduced fresh water flows adversely affect the salinity of the water which both people and wildlife depend on. Less fresh water also means a higher water temperature as well as a larger concentration of pollutants that favor algae blooms. Last year, an algae bloom in the Delta led to foul-smelling water from my tap.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1527	3	We can take less water from the rivers flowing into the Delta, by pushing for water efficiency and conservation, fixing leaks, recycling more water, capturing storm water, and wise water management. I support farmers who grow food for us, but I do not think it is fair to let a special few grab vast amounts of water for producing exports, to get wealthy at the expense of all life that depend on a healthy Delta. Please preserve the Delta, for us and for future generations.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1528	1	Thank you for setting in-stream flow percentages to address the support of the habitat for wildlife in CA waterways. However, flows need to be set at a higher percentage to really accomplish the goal. I hope that you will commit to higher 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.
1529	1	I would like to say "thank you" for setting instream flows that are vital to keeping the health of our essential California ecosystems in place. I would also encourage you to consider raising the impeding flow percentage levels based upon recommendations from the Dept. of Fish & Wildlife to promote the health of Salmon populations throughout the region.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1530	1	<p>I would like to thank the Water Board for setting instream flows for the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers. This is critical to ensure adequate support for wildlife systems to support fish, wildlife, and water quality.</p> <p>However I am concerned that the proposed amount of water to remain in the rivers will fall short of the levels required. Please follow the fact-based scientific requirements that the flows be set higher to allow salmon and other wildlife to survive.</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.
1531	1	I write to urge you to seriously consider Merced Irrigation District's Merced S.A.F.E. Plan as a viable alternative to the State Water Resource Control Board 's Bay Delta SED water plan. As a Merced farmer and concerned community member, I believe the Bay Delta SED water plan does a disservice to the city of Merced and the surrounding rural area by diverting and funneling water out of an area where water and livelihood are one in the same. 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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>within the Merced Irrigation District rely solely on the water supplied by the river for their crops and irrigation needs since there is limited to no access to state or federal water projects. By depleting the Merced River for an uncertain attempt to preserve the salmon population, the state would be directly responsible for the inevitable water, employment, and agricultural shortages to follow Merced County's economic well-being is directly impacted by the agricultural business as the number one source of employment and revenue for the county. Additionally, the Bay Delta SED plan directly affects the ground water supply available to my farm since the neighboring farms are jointly supplied by MID and ground wells for their irrigation needs. The less water available through MID, the higher demand to utilize ground water, of which my operation is entirely incumbent upon. My point being, there is much at stake for Merced County on a personal, economic and community level that goes beyond mere bureaucracy.</p> <p>In contrast to the harmful and withstanding effects the Bay Delta SED water plan would have on Merced County and the environment, the Merced S.A.F.E. Plan is the superior alternative, taking a more aggressive and proactive approach in preserving and promoting the existing salmon population while allocating MID farmers and the community of Merced the water they so desperately need. MID's plan would aim at controlling the Merced river flow to encourage salmon migration, modernize and expand the Merced River Salmon Hatchery, and take assertive steps in diminishing the predatory, non-native species threatening the salmon population. I know I speak for the community of Merced in confirming our commitment to the preservation of the environment and I am positive the Merced S.A.F.E Plan can successfully serve both the salmon population and the community of Merced.</p>	
1532	1	Salmon and steelhead matter. A healthier environment that supports our native trout and salmon, is overall better for humans. We are in this together.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1533	1	<p>The reason why I write this letter is because I wanted to give my opinion about the river. I think that if the water level were increased more, it would be very useful to do more activities with the family.</p> <p>When there is plenty of water you can swim, take boats, and children have a lot of fun and it also help us a lot to entertain us. When the water level is low, accidents occur, such that they can be hit and then not be well. Also there are a lot of weeds and the river gets very dirty and that does not help. All this is for the good of the family. I hope this helps you to support us (increase water levels) in that and we are also willing to support as it is for the good of the families.</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.
1534	1	I object to the proposed flows for the San Joaquin tributaries!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1534	2	The result of the proposal will be that the operation of our family farm will suffer greatly and the ability to provide for my family and for future generations will not be assured. I might have to quit farming altogether.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1534	3	My family has been farming in the Merced area for more than 100 years now and due to your proposed grab of water from the Merced River our existence in the future is greatly threatened.	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
		And it is not only affecting my family--it will impact our whole region in a negative way.	
1534	4	ATT1: Graphic of impacts of the proposal if implemented in 2015.	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.
1535	1	The Revised SED dramatically harms the nearby two-year effort by our local water agencies who are diligently working to achieve the state-mandated groundwater sustainability goals outlined in the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). If implemented, the SED will be the direct cause of groundwater reduction in our region, making it nearly impossible to achieve the state-mandated groundwater sustainability.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1535	2	As dairy farmers we have to use sound science in every decision that we make. We breed our cows at certain times due to the scientific information we have gained. We water and fertilize our crops at certain times based on scientific research. We understand how valuable water is in this area and we work everyday to be good stewards of the land by reusing our water in many cases 4 times over. We depend on our groundwater and our water deliveries for the Turlock Irrigation District in order to operate. Your proposals would be devastating to our operations and those in 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.
