

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
400	1	Ground water in all of San Joaquin Valley is being over drafted, except the Modesto/Turlock area. The reason for this is because of our surface irrigation system. Now you want to take water away from us so that we can be as bad off as the rest of the valley. Stop trying to destroy agriculture in California!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
401	1	We need more time to review SED. It took years to be drafted and we are provided mere months to review it breadth.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
401	2	Do you realize the impacts that 40% unimpaired flows will do to my community in Modesto? Do you realize that 40% unimpaired flows AND sustainable groundwater management is impossible? The water must come from somewhere, surface or ground.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
401	3	How does this play into the Governor's WaterFix project, aka the twin tunnels, especially when one considers that WaterFix plans to divert Sacramento River water around the Delta? Are these desired unimpaired flows from the San Joaquin tributaries meant to prevent ocean water from intruding further into the Delta so WaterFix can be constructed on the backs of a regulatory taking of water from 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.
401	4	Have you considered other solutions to the water quality and salmon health issues? An annual bass fishing competition could be held to control the predatory population. Riverbed rehabilitation projects could provide better breeding grounds for 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.
401	5	Please consider the full impacts of your actions. According to your Mission Statement, it is your responsibility to ensure water quality for drinking, public health, and all beneficial uses -- not just for the environment.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
402	1	I am adding my comment in the decision about Delta's water. Please don't allow Big Agriculture to influence your decisions about the flow of Delta's water. Do not let the Delta be diverted east and southward. The San Francisco Bay is the natural destination and many birds, creatures depend on the health of this ecosystem, water being the focal point.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
403	1	I fully concur with Assembly member Bigelow's opposition to the suggested flow requirements stated in The SWRCB's Bay - Delta Plan, Phase 1- Revised Draft Substitute Environmental Document (SED).	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
407	1	I am writing to you in regards to the Bay Delta Plan. As you know the Board issued a report that determined that 60% of unimpaired flow for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta would protect fish and wildlife. What I want to know who is who is speaking for the Salmon and other wildlife? Who has determined their life is worth less than the rights of humans? Who has determined that farmers have a right to this water- especially Southern Californian Farmers? I for one think that farmers waste far too much water and grow crops that should not be grown in California. Why should we be subsidizing that? I am not saying this because I eat salmon, which I do, but because I appreciate wildlife and nature and want to ensure the long term sustainability of the planet and all its life forms.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
407	2	Rather than take this precious water necessary for flora and fauna, we should stipulate that farmers must use water efficiency measures such as drip irrigation systems and avoid water intensive crops like rice and cotton. Water rates for farmers should be raised to force them to conserve more and avoid the raising of cattle which requires a lot of water. Perhaps cattle and water intensive crops should be grown outside California in states where they get	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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
		more rain.	
407	3	I recommend that the water flows for Sacramento, San Joaquin Delta be kept well above the 60% level!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
408	1	[ATT 1:] Article posted to the California Water Law Journal on 10/11/16, Truly a Watershed Event: California's Water Board Proposes Base Flows for the San Joaquin River Tributaries by Paul Stanton Kibel	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.
408	2	[From ATT1:] Conclusion - Flows and Fisheries at the Watershed Level The September 2016 proposed base flows for San Joaquin River tributaries represent an important step in efforts to manage water resources at the watershed level. They also confirm that the "flow first" 2010 public trust criteria worked as designed, establishing a scientifically-grounded methodology and baseline for the full protection of fisheries that could then be relied upon as a credible reference point in subsequent regulatory proceedings such as the Bay Delta Water Quality Plan update. Even so, not all of the initial responses to the September 2016 proposed flows have been positive. Some environmental and fishery conservation groups have criticized the proposed 40 percent/30 to 50 percent range of unimpaired flow standard as being too low to restore and sustain salmon, steel head trout and smelt fisheries, and have suggested that the 60 percent of unimpaired flow standard set forth in the 2010 public trust flow criteria report is more in line with the supporting science. [footnote 16: Doug Obegi, State Water Board's Flow Proposal Falls Short (September 15, 2016 Press Release from the Natural Resources Defense Council).] Some environmental and fishery conservation groups have also raised questions as to whether in times of drought the State Water Board will simply grant temporary emergency waivers to allow levels of diversion that result in base flows below 30 percent of unimpaired flow range. [footnote 17: Doug Obegi, State Water Board's Flow Proposal Falls Short (September 15, 2016 Press Release from the Natural Resources Defense Council).] This latter concern is based on the experience during the 2012-2015 drought, when the State Water Board granted a series of temporary emergency waivers for compliance with water quality standards. [footnote 18: Order Approving in Part and Denying in Part a Petition for Temporary Urgency Changes to the License and Permit Terms and Condition Requiring Compliance with the Delta Water Quality Objectives in Response to Drought Conditions (February 3, 2105, California State Water Resources Control Board).]	This comment summarizes information from an article regarding flows and fisheries. Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, for responses to comments regarding science and policy support for adopting the LSJR flow objectives and the section describing emergency provisions and drought.