1535	3	We use the most up to date sound science in our decision making for our operations and we hope that SWRCB would also do the same. Before your board votes to harm our family dairy operation and hundreds of others, the agricultural economy, and our community, please work with the local water districts (many of whom have peer-reviewed most recent science) to look at non-flow measures that can accomplish realistic goals for the environment and the Bay-Delta before considering a flow-centric approach.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1536	1	Please stop taking our water which is badly needed in Stanislaus County.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1537	1	<p data-bbox="291 920 1094 1105">I'm greeting you all in the belief that if 69 TAF from each future WY are held from UF in cumulative storage for releases in likely 35% of WY to meet SWB 40% goal, as an example, for the Tuolumne River without undo cost to ratepayers or farmers by wise irrigation and SFPUC water supply managements. 69 TAF which is about 3% of average UF during the past 44 WY, 1971 through 2015, are likely if present weather patterns continue. Calculation results are in spreadsheet 14 (ATT 2). A peculiar flow for Dry Creek arose for 2013 through 2015 that is discussed in column U of spreadsheet 14.</p> <p data-bbox="291 1122 1094 1333">The increased releases in the Tuolumne River to meet 40% of unimpaired flow suggested by the SWB for February through June will be important for environmental and fishery purposes. While Diverters are concerned about the increase it, is my belief that the impact will be less than assumed. My goal is to try to understand how release amount might be more clearly understood than was quickly explained for me by Mr. Grober at the Modesto SWB hearing. As a result of my confusion, I have consulted the Districts 2012 data base for UF and USGS data for the past 44 WY for La Grange and Modesto gauges for February 1 through June 30.</p> <p data-bbox="291 1349 1094 1487">Summary of ideas: The present "Next Year" release method, as I view it, identifies additional SWB releases in 35% of 44 WY, 15 of 44. These years would need extra release, and I believe additional 69 TAF added to storage each WY would prepare the water agencies for large groups of yearly releases that occasionally occur roughly in groups of possibly three every 20 years (Column Y in spread sheet 14). I see a possible pattern of these deficient years that</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. Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling regarding carryover storage and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection regarding temperature. Please also refer to Master Response 2.2, Adaptive Implementation regarding implementation of the plan amendments. Please see the index of commenters in Volume 3 to locate the letter numbers of other commenters.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>give some hope that reserves held in storage over time and added to each WY can supply the more challenging years that occur. The key reserve amounts are 2.9% of average UF from 1971 through 2015. A method of gaining that storage without large impact on irrigators and SFPUC water supply would be to improve irrigation water use and encourage more conservation in the MID and TIO service areas and SFPUC service area. The present releases plan appears to be what I call the "Next Year" method by holding La Grange release until the next WY, for example 1971 flow held in storage (Col S) until added to 1972 Dry Creek unimpaired flow (Col U), all flowing into the San Joaquin River and on to the Delta.</p> <p>Observations and Calculations: from years of canoeing on the Tuolumne below La Grange and living on Dry Creek, I observed the "Next Year" method of operating that holds last years release in storage (Col S) and release it in the following WY for FERC fishery and recreation requirements at La Grange in several months including May, and also for generation purposes. Two USGS set of data for February through June were used as a group of five in my work. As I dug into the need for extra water, I was surprised to find that 28 of the 43 WY required no extra release, (column X and Y). Releases are needed in 15 of 43 WY in groups mainly during low precipitation years. Of course precipitation patterns will not to be like those in the past 44 WY, but I know of no better mix of forecast patterns to suggest for the future. A visual explanation of my logic is shown on page 4 (ATT 1) using WY 2012 and 2013 as the example from spreadsheet 14 at row 59 columns Sand 2013 in row 60 in column U with the two row sums in column Y where the needed release is shown. Spreadsheet 14 repeats this calculation 43 times which leads to the releases needed in column Y that displays the needed extra releases shown in 35% of 43 years. Holding some water in storage in every WY could have provide for the preliminary SWB goal of 40% that can probably be managed by the Diverters through continued diligent carryover storage of about 69 TAF in each WY into their three large reservoirs. All my results are shown in spreadsheet 14 column X and Y. The overall suggestion is to add to reserve for each of those 15 WY that make up 35% in all years. For those 29 abundant precipitations WY I noted that present releases are up to 22 times more than the SWB goal shown in column X. This is serious work, but I laugh that the SWB never sends a letter of thanks for those abundant years of release to the Delta. The total extra SWB release in very low UF, for example 2015 in column O for that drought year will probably be zero release beyond the prior storage that years 540 TAF shown in column Y. There is a likely SWB rule shown as a no-release category due to severe drought, which I can't yet quantify. For all years a conservative storage plan should begin before the SWV release rules go into effect to have storage immediately available when needed. I guess that holdover storage would amount to less than a 12 WY reserve held for deficient years that will come fairly often (see bottom spreadsheet 14 Col O and Y). My point is that holdover storage will not be a huge amount of reservoir capacity. This abundant WY would be a good time to start that 69 TAF reserve. My calculations lumped February through June releases together for each WY which might make a small difference by separating the five release amounts into monthly results. Also holdover storage goals could be a small problem for Don Pedro with Army Corps flood rule in some years. Tuolumne Diverters now calculate UF daily to apportion flow that would assure WY calculations are accurate. There is another method of handling release flow from above La Grange that I call "This Year" method that might save some of the SWB required amount, but that workable method is too difficult to discuss here.</p> <p>Notes that may be helpful to the SWB to calm fears of large economic impacts should the 40% rule or larger be implemented. A review of water history from my point of view that may have escaped SWB analysis may be useful. About six years ago a now retired MID</p>	

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>General Manager floated a trial balloon at a public meeting about improving canal operations by preventing 37,000 acre feet (37 TAF) of tail-water per year from spilling into the Tuolumne at the end of an irrigation canal near the river confluence. His idea was to sell 37,000 acre feet of water per year to fund automation of the canal system to reduce that spill and improve system operation. Water users did not approve selling MID water. Another tail water release sometimes spills into the Stanislaus River. Improving canal operation and on-farm water use methods will likely continue very slowly, because the easy steps have partly been taken and irrigation water is very cheap, so there is not a strong incentive to invest money in efficiency improvements. Changes might be funded by using electricity profits (depending on a court finding) to help farmers change to more controllable water application methods that MID uses power revenue presently to subsidize water delivered to farmers and that revenue could also be used to improve on-farm water application . Another method is to raise the cost of water delivered to farmers that replace flood irrigation. My hope is the Diverters will join with the SWB and Regional Boards to encourage improved on-farm operation for their communities' economy while meeting the SWB goals. MID already have low cost loans for piping water to individual farms. MID took over the core of domestic water supply for Modesto in about 1990 which slightly increase demand on the Tuolumne at La Grange Dam by replacing ground water pumping. TID will likely be doing the same in a few years for Turlock, that plan to increase river release eventually up to 100 CFS for recapture of that amount downstream of salmon spawning redds into under-drains already in place. Both core cities are growing, but both districts say increased domestic demand outside their cores cities will be matched by the shift of land use from farm irrigation to urban demand. SFPUC plans for an 8-year drought at the beginning of every year. All three Tuolumne Diverters generate and sell electricity to their water customers partly to support their farm and some school irrigation customers. Possible solutions for meeting SWB goals in future years could include improving on-farm irrigation, business evaporative cooling using recycled waste water. Urban wastewater recycling is already in use for some farm irrigation will help, as will using recycled water for business for evaporative cooling and improving landscape irrigation efficiency. A temperature profile is being prepared for below La Grange Dam for FERC licensing. Salmon fry or smelt (not sure which) were taken ca 25 years ago in Dry Creek are from ca 0.9 mile above the confluence by a licensed scientific collector. Sources of Dry Creek flow are accretion, spills, pirating, frequent on-farm irrigation errors and smaller streams.</p>	
1537	2	ATT 1: Example of how "Next Year" method is calculated.	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.
1537	3	ATT 2: Spreadsheet: 44 Water Years of Tuolumne River releases that fit SWB goals	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.
1538	1	<p>I am in opposition to the new water proposal. We DO NOT need to increase the flows especially in drought years. Lake Tulloch generates power and it is also our community's drinking water. This proposal is outrageous. It will have a HUGE negative impact on many many lives in our area and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>PLEASE PUT A STOP TO THIS NONSENSE!</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.
1539	1	I am deeply concerned about the collapsing San Francisco Bay ecosystem and the potentially fatal impacts of further flow diversions.	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
1539	2	Of course people need to eat, and crops need water. But there are ways of growing food that don't require the level of water use currently being demanded by industrial-scale agricultural interests. There are, on the other hand, no ways of bringing back extinct species and obliterated ecosystems.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1539	3	I support increased flow objectives in the new water plan--60% unimpaired 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.
1540	1	I live at Lake Tullock Our drinking water comes from the lake. If the lake level is lowered due to excessive water flows we may have major difficulties getting drinking water. Please do not release excessive amounts of 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.
1541	1	I strongly support increasing the flow of the San Joaquin River as outlined in the 2016 Bay Delta Plan Amendment & 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.
1541	2	I attended your final public comment session in Sacramento. I was impressed with the attention you paid to each of the many public comments. You are in the position of making a difficult decision with "no sweet spot" as you all mentioned. I grew up in the Bay Area and graduated from college and graduate school here. I've seen the transition to understanding and valuing a healthy aquatic and wetlands environment. As a retired person I now have time to advocate for changes to improve our environment. It will be my legacy to my children and grandchildren. For the rivers and the bay one change is increased fresh water flow through the river. It's not just about the salmon. It's about the salmon as a keystone species for the health of the rivers and the wetlands. We all need to be part of the solution. As a Hetch Hetchy system water user I understand this means we need to further conserve water. As a citizen of the city of Palo Alto I understand this means supporting city initiatives to support further water conservation and alternatives such as grey water use and eventually "recycled" potable water. As a consumer who relies on salmon as my protein I support a healthy local salmon industry.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1541	3	I am confident that the valley farmers are and will adjust and change too. It would be so different if they had to pay even close to the true value of the water - but that's another situation - historical water rights - which I understand is starting to be addressed.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1542	1	I believe that increased water flows on the delta are needed to protect the southern portion of the delta. Scientists say that we need 60% of flows on the San Joaquin River, not the proposed 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.
1542	2	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.
1542	3	The farmers that currently rely on this water in the southern portion will possibly not be able to farm due to increased salinity in the water, home values will plummet do to increased salinity.	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
1542	4	I believe Southern California should create more water storage and use desalinization plants to get their water, don't rely on taking Northern California's water and causing the demise of the Delta System, the San Francisco Bay needs the water to flush it out and keep it healthy for Salmon, Halibut just to name a couple fish which currently are not in a healthy state of being	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1543	1	As a husband and father of five kids, I oppose the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) proposed Bay-Delta Plan, Phase 1 Substitute Environmental Document (SED) as it will undoubtedly create significant, unavoidable and lasting impacts to my family and the community that we call home.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1543	2	A sustainable water supply is the backbone of our region, and with the increased flows that you are proposing, you're putting that water supply in jeopardy. Of course, it's easy to prove that this proposal will have devastating impacts to our agriculture community, but beyond that, this proposal will impact the schools that my kids attend; the city of Modesto where I live and its future growth; and the disadvantaged communities within the proposal's plan area that are already vulnerable and economically strained.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1543	3	As an employee of the Modesto Irrigation District, it's also important for me to note that MID treat, delivers and wholesales clean and reliable drinking water to the City of Modesto. The City receives the same allocation as MID's agricultural customers. Therefore, any reduction in MID's surface water will proportionally affect the City's residents. This will leave more than 250,000 people and 6,000 businesses without a sustainable water 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.