408	3	[From ATT1:] Some agricultural water users have criticized the proposed 40 percent/30 to 50 percent range of unimpaired flow standard as economically unfeasible given current reliance on diversions from the Tuolumne River and Merced River for irrigation. [footnote 19: California Farmwater Coalition, Reactions to State Board Unimpaired Flows Action (September 16, 2016).] Such users have also suggested that meeting the 60.8 degrees temperature target may not by itself be sufficient to restore and maintain coldwater fisheries because of other non-temperature related stressors such as pollution and invasive aquatic species. [footnote 20: California Farmwater Coalition, Reactions to State Board Unimpaired Flows Action (September 16, 2016).]	Please see Master Response 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model and Master Response 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects, for responses to comments regarding economic effects of the plan amendments. Please see Master Response, 3.1, Fish Protection, for responses to comments regarding water temperature benefits of the plan amendments to cold water fish species and impacts of related stressors.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
408	4	<p>[From ATT1:] Amidst criticisms and concerns, however, important areas of consensus have emerged. Scientifically, there is now consensus that, independent of such other non-temperature fishery stressors such as pollution and invasive aquatic species, the survival rates of salmon and steel head trout decline sharply once instream temperatures rise above 60.8 degrees Fahrenheit. Hydrologically, there is now consensus that adequate flows from the San Joaquin River and Sacramento River into the Bay Delta (at whatever levels they are set) cannot be ensured without also ensuring there is adequate flow contributed from these rivers' main tributaries.</p> <p>These points of consensus, reflected in State Water Board's September 2016 proposed base flows for the San Joaquin River tributaries, represent tangible movement in the direction of watershed-based governance.</p>	<p>The comment provides general support of the plan's proposed base flows for the San Joaquin River tributaries. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
410	1	<p>We need the water for farms and residents. For that reason, I am opposed to your plans to increase river 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>
411	1	<p>Your plan to raise river flows is a dirty, bullying trick to divert all that water and I don't approve! Has there even been an option for the residents to vote on this, the folks that live here and will be impacted?</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>
412	1	<p>Dear Ms DAdamo,</p> <p>I read that you are from a farming background. Please listen to the pleas of the farmers of the Central Valley. Please listen to the board members of TID and MID who have been managing our water and electrical power for many years. I know that the salmon and delta are important. This water situation is very drastic. The timing of water and power needs help keep our water and electricity available to us, who pay for it.</p> <p>Please listen to those who know the our needs of this 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>
413	1	<p>I believe you should realize this discussion about the Delta is a classic battle between Hunter-Gatherers and Farmers, a battle that has been ongoing since the first seed was planted. This basically is NOT a fish vs farmers issue, but rather a farmer vs fisherman issue and a seafood vs landfood issue.</p> <p>I personally enjoy the food that comes from the sea as much or more than that from the land. You might think of this as food for us here, vs rice and other crops for other parts of the world. The other ecological issues of which you all are aware are also significant. An example, Salmon were so abundant in the San Joaquin river that farmers would pitchfork them on the land to feed their pigs. The loss of habitat in the Delta affects the whole food chain.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
414	1	<p>If, as stated, the State Water Control Board must consider ALL (beneficial) uses of water (municipal, irrigation, fisheries, hydropower, recreation, etc.), and that it is their responsibility to balance all these needs, accordingly when developing policies, I am concerned that the proposed dramatic increases in flow volumes on the Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus Rivers may be the result of incomplete, inaccurate information and faulty logic.</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>
414	2	<p>Since there is no clear correlation between increased flows (natural or engineered) and larger native fish populations, it seems that it would be more prudent to direct resources</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
		toward ecosystem restoration, hatchery development, and the elimination of non-native species. Make a more thorough assessment of the effect of increased flows before advocating for that.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
414	3	Sustainability is the foundation of every effective resource management plan, a component that is clearly missing here. The Water Control Board acknowledges that their plan would result in more ground water pumping, more quickly depleting this source for drinking water and irrigation. In spite of recent legislation to regulate pumping, it is unclear how long it will take to implement and enforce. In the meantime, farmers may pump until their wells go dry because they'll have considerably less surface water for their crops.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
414	4	It seems likely that the economic impact to agriculture has been grossly underestimated. Without an accurate assessment of the 'ripple effect' to our general economy, the magnitude of this new policy cannot be appreciated. And if farming as we know it is no longer viable, will the proposed changes be in our best interests?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
414	5	These changes appear to be neither equitable, effective, or sustainable. Increased river flows, questionably effective in supporting healthy salmon and trout populations, will create negative impacts to all other water uses, and over drafting will contribute to subsidence and depletion of the underlying aquifer. We can anticipate that the demand for water will continue to increase as a result of population growth, related agricultural demands, climate change, and the fact that water is a finite resource. Going forward, It seems likely that compromise and sacrifice will be necessary for ALL involved. It just doesn't seem like the proposed plan distributes the sacrifice evenly. Nor does it come close to developing an accurate cost benefit analysis.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
415	1	In addition, 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.