1543	4	The Board has also failed to understand our community and work with the local cities and irrigation districts who will be most affected by your proposal.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1543	5	I suggest the Board throws out this proposal and starts over again.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1544	1	I am against the Board's plan to increase flows from the Merced, Stanislaus, and the Tuolumne Rivers as outlined in the SED. The board and staff have either overlooked or underestimated the negative impacts that the plan will have on the Valley.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1544	2	This plan will greatly reduce the regions ability for groundwater recharge under SGMA and will lower the quality of drinking water in the 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.
1544	3	Thousands of acres of productive farmland will have to be fallowed.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1544	4	Land will be more vulnerable to soil erosion and events of wind blown dust will increase which will lower the air quality in the entire San Joaquin Valley.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1544	5	The Plan will lead to higher unemployment and a reduced quality of life to the people who live in the region. This Plan will lower land values dramatically.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1544	6	The Plan will also greatly reduce the thousands of acres of wetlands and the wildlife habitat that they provide through the use of surface 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.
1544	7	The Plan as outlined states "settlements are encouraged". The MID has developed the SAFE Plan that has a common sense approach to help increase the salmon populations in 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
		Delta. I recommend that the SWRCB work with the MID and embrace their plan. Here is a settlement!	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1545	1	<p>I live with my family in San Carlos, CA and regularly fish the Pacific Ocean, SF Bay, Delta, and all the rivers in California. The health and numbers of the native fish are very important to my family. We love eating fresh, wild fish and exploring California’s world class biodiversity. My kids are growing up in the Anthropocene... the age of human induced extinction. COLLECTIVELY, we can mitigate the damage caused by erroneous 20th century assumptions; specifically over pumping the rivers and estuary.</p> <p>Rivers are ribbons of life. 2017 is a time for renewal and restoration of California’s natural heritage, the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary and all the rivers that feed it fresh water. The San Joaquin, Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus rivers are CRUCIAL to the health of the region.</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.
1545	2	In 2010 the State Water Board issued a report titled Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem that determined that approximately 60% of unimpaired flow between February and June would be fully protective of fish and wildlife in the lower San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries. Please protect at least 60% of these unimpaired flows into the estuary (all the way to the ocean).	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1545	3	<p>A Bay-Delta that cannot support Smelt, Sturgeon, Salmon, Splittail, or Steelhead cannot supply clean drinking water, ground water, or irrigation water.</p> <p>We are stuck in a "Progress Trap, innovations that create new problems that society is unable or unable to solve, or inadvertently create conditions that are worse than what existed before the innovation (as described in Ronald Wright’s 2004 book, A Short History of Progress*). The following quotes from this book are quite analogous to our current situation.</p> <p>Many of the great ruins that grace the deserts and jungles of the earth are monuments to progress traps, the headstones of civilizations which fell victim to their own success. In the fates of such societies -- once mighty, complex, and brilliant -- lie the most instructive lessons...they are fallen airliners whose black boxes can tell us what went wrong.</p> <p>--A Short History of Progress, p 8</p> <p>The lesson I read in the past is this: that the health of land and water -- and of woods, which are the keepers of water -- can be the only lasting basis for any civilization’s survival and success.</p> <p>--A Short History of Progress, p 105</p> <p>Please protect the freshwater flows that improve water quality and support keystone species like Chinook salmon. Shared sacrifice in the urban and rural regions of California are needed to solve this problem collectively.</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.
1546	1	<p>Governor Brown,</p> <p>I am writing to support your recent letter to the State Water Board on the minimum flow standards on the lower San Joaquin River to the Delta, and to express my concern over the dangerous water policy recently proposed by the State Water Board. For the coming year</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
		<p>the Board has recommended a near doubling of the amount of water used for fish flows from our rivers and lakes. This would be disastrous for the Northern California economy, ecology and community.</p> <p>As an example, the Lake Tulloch Basin in Tuolumne and Calaveras counties is home to about 10,000 people. Lake Tulloch is their sole source of water. New Melones Reservoir upstream of Lake Tulloch was drawn down to just 10% of its capacity in 2015. Lake Tulloch was threatened with being drained (this is our source of drinking water!) to maintain the fish flows. Because fish flows continued in 2016, New Melones did not significantly recover from the severe drought conditions. If weather experts' projections of limited precipitation this winter comes true, the continued draining of these two reservoirs will make a bad position even worse.</p> <p>Peter M. Reitkerk, the general manager of South San Joaquin Irrigation District, agreed: "if implemented, this will only result in lower reservoir storage, less water for agriculture and urban use, reduced recreation opportunities for foothill and mountain communities and continuing impacts to fish populations in the Stanislaus as we've witnessed in 2015 and 2016".</p>	
1546	2	<p>I urge you, Governor Brown, to take action to insure that you and your agencies have a complete understanding of the impact these policies have on seven counties with a population of 1.7 million people and supporting major agricultural production. These counties include Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Merced, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador and Mariposa counties.</p> <p>This action should include insuring adequate public input in two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) by extending the public comment period from 60 to 120 days 2) allowing three public hearings to be held in Modesto, Stockton and Merced, which provide for public comment from these seven 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.
1546	3	<p>In the long run we need to build additional surface and underground storage. The population of California has grown by 42% since New Melones Reservoir was built, and we have only increased surface water storage by 3%. In the meantime, we need to store water, not flush it down the river to the ocean.</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.
1546	4	<p>I urge you to take action in suspending anymore water releases for fish enhancement until we know if there is adequate precipitation this winter to substantially refill the reservoirs. I further would urge you to ask President Obama to have the Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of Commerce use their power to suspend the use of the Endangered Species Act until we have refilled our reservoirs and have developed a workable and balanced plan.</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.
1547	1	<p>Recently misinformed bureaucrats have attempted to change what has worked for decades in a misguided attempt to "save" some fish. The State Water Board has proposed action that will severely damage all of us with severe county regulations. Their suggestion of nearly doubling the amount of water used for fish flow would be a disaster for the economy, the ecology of the area and the communities affected. The Lake Tulloch Basin in Tuolumne and Calaveras Counties is home to about 10,000 people whose sole source of water is Lake</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
		<p>Tulloch.</p> <p>During the drought last year, New Melones Reservoir was drawn down to 10% of its capacity. Ironically, independent research found that 80% of the fish died because the water was too warm. The most bizarre fact is that in May of 2015, 30,000 acre-feet of water valued at \$2.1 million dollars was released downstream for the benefit of nine (9) fish! I urge you to take action to ensure that all agencies involved with the issue have a complete understanding of the impact their policies have on us and our agricultural production.</p>	
1547	2	<p>In order to ensure adequate public input, you could extend the public comment period from 60 to 120 days. I suggest that there be three (3) public hearings set in Modesto, Stockton and Merced which will provide valuable public input on the need for rational regulations</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>
1547	3	<p>I and my family are aware of the continuing nature of the drought. Based on that, I request that you take action to suspend the release of any more water for "fish enhancement" until you have all of the facts.</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>
1548	1	<p>No tunnels!!!!</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>
1548	2	<p>We do not want to see a weakening of salinity standards in the south delta. Water quality standards must be protected to ensure we keep our delta healthy.</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>
1548	3	<p>Due to the lack of sufficient water flow to the delta this last year, we had harmful and deadly toxic algae blooms in our coves and waterways throughout discovery bay. We were unable to even get into the water without fear of getting infections or worse becoming sick. It was very concerning for our pets as well. A permanent reduction of our water exported must happen to protect 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>
1548	4	<p>We have lived in discovery bay for seven years. This is our home and we must protect and preserve our precious delta and environment, but most importantly we must ensure that our water quality is maintained and even improved.</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>
1549	1	<p>I am writing on behalf of protecting the fresh water or instream flows to the Delta and to San Francisco Bay. As a 28 year resident of San Francisco and Marin County, I love our amazing ecosystem and the magic of our fellow Earth-species. As a Bay swimmer; avid cetacean lover; worshipper of remarkable salmon that feed us, employ us, enable the recreation of fishing; admirer of our bird life (and on and on), freshwater is critical. We need to protect our natural resources, the Bay -- it is the life blood that sustains the life we love in the SF Bay Area and really all of N. 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>
1550	1	<p>I have owned a large 1200 acre parcel of land in Copperopolis, California for nearly 20 years. I purchased this property with the full understanding of a Water Flow Easement that exists on Lake Tulloch as an agreement between the Water District and the land owners for the formation of Lake Tulloch. This agreement has been honored for decades even during past drought periods. As you are well aware, certain state and federal agencies have tried to increase the fish flows which will reduce the amount of water in the lake. This unprecedented water grab will substantially reduce land values and affect the ways of life for thousands of people in the region. I have development approvals that I received in 2007 for my parcel and this pending damaging increase in water flows have already adversely</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
		impacted the value of my land.	
1550	2	I write this letter of support today urging that you stop and reconsider the Board's position on increased water flows on the lower San Joaquin River to the Delta and to take action to protect our region of nearly 1.8 million people from the dangerous water policy proposed recently by the State Water Board. The thought and idea of nearly doubling the amount of water used for fish flows from our rivers and lakes is disastrous but totally irresponsible for the economy, ecology and community. I am happy to see that Governor Brown also understands the damage this position is creating. The policies that put fish first, people second is absurd. In 2015, fish flows continued even though we were in the middle of a serious drought and had serious ramifications.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1550	3	The current State policies have also serious compounded the potential of increasing the salmon population. The Striped Bass was planted in the deal and are devouring salmon as predators. We just learned that the planted Stripe Bass has now been declared as a native fish. This is crazy! Now state regulators want to punish agriculture, our communities, and region for bad 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.
1550	4	The Lake Tulloch Basin in Tuolumne and Calaveras Counties is home to about 10,000 people. If we do not have heavy snows in the Sierra, we are threatened as we were last year with the draining of our lake which is our sole source of water. New Melones Reservoir above us was drawn down to just 1 0% of its capacity in the middle of the drought last year. Ironically, independent research found that 80% or more of the fish died because the water was too warm. The fish flows don't work too. In May of last year 30,000 acre feet of water valued at \$21 million was released to move a total nine fish down stream	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1550	5	In the best interest of all Californians and the local community in particular, I strongly urge the Board to change this wasteful policy and stop the damage to the region both economically and environmentally. If it continues, this policy will have irreparable damage and on seven counties with a population of 1.7 million people with major agricultural production. These counties include Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Merced, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Amador and Mariposa 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.
1550	6	If continued wasteful draining of our reservoirs continues and we have inadequate precipitation to fill them, the policies of the State Water Board will make a bad position even worse.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1550	7	It is important for our state to have a long term view and build additional surface and underground storage. The population of California has grown by 42% since New Melones was built and we have only increased surface storage by 3%.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1550	8	Therefore, I urge you to take action in suspending anymore water releases for fish enhancement until we have known if there is adequate precipitation this winter in order to substantially refill the reservoirs. I further would urge you to ask President Obama to have the their Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture and Commerce use their power to suspend the use of the Endangered Species Act until we have refilled our reservoirs and have developed a workable and balanced 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.
1551	1	I believe that removing the amount of water that flows through the south delta system will damage the state of our Delta. Reducing the flow will allow Bay salt water to flow deeper into the delta. By introducing salt water into the south delta will cause irreversible damage	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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 eco system. Scientist say we need a 60% water flow to maintain a healthy system, not the proposed 40%. Also, the reduction of water quality will negatively affect the Delta agriculture.	