415	2	The potential impact of the SED would have immediate, negative effects on the operations of Belknap Ag as market conditions such as water availability can drastically affect the volume of equipment sales. Approximately 80% of our employees are located in regions that would be affected by the Bay-Delta Plan, the impact of which would force us to consider employee layoffs. We view our \$10M annual payroll as an investment in our communities and generate \$3M in California State and local sales taxes annually. The negative impact of the SED would inhibit our ability to grow the rate at which Belcorp Ag can contribute to the local 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.
415	3	Before your board votes to harm our agricultural economy, our drinking water and 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.
416	1	I have lived on the Stanislaus River from time to time since 1952. I knew the river before the New Melones Dam was constructed and afterwards. For the most part, the river's general ecology did not significantly change in our area. However, since artificial water surges were instituted a few years ago, we have noticed 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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>significant change in water edge erosion. On our river front (about 150') during the last surge in 2016, we lost about 6 feet of river edge and 2 significant healthy trees that were over 50 years in age and a prime natural spawning area for salmon. All this in about 2 week's time during the surge. The same area has been stable for a very long time. Water edge erosion of this type is not natural. An increase of river flow, especially utilizing the surge concept, will just increase the problem.</p>	
416	2	<p>Scientific studies conducted by FishBio (Oakdale, Ca) clearly indicate that artificial river surge flows do not significantly support a good environment for salmon. There are better ways to do so. The surges do not work and an increase in artificial surges will increase the damage done to the ecological balance of the Stanislaus River!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
417	1	<p>The California Legislature and your board has a bad policy of making law based on political not scientific reasons. Also the public lands and rivers belongs to the people. Anything that prevents those the use of those land and rivers is wrong.</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>
418	1	<p>It has come to our attention that good-faith efforts of water districts and legislators in our state have been ignored by your board in their efforts to secure water for communities and agriculture in the Bay-Delta region. The actions of the board have served to frustrate local water officials who are held responsible to deliver clean and reliable water supplies to both residents and farming operations up and down the Central Valley of California.</p> <p>As business owners whose future depends on the health of the agricultural marketplace, we are simply appalled at the utter lack of fairness, transparency, and reciprocity that the SWRCB has demonstrated in their latest report. The report calls for unimpaired flows that are even higher than the unsustainable 35% that the SWRCB imposed in 2012. This state can never recover from drought conditions if the water dedicated to fisheries continues to increase, while residents and farmers lose their livelihoods and their standard of living. Water that is desperately needed to grow food and secure the safety of our Valley residents continues to stream to the ocean. This SWRCB has a responsibility to provide water resources to all Californians. The board has talked about good-faith negotiations and about meeting the needs of all stakeholders, but its recent unilateral actions and unwillingness to even respond to any stakeholder (other than the environmental lobby) is not only evident, but severely troubling.</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>
418	2	<p>The Central Valley of California has fed the nation and the world for generations. Agriculture is the state's primary GDP driver. This said, we are urging a fair, even-handed allocation of water resources that includes the needs of municipal, agricultural, and environmental participants. This board works for the people of California, and we insist that our government serve the needs of its people. The proposal for flows in the current report will economically cripple this state, and put nearly a million California residents at risk. We demand that the SWRCB abandon their plan to impose unrealistic and one-sided water policy, and respond the stakeholders in local jurisdictions who have already demonstrated their willingness to compromise. The future of our state depends on our ability to treat all parties with fairness and dignity.</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>
419	1	<p>Why do you waste water by passing it to the ocean? The farmers can use it!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
420	1	<p>The farmers in the valley have worked hard to build dams and create lakes to store water</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
		for our crops. The valley produces a large part of the food that feeds our nation. It is unfair for the state to take what we have worked so hard for, and need so badly. We are in a drought and yet you want to take what precious water we have.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
421	1	California is a breadbasket as much as the Midwest. Water is needed in the valley for everything. Based on this, you should act in the best interest of the 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.