1551	2	By allowing the water quality to be reduced, it will affect our property values.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1552	1	The State Water Resources Control Board’s proposed Bay-Delta Plan, Phase 1 Substitute Environmental Document (SED) will have devastating impacts to the communities that our families call home.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1552	2	As employees of the Modesto Irrigation District, we see firsthand that a reliable surface water supply is the backbone of our region and undeniably brings value to all. The flow requirements described in the revised SED will create significant, unavoidable and lasting impacts that will harm the water supply and socioeconomic welfare of our families, friends, coworkers and fellow members of the community.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1552	3	The State Water Resources Control Board has failed to analyze the serious socioeconomic impacts associated with this proposal. The Board has also failed to analyze and recognize how this proposal will affect groundwater, future city growth, schools and numerous disadvantaged communities within 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.
1552	4	Your own staff has noted that there are smarter ways to accomplish your stated goals that would require less water supply impacts. We urge you to look at alternatives besides more flows and to work with the local cities and irrigation districts such as MID. We know our region, we know our economy and we know our water. The decision that could destroy our communities shouldn’t just be made by five appointed individuals.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1552	5	We strongly oppose a proposal that doesn’t take into consideration or analyze the long-lasting, irreversible impacts that would result from significantly increased unimpaired 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.
1554	1	The Revised SED dramatically harms the nearly two-year effort by our local water agencies who are diligently working to achieve the state-mandated groundwater sustainability goals outlined in the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). If implemented, the SED will be the direct cause of groundwater reduction in our region, making it nearly impossible to achieve the state-mandated groundwater sustainability.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1554	2	As dairy farmers we have to use sound science in every decision we make. We breed our cows at certain times due to the scientific information we have gained. We water and fertilize our crops at certain times based on scientific research. We understand how valuable water is in this area and we work everyday to be good stewards of the land by reusing our water in many cases 4 times over. We depend on our groundwater and our water deliveries for the Turlock Irrigation District in order to operate. Your proposals would be devastating to our operations and those in 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.
1554	3	We use the most up to date sound science in our decision making for our operations and we hope that SWRCB would also do the same. Before your board votes to harm our family dairy operation and hundreds of others, the agricultural economy, and our community, please work with the local water districts (many of whom have peer-reviewed most recent science) to look at non-flow measures that can accomplish realistic goals for the environment and	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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 Bay-Delta before considering a flow-centric approach.	
1555	1	There seems to be an error in BDWQC Plan! Oregon had a dwindling problem--they got rid of the stripers and the salmon population came back without any water control B.S. I kept a boat in the Delta years ago. There was no size limit or stripers and there was good salmon runs. Fish and Game decided to up the size to 18" to keep a striper--all they did was to increase the amount of stripers in the river--so less salmon make it to the ocean every year. It doesn't matter if you pair more water down the river--they won't make it past the striper population.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1555	2	The Delta tunnels are just a water grab by L.A. (Democratic voters). Where do the salmon go when they hit the tunnels if they are built?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1555	3	<p>I farm almonds--not a lot, 50 acres--but it is my livelihood. Without water I have none. I have one employee--no water, he's out of a job. No fertilizer, no irrigation supplies, no equipment, no taxes, no new stool or refrigerator or washing machine, no weekend dinners at restaurants, no movies. No health insurance, no new cars. I guess all the voters on the coast and L.A. think their food comes from the grocery store--Trader Joe's, etc. You turn the water off for a week to the Bay Area and there will be a complete change of water plans. You think the homeless problem is bad with the pissing in the streets, wait till everyone has to do that--no water for toilets, showers, etc.</p> <p>You have finite resources. They do not increase with the population; at some time in the near future this state can only support a certain number of people.</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.
1556	1	<p>I live in Merced, CA on an AR-zoned acre lot with a 140-ft well and septic system. During the drought, I did not water the lawn area and watered coniferous trees monthly. When I planted in the late-1970s, I put in drought-resistant hybrid Bermuda grass and Australian, Mediterranean, and native plants. I have no swimming pool or working outdoor fountain. Now I am satisfied with wet season green and dry season gold vistas. California needs to consider these new guides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Salmon: shoot sea lions in bays and harbors. Convert carcasses to pet food. - Humans: my late husband lived in CA with 4 million people. Now there are more than 33 million people. There is not enough water for all. Charge every person entering CA as an immigrant \$1000 for establishing residence. Take tax proceeds to build desalination plants on the coast. - Plants: Put a 50% tax on nursery plants that are considered water guzzlers. Outlaw water guzzling lawn grasses. - Study: fund hydrology studies to find out where surface and groundwater comes from and goes <p>Start working on sending potential Californians elsewhere with the water residence tax of \$1000 per resident. Pay, or go to Oregon. Shoot those sea lions chomping on delicious, fat Chinook. PETA be hanged. Control what is sold as nursery stock with another tax. And for Pete's sake, start a statewide water study. With so many people, farms, and industry depending on it, we need a lot more information in every California water basin.</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
1556	2	I read Cadillac Desert and remember the Pat Brown (large ditch) line "If you don't send SoCal water, all those people will move into NorCal!" Jerry's (Brown) Twin Tunnels continues this idea. However, you can't turn the San Joaquin Valley into Owens Valley for the Metropolitan Water District in LA. The ag industry feeds much of the U.S. and exports billions for our economic welfare. The salmon issue is a curtain for the Met to hide behind. You need water to put in those tunnels.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1557	1	The Water Board seems to want water for fish to help them but is not concerned about predators of fish or contamination or repairing habitat. The Delta trials with billions of gallons of water hasn't worked. It's more than water flow.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1557	2	The proposed tunnels to send more water south will only cause more salinity.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1557	3	I think the real reason for the water is the same as it has been for over 100 years starting with Mulholland--to take water and make it legal to steal it. Justify no matter what the cost.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1558	1	The multiyear drought has had a dramatic effect in this area, and we can use all the relief that we can to alleviate overdrawn water from the ground through pumping.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1558	2	My drinking water comes from a well on my property. Recently, because of the drop in the water table, I had to drill a new well for \$15,000, not an expense I can easily afford as a semi-retired citizen.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1558	3	The state's plan will further exacerbate our local water situation, placing unnecessary hardship on our local farm owners who will be forced to rely more on groundwater pumping for irrigation. The resulting excess drawdown of the water table will directly affect hundreds of local homeowners, such as myself, who will be forced to spend thousands of dollars to drill new wells sooner than necessary. Wells are very expensive to drill and the waiting list just to get a well drilled is almost two 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.
1558	4	Personally, I feel that this is a huge unwarranted burden being placed on me by Sacramento to support the agenda of big city environmentalists to the detriment of our poor, less popular, local community.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1559	1	My main concern is the depletion of the local aquifers by substantially limiting the surface water throughout the county. By doing this it causes more groundwater drilling, thus causing a much greater problem.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1560	1	This county is one of the major food producers in the valley and cutting back our water supply will affect everyone's 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.
1561	1	This county is one of the major food producers in the valley and cutting back our water supply will affect everyone's 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.
1562	1	Please do not give all our water away. Many of our neighbors are farmers, many of them have had to drop their wells deeper or pay the expense of drilling for a new one. We know farmers who are not planting crops due to the drought. This impacts everyone in our area financially, especially the farm laborers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
1562	2	Please put people above salmon.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1563	1	My family are third generation farmers in the Merced Irrigation District. If you take so much water away from us, we will have worked these years in vain as our property will be worth very little. The whole economy will be a disaster. Do you consider the impact on people in your decisions or is it just fish and some environmental concerns? What are you thinking? Be fair to us, please. I thought we had rights in this democracy!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1564	1	Since 1990 I have been involved with the Merced Irrigation District, first as a member of an advisory council member and later as a concerned citizen. I have watched as the district grew from a "good old boys" district to become a modern well run organization. The current leadership has just completed a \$25 million study for relicensing the Exchequer Dam and in the process conducted many studies of the Merced River's hydrology and ecology. Their studies resulted in the S.A.F.E. plan (Salmon, Agriculture, Flows and Environment), a plan that addresses the concerns of all stake holders. Ignoring this the SWQCB has proposed increasing flows even more for the dubious goal of protecting runs of hatchery raised fish (the native fish having long ago gone extinct).	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1564	2	When I started farming in 1984 we all irrigated with flood, furrows and sprinklers. In the ensuing years I, at the cost of hundreds of thousand dollars, have converted all my irrigation to "micro irrigation", drip and micro sprinklers to conserve water. There is nothing left for me to do but take land out of production, some of the most productive land in the world. If I reduce my acres my annual payroll of \$1 million will be reduced proportionality. What happens to those employees? What happens to the fertilizer companies, the tractor dealers, the parts stores, etc.? Merced County is already one of the poorest in the State; it will become a wasteland .	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1564	3	Short of removing the dams on the Merced River, we will never have the historic salmon runs of the 19th century, and even that is unlikely with the non-native stripped bass devouring the salmon smolts as they move down stream.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1564	4	I implore you to accept the S.A.F.E. PLAN that address the needs to the best extent of all concerned, including the salmon.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1565	1	More water doesn't equal more salmon!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1565	2	People, food are most important before 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.
1565	3	Need to "run the reservoirs full", then you will have the water for the fish. We need more water storage that the people of California voted for!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1566	1	Need to "run the reservoirs full", then you will have the water for the fish. We need more water storage that the people of California voted for!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1567	1	Need to "run the reservoirs full", then you will have the water for the fish. We need more water storage that the people of California voted for!	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
1568	1	Ballico-Cressey School District is very concerned with your Draft Revised Substitute Environmental Document (SED) supporting Phase 1 of the Board's Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. If approved, your proposal requiring the Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus Rivers to dedicate 40 percent of unimpaired flow to fish and wildlife would cause irreversible harm to our region.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1568	2	The Revised SED will not only financially harm our region's farmers, manufacturers and businesses, but it will directly harm public entities like ours who provide educational services to our local ag community. We are an agriculturally based community; when actions are taken that directly harm the largest economic sector in the region, everyone will be directly impacted.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1568	3	Beyond devastating our community by demanding 40 percent unimpaired flows from February 1st - June 30th annually, your staff is proposing taking over control of our locally paid for, built and operated Don Pedro Reservoir. Don Pedro was built specifically to allow our community to survive a prolonged drought, similar to the one we are currently in, but the Revised SED now limits the amount of water available to our community.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1568	4	Our district recently passed its first bond to improve our 50 year old campus. If passed, your action would deplete local property values so much that it would likely be the demise of our district all together. Please consider the devastating impact your Revised SED will have on all businesses within our community.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1569	1	MID and TID have demonstrated better science and better solutions for the same concerns that state regulators are attempting to use. I request that you seriously consider MID and TID's information.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1570	1	Southern California has been using other areas water without regards to saving water and the impact it has on the areas that you as members of the State Water Board is abetting in this water grab and will deplete and destroy our habitat. They and you have no right to take what little we have for our area. We.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1571	1	I completely support the state water board's proposal to protect the Tuolumne River. It's obvious that farmers consume more water than California's climate can sustain. I encourage strict regulation on the gross over planting by agriculture in CA. I believe restricting exports of crops like nuts, cotton and rice is a.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1572	1	The impact the unimpaired flows will have on food production in the valley will be devastating. Without valley agriculture our food safety will be seriously compromised as we will be forced to import critical food supplies from countries that are years behind California and the U.S. in food safety practices.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1573	1	This is choosing southern California over the northern San Joaquin Valley. Without the surface water from these three rivers for farmers, thus saving groundwater, in addition to the groundwater saved by using a percentage of the river water for cities, I predict that all aquifers will eventually go dry throughout our.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1574	1	People are more important than fish! Farms, jobs, and communities need the water more than fish. Stop using failed science as a smoke screen for Southern California to steal water from us. Our groundwater quality and health demands that you stand down on this ill-	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
		conceived idea. This is what happens when wackos run our state, instead in people with common sense.	