422	1	Please consider science fully when making decisions about how much water should stay or go in California's water system. All people, including farmers, can learn how to conserve even more than they are already doing. The salmon and other creatures in the water system cannot speak for themselves so we have to consider how our decisions impact them. I am a home owner in the Central San Joaquin Valley and I understand water conservation and needs. I am willing to do my part, whatever it takes.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
423	1	Promises made in the past that are kept in the present breed confidence and trust in the party who makes that promise, be it family, neighbor or government. The opposite is also true. Promises not kept breed distrust. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown gave assurances that only excess water would be taken from Northern California. If he had not done that, he would have not gotten support from Northern California and there would be no California Aqueduct. That assurance is now being broken by the current officials who recommend and support this plan. There is no excess water and the pumps at Tracy should be shut down until there is excess water. This would greatly help the Delta, especially the salinity problem in the south Delta. Are you going to be faithful and honest government officials and keep the assurances of Pat Brown or not?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
424	1	Our water supply comes from Lake McClure. Last year the lake was at 6% capacity at the end of the year. If this plan had been in effect, I would have lost my house, as well as many others in the Don Pedro subdivision. Why? Because without water, I have no fire insurance. Without fire insurance I have no mortgage. Without a mortgage, I have no house.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
424	2	<p>The residents of the Don Pedro subdivision cut water usage by 62% to survive. My wife and I live on 2 consumption units a month. That's less than 1500 gallons of water a month for showers, cooking, cleaning and toilets. We must take less frequent showers together, have a bucket in the shower to catch the water until the water get warm, curtail all outside watering, only flush toilets when absolutely necessary and curtail visitors from water usage. It sucks! I catch rain water during the winter to keep our outside plants alive during the year. We lived month to month not knowing if we would have any water at all.</p> <p>I think the water resource board members need to spend a year with the same restrictions to understand what a stupid, insane plan this is. They should live month to month not knowing if they would even have a roof over their heads due to the lack of water. How in your right mind, could you imagine taking more water out of a reservoir at 6% capacity to save a fish, that I would no longer be able to afford to eat.</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.
425	1	The constant release of water on the Stanislaus River has done NOTHING to improve fish health or populations. Has anyone thought that in a drought year the river would be a trickle to dry? No fish would be in it anyway. The mismanagement has created critical water levels for firefighting and the local communities that have sacrificed more than anywhere in the state for the sake of a few. This cannot continue. Stop making up science and look for yourself at the decimating effects of the poor management and tell anyone you are doing	Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection for a description of the plan amendments and their objective and for information regarding the need for flow to reasonably protect the beneficial use of fish and wildlife in the three eastside tributaries and the LSJR. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		good for the environment.	As described in Appendix B, State Water Board’s Environmental Checklist, heavily forested or vegetated areas exist in parts of the plan area and most of the extended plan area. These areas have experienced several forest fires within the past few years. Per Public Resources Code Section 4291 it is required that communities and residences located in State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) clear defensible space around homes and buildings to avoid loss associated with wildfires and follow the requirements of this defensible space (BOF 2006). The defensible space is not irrigated or watered, but rather is a complete clearing of vegetation from around structures to reduce or prevent the risk of damage during a fire. SRAs are areas where the State of California has the primary financial responsibility for the prevention and suppression of wildland fires (BOF 2012a). SRAs are identified parts of Calaveras, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Mariposa, and Madera Counties in the plan area and extended plan area (BOF 2012a). In addition, the State of California has identified Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones the plan area or extended plan area of following counties Calaveras, Tuolumne, Mariposa, and Madera (CALFIRE 2007). These designations allow the State to make recommendations to the local jurisdictions and the government code (Sections 51175–51982) then provides direction for the local jurisdiction to take appropriate actions to help reduce and control the potential for fire (BOF 2012b). This includes the enforcement of the defensible space requirements (BOF 2012b). The plan amendments may result in a change in reservoir storage in the extended plan area; however, these changes would not alter the requirements of the state and local agencies to enforce defensible space requirements and other requirements to reduce the potential for fire and control fires. Water would continue to be available in either reservoirs or rivers to fight potential forest fires.
426	1	There was not enough fish in the river to feed a small town and never has been. While I was in schools in the area, the rationale for building a new dam was to be able to go through 4 to 5 years of drought and not be in a short supply of water for irrigating crops.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
426	2	<p>The plans that the "criminal organization" called the State Water Board would destroy the system our great grandfathers and grandfathers put together to make this valley from a desert into a garden. It appears that there is no institutional memory in the staff of boards of any irrigation district.</p> <p>A flat out no way must be the answer to any criminal state water board theft of our stored 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.
427	1	I’m sick of letting my lawn die and catching my shower water to flush the toilet, only to have the state waste it. I’m quitting!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
428	1	Stop listening to the wrong group and listen to common sense and your conscience as you do your job. Do you care about a fish or people?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
429	1	<p>I strongly support the Board’s proposal to keep more water in the Tuolumne, Stanislaus and Merced rivers, to increase river flows for fish and wildlife to at least 40% of the flows that would be in the rivers under natural conditions.</p> <p>For so long agriculture and Industry have diverted a large percentage of the San Joaquin River out of these three tributaries. The lack of water and the resulting increased water temperatures are threatening the populations of our local fish species.</p> <p>Yes, let’s improve the water quality in these rivers and by doing so improve the wildlife habitats for the benefit of all. Please keep more water in our rivers.</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
430	1	With the drought and everything else going on, your plan to increase river flows will further damage our fragile ecosystem and take precious water from farmers who need it.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
431	1	This unfair water grab has potentially devastating consequences for people and the regional economies in the valley – where agribusiness directly contributes more than \$6 billion annually to Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties – as well as the foothills – where New Melones and Tulloch reservoirs are located. The economic blow is likely to be far greater than your staff’s estimate of \$64 million a year.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
431	2	Releasing water between February and July doesn’t make any sense. It forces electric utility companies to produce unnecessary hydroelectric energy during a non-peak demand period. This is irresponsibly inefficient. It creates cheap power in the winter when it’s not needed as opposed to saving the water in reservoirs to make cheap power in the summer when demand is high.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
432	1	I support increasing the river flows in the Tuolumne, Merced and Stanislaus rivers to 50%. Climate science is telling us that our region is warming, our snow packs are diminishing, and longer, hotter droughts are inevitable, especially since Congress resists action on CO2s. Our weather patterns are likely to change to long-term drought with occasional powerful storms bringing sudden flood conditions. Our traditional storage behind dams and reservoirs may be obsolete during long-term drought and will take on a new function as collection points for distribution of water from short term weather events to underground valley aquifer storage. We will need the right kind of water storage and distribution infrastructure: individual, community and state.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
432	2	<p>River flows into the Delta must be preserved at high level to prevent the incursion of saltwater pushing upriver from the Bay, risking polluting Central Valley aquifers and a potential decline in Central Valley productivity. At an 18" sea rise, we face those catastrophic dangers. During the last 150 years water levels have risen 8" at an accelerating rate. By mid-century we will likely reach 18". At the same time our temperatures will rise from today’s 10 to 25 days of 100-degree temperatures by mid-century to 25-50 days and by 2100, 50-100 days of 100- degree temperatures per year.</p> <p>If we bend to today’s political pressure for our regional economy and cities they will likely fight for the greatest share of water rather than confronting future shortages. We will continue to build infrastructure that assumes historical supplies of water. We must encourage applying the best possible techniques to water use, while preserving quality. If we maintain the river flows our cities and economy will adjust to these realities sooner and we may avoid untenable water decisions in the future.</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.
432	3	We must preserve our natural world. It’s arrogant to believe nature’s waters are ours to consume. We cannot allow our rivers to become un-flushed sewers unable to maintain surrounding life to meet short-term human demand. We must buy wildlife as much time as possible for humanity to understand and perhaps solve its water dilemma. We must have a workable ethical framework toward water since the alternative is unthinkable and unworkable.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
432	4	I support the State Water Board raising the minimum flow levels in the Tuolumne, Stanislaus, and Merced rivers to at least 50% of the natural unimpaired flows that would occur without dams and 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
433	1	I object to the proposed flows for the San Joaquin tributaries. The result of the proposal will be that I'll have to reduce the size of my family farm to below economic levels, or give up the farm altogether. I will lose, my employees will lose and local businesses will lose. Who are the winners? The salmon? Maybe, maybe not.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
433	2	Increased flows in the past have not significantly improved fish survival. Only the non-native striped bass will benefit if their food supply of salmon smolts is increased. Perhaps you should direct your attention to removing or reducing striped bass populations first. If that doesn't help, then you may consider increased 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.
434	1	As an organization, we are very concerned about your Substitute Environmental Document (SED) and its proposed unimpaired flow requirements for the Tuolumne, Stanislaus and Merced Rivers. As you know, the economy of the central valley is largely driven by the agricultural sector. We find it troubling that your plan lacks any proposal to address what you label "significant, but unavoidable impacts" 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.