1575	1	People are more important than 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.
1576	1	We need to focus first on human life over fish life. We are in a severe drought and need the water for food for the farmers and drinking 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.
1577	1	Agricultural crops feed the world. Stop handcuffing our abilities to do so!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1578	1	I implore the State Water Board to aggressively pursue desalinization research, additional regional dams, and urging continued water conservation methods. As the slogan for Modesto states: "Water wealth, contentment, health". Our agricultural leadership is threatened!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1579	1	I don't understand how water for fish is more important than water that will grow food for Humans????	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1580	1	The water diverted by the water tunnels to bypass the delta is why this is happening. How long can water just be transferred to the southern parts of the state? There has to be other solutions. In the south, water desalination plants, stop growth in desert areas, stop green golf courses, have catch basins when it rains to store water [comment cut off].	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1581	1	More needs to be done about invasive 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.
1582	1	I have seen statements that this proposal is based on the best science available. Best science available does not equate to good science. If the science behind your decisions is flawed, then there is only one kind of conclusion you can draw from it, and that is a bad one. Please go back and look at what has been done.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1583	1	Water for agriculture helps the wildlife thrive. Every orchard and field crop is home to many species, including those that are endangered. Then most of the ag water goes to the aquifer or creeks and rivers. Very little is wasted.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1584	1	This water war is not about fish. Those of us in the know realize that the San Joaquin fall-run chinook is a hatchery-based population, whose genetics were compromised by CDFW years ago; the ESU is gone. Peter Moyle himself, referred to the Delta Smelt extinction (08/04/2016, Sacramento). Finally, weir counts on the [comment cut off].	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1585	1	If you reduce the number of Striped Bass, the salmon numbers will improve.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1586	1	The water issues facing the State can be remedied without harming the Central Valley! Unimpaired flows will not solve the problem of declining salmon populations. Predatory fish are the cause. This proposal is wrong and needs to be fixed. You're going to drive agriculture out of the great state of California [comment cut off].	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
1587	1	Remember that food grows where water flows. The Central Valley is the prime agricultural area for the entire nation's food supply and water is critical to this purpose.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1589	1	I own about 1/3 of a mile of the south bank of the Tuolumne River. I really enjoy watching the salmon spawn each fall literally in my own back yard. I could believe that the water board's motive is to enhance the salmon population if the recommendations of FishBio weren't routinely ignored as pulse flows continue each spring and fall. The board seems to dismiss any proposal that doesn't include increased river flows. It is difficult to believe that Chinook salmon is endangered when it is readily available in grocery stores and restaurants. I question the true motives of the 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.
1589	2	Please back away from this destructive and ill-conceived proposal. California agriculture is not a problem to be solved. It is a valuable asset to our state and to the world. Let's work together to use water to its maximum benefit. Homo sapiens is a species too. The transformation of the Central Valley that irrigation has made possible is nothing short of miraculous. Please acknowledge this and join agriculture in implementing means of using our limited water resources most beneficially.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1590	1	We all know the increased flows are to provide water needed to make the twin tunnel project work. Additional water will not help fish or improve river habitats because it will be sent to water users in so cal.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1590	2	By stealing our water you violate my families property rights and water rights and threaten to destroy wha.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1591	1	In addition, I do not understand how the lives of fish take precedent over the lives of human beings who have made their homes in the Central Valley and depend upon this water. We deliver food throughout the world which cannot be done without access to this 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.
1592	1	I think the increased flows during a drought is crazy. There are alternatives like improving spanning bed, plus preserving and reintroducing native fish in our hatcheries. Please don't deplete our reservoirs.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1593	1	I urge you to reconsider this proposal. Our region in California is instrumental in growing food and resources for not only California, but the world. This proposal will damage the lives of migrant workers, as well as USA citizens to an extreme degree. The loss of jobs and income will create strife and despair fo.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1594	1	Let people be a priority over 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.
1595	1	The FIRST thing to do is control the number of predatory (Stripped Bass) fish if we are trying to protect the salmon run.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1596	1	Please support desalination plants up & down the Pacific coast, shifting California's water supplies away from the mountain runoff to the nearly inexhaustible Pacific Ocean. We can pay for this by delaying the High-Speed Rail Project.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1597	1	This unreasonable, unjust proposal proves that the California State Water Board cares more about a species of fish (on which they have already wasted millions of tax dollars over 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
		years and precious water during the current drought), than they do the fellow human beings over which they lord and rule. It's time t [Note: comment submitted as shown]	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1598	1	State lawmakers need to impose strict guidelines to Southern California use of water for ornamental use, no more lawns sustainable plants intended for that desert climate. Farms feed people lawns don't.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1599	1	Our Central Valley in California is one of our countries biggest food resource. We need the water that is here to feed our country. We do not have the abundance of water that would allow us to continue to grow the crops that we need and supply other regions. The lack of water would effect more than just our a	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.