434	2	Another equally troubling aspect of your SED as currently written, would be its negative impact on groundwater sustainability. Because you assume that maximum groundwater pumping will be used to replace the lost surface water, you must also be aware that this will eliminate the possibility for local agencies to sustainably manage groundwater under the Sustainable Ground Water Management Act (SGMA) without devastating family farms and local economies.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
434	3	There can be no doubt that as currently written, your plan will deliver devastating economic consequences to our region. While it appears this outcome is of little or no consequence to you and your board, I assure you it is of critical importance to everyone involved in the agriculture sector, whether directly or indirectly.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
434	4	We urge the SWRCB to abandon this ill-conceived SED and enter into good-faith discussions with all impacted parties with the goal of reaching a negotiated and balanced solution that preserves the agricultural sector and groundwater resources of our region. We also believe that any eventual solution should be based on sound science that has already been developed by our local agencies during their relicensing efforts for both the Exchequer and New Don Pedro dams.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
435	1	<p>This is the craziest idea anyone could come up with. We won't even know what will be remaining in our reservoirs for people. When fish become more important than people, that's when you people need to retire.</p> <p>When the reservoirs were almost empty, why didn't you remove the small mountains that are usually submerged? This way you would have increased the capacity, since you haven't built any new ones, for many years.</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.
436	1	People are more important than fish. I own a house boat on New Melones Lake and use it for 80% of my family's recreation. We had to take boat out last year due to low water level. This is a large expense for me and I lost the whole season. Please rethink this situation and come to a better conclusion than to raise flows on the Stanislaus River and keep the lake low.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
437	1	Your plan to increase river flows will accomplish nothing but the reduction of agriculture in the area. Water from the Stanislaus River should be used to replenish the groundwater in	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
		this area. We can't keep removing water from the bank without putting some back in.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
438	1	Your plan to increase river flows is wrong. It will be devastating on California agriculture. We feed not only ourselves, but contribute to the feeding of the world. Farms and ranches will be forced out of business, devastating the economy and a way of life, but also the affiliated businesses and their way of life. Stop this water grab. It is too harmful to everything and everyone who is reliant on the use of 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.
439	1	Any plan to take more water is theft of a resource that the landowners paid for the rights to in the early 1900s. There are populations that you think there were in the past, according to my great grandfather and grandfather who farmed in century before. Their blood, sweat and tears paid for and put in the current storage system and irrigation system that this area from a desert to a garden that feeds a good portion of this nation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
439	2	There is not and never has been enough fish in these rivers to feed a small town. Taking more water for the delta wi population as a viable food source, but it will drastically impact the viable food source that exists 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.
440	1	I am writing to oppose the 2016 Bay-Delta Plan Amendment & SED. It is not a good 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.
441	1	We don't want another dust bowl. We can't keep taking our underground water. We can't grow food without water. Look at Madera -- they can't sell their properties because there's no water. Wake up and save the Central Valley don't take 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.
442	1	New Melones Reservoir is far too low now. If you increase the flow, it will practically empty the lake. As it stands now, we can't even swim because it is too far of a walk to get to the water and way too steep, plus now that the water is so warm there is a problem with leaches. Please do not increase 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.
444	1	I am submitting this letter in defense of a healthy Bay/Delta which will require enough water to flush out the ecosystem as nature has designed it. A 60% flow of the San Joaquin at Chipps Island is essential to the health of the south Delta. I am not a hydrologist but I grew up around the Delta in the late '50s and early '60s and it doesn't take a scientist to note the difference in the health of this 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.
444	2	Pumping from the Delta started in the early '60s and the degradation of the area was evident immediately. There was a cardboard plant in Antioch that had to be closed due to saltwater intrusion. The fishing started a slow but steady decline. It was nothing for us kids to catch twenty strippers in three or four hours fishing. Catfish were plentiful as were carp, sturgeon, bass, bluegill etc. We had two strong salmon runs and you could fill a rowboat to the gunnels with shad when they ran. There was a thriving shrimping business in San Pablo Bay. None of that exists today. You can literally fish for a whole day and not get a bite. The fish population in 1960 was estimated at 17 million fish. The last number I heard for the Delta the population was down to 4 million fish. We never saw algae blooms like you see in Stockton now. Sloughs we would take a boat with a three foot draft into now you can only access by pontoon or canoe due to silting. The major cause of all this decimation of the ecosystem is not enough water flushing out the Delta/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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
444	3	I have no qualms of sharing resources unless it bankrupts one ecosystem in order for individuals to simply make money. You're not saving the world from hunger by growing pistachios and almonds in the desert of the southwestern San Joaquin Valley. It's a poor trade to ruin naturally rich farmland that is the Delta in order to give more water to a silicate-ridden area simply so corporate agriculture can increase its profits. What about all the towns on the coast that rely on salmon for their living, are we telling them the destruction of the second largest salmon stream on the West Coast will be accomplished so people can buy \$5.00 bags of nuts?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
444	4	We need adequate flows of water to keep the Delta/Bay from becoming a saltwater estuary. We may never see the healthy ecosystem that was the past but we must preserve adequate water quality to insure a semblance of our traditional ecosystem and our historic fisheries. Please do your job to maintain adequate water flow for the Delta/Bay so we don't lose this wonderful natural area to greed and profiteers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
446	1	What the hell is going on You are Risking Bankrupting the Valley with your stupid Plan over a few 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.
447	1	Where do people fit into your perverted proposals? The fish did fine before you folks decided they are more important than us mere mortals. When fish can put food on my table I'll be more supportive, until then give the farmers what they need. You all need to read the Bible and see where fish fit into the scheme of things.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
448	1	I want you to know that as a biologist, California taxpayer, and avid outdoorsperson, I support efforts to keep our Delta healthy and restore salmon habitat on the tributaries of the San Joaquin River. Scientifically-informed, minimum instream flow standards must be ensured.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
448	2	<p>UC Davis fish biologist Peter Moyle has said that of the roughly 120 native freshwater fish species in California, "over 80 percent of those are faced with extinction by the end of the century if current trends continue." A recent study sponsored by the San Francisco Estuary Partnership found, in fact, that so little freshwater is flowing from rivers' that feed California estuaries, especially during the ecologically critical winter and spring months, that entire deltas are in ecological collapse. Jon Rosenfield, the lead scientist on the Bay Institute report, said "Over the past four decades urban users and farmers have diverted so much water from the rivers that in all but the wettest years, severe drought has become a permanent condition for wildlife." According to an October article in SFGate, some of the most problematic effects at work include:</p> <p>Looming fish extinctions. In addition to the delta smelt, which farmers often blame for water cutbacks, five other native fish species are severely endangered. Among them are two runs of chinook salmon, longfin smelt, green sturgeon and Central Valley steel head. Dozens of others, such as fall run chinook salmon, white sturgeon and the Sacramento splittail, are in severe decline, listed currently as "species of concern."</p> <p>Starvation of fish-dependent species. Orca whales off the coast rely on chinook salmon for food. As salmon populations plummet, the whales are exhibiting signs of food deprivation and reproductive failure. Other marine mammals such as seals and fish-eating birds - pelicans, terns and cormorants - are also affected. Twenty-two species of birds in the estuary are listed as endangered, threatened, or species of concern. Habitat loss is the main</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>stress, but it is compounded by a decline in available food.</p> <p>Diminished freshwater to the Gulf of the Farallones. This national marine sanctuary just outside the Golden Gate is a hot spot of marine and avian life fed by a plume of brackish water- part fresh and part saline- that has declined as river flows into the estuary have fallen.</p> <p>Increased salinity. Lack of freshwater has harmed zooplankton that lie near the base of the food chain, providing food for fish and birds. Salinity changes encourage invasive species such as the overbite clam, which in turn reduces phytoplankton at the base of the food web.</p> <p>Lack of sediment. Reduced river flows mean less sediment is deposited on the bay's beaches and tidal marshes.</p>	
448	3	<p>Aquatic ecosystems like the Delta need freshwater flows to survive and provide people with the riparian services on which Californians rely. These flows provide the necessary habitat at the right temperature for salmon to once again thrive on the San Joaquin River. Salmon are a keystone species for the entire Central Valley of California. The nutrients they bring from the ocean to the headwaters allowed the valley to become the fertile agricultural land it is today and are necessary to sustain that fertility.</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>
448	4	<p>The Water Board must listen to the fisheries scientists and biologists and set the bar higher. I urge you to set the instream flows at 60% to ensure the salmon and the Delta ecosystem survive and continue to function for Californians.</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>
449	1	<p>It appears that you really do have a most difficult job in regulating how much water flows through the Delta and out to the Bay. I am most appreciative that you have chosen to increase the levels 30 to 50%. However, I think we need to keep in mind the science behind how much water flows and how that effects our environment. I understand that that agri-business is wanting more water for farming.</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>
449	2	<p>I am concerned that agri-business is not just in the business of growing crops but that it is truly in business to make a profit. It concerns me greatly, to see some traditional crops being replaced by thirsty crops such as almonds and other nuts, that need to be irrigated even in the winter. I know we can't tell them what they can grow at this time, but by limiting the amounts of water they are allowed, this will naturally regulate what crops they can grow.</p> <p>I have heard figures that say 70% of our almond crops are being exported to other countries. I understand that this is a complicated issue, but I don't think this should take precedence over our water needs and environmental concerns in our own back yards. Everywhere I drive, lately, I see fields being torn up and replaced with nut trees. Even with efficient watering methods this is absolutely outrageous. I sincerely hope that you will allow more water to flow through the Delta now and in the years to come.</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>
450	1	<p>I am writing to support your recent letter to the State Water Board regarding the minimum flow standards on the lower San Joaquin River to the Delta and to take action to protect our region from the dangerous and outrageous water policy proposed recently by the State Water Board. Doubling the amount of water used for the fish flows from our rivers and lakes is disastrous for the economy, ecology, and 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>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
450	2	I urge you to take action to insure that you and your agencies have a complete understanding of the impact of these policies on seven counties with major agricultural production.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
450	3	I also 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.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
451	1	We oppose an increase in unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River because this proposed plan is an unfair water grab. Diverting more than 300,000 acre feet of water from Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced river basins water to Southern California would have devastating consequences to the economy of these areas.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
451	2	Agribusiness would be impacted significantly. The state's estimate on how much of an economic blow this could be to the Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties, as well as the foothills, could be \$260 billion a year, or higher.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
451	3	This proposed plan would not increase the fish population and the unscientifically supported attempt that it would benefit fish and make up for what Gov. Jerry Brown's twin tunnels project would remove from the Delta is not correct. Research in the river has proven that habitat restoration, augmenting spawning habitat, controlling water temperature and reducing predation are the best ways to increase fish 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.
451	4	Simply flushing water down the river in the spring and fall does not work, which has been supported by 20 years of science.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
451	5	Since 2011, more than 500,000 acre feet of extra water could have been stored behind New Melones reservoir that was instead sent down the river.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
451	6	This unfair water grab has potentially devastating consequences for people and the regional economies in the valley. We therefore favor a sensible, balanced water management plan for the Stanislaus River that fairly distributes this precious resource.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
452	1	I think your proposal to increase flows in the rivers will essentially destroy ag in the valley. It also will destroy our groundwater basin and turn the valley back into a desert once more.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
453	1	<p>Contra Costa County opposes the Board's proposal to degrade, rather than improve, water quality in the Delta by relaxing the April-August irrigation water quality standard in the South Delta.</p> <p>The following are Contra Costa County's initial comments on the SED with a focus on general policy issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Require flow objectives for the upper San Joaquin River from Friant Dam to the Merced River confluence 2. Protect and improve South Delta water quality 3. Ensure impacts are not redirected to subsequent months 4. Ensure sufficient flows for San Joaquin fish downstream of Vernalis 	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments in general opposition to the plan amendments or an SDWQ alternative, and regarding voluntary agreements. Please see Master Response 1.1 and the Executive Summary, Section ES11, Areas of Known Controversy and Changes Made to the 2012 Draft Substitute Environmental Document, regarding areas of controversy addressed in the SED and changes made. Please also see Chapter 4, Introduction to Analysis,</p> <p>Section 4.2, Recirculated SED, for a summary of changes made.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1.1, , General Comments, and Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding the geographic scope of the plan amendments. In addition, please refer to Master Response 1.1 and Master Response 2.1 for a description of the San Joaquin River Restoration Program and the upper San Joaquin River as it relates to the plan amendments.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, regarding the scope of the Bay-</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>5. Should not set San Joaquin flow objectives as four steps</p> <p>6. Any voluntary settlement agreements must achieve the new flow and ecosystem objectives</p> <p>7. The revised SED should discuss Areas of Concern and how they have been addressed</p>	<p>Delta Plan proceedings, and the separate and independent proceedings to address different watersheds.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3.3, Southern Delta Water Quality, regarding the water quality of the southern Delta and the reasonable protection of southern Delta water quality for the beneficial use of agriculture. Also refer to Chapter 3, Alternatives Description, Section 3.4, Southern Delta Water Quality (SDWQ) Alternatives, for a description of the SDWQ alternatives.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2.1, Master Response 2.2, Adaptive Implementation, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding months outside of the February through June period.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 7, Aquatic Biological Resources, Impact AQUA-12, for a discussion of the analysis of changes in southern Delta and estuarine habitat, including a description of the existing fish protection requirements. Please see Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding fish benefits that result from the plan amendments. Although increased spring inflows from the San Joaquin River the plan amendments could result in increased export pumping and entrainment risk for juvenile salmonids entering the Delta, expected increases in San Joaquin River salmon production (number of juveniles entering the Delta) combined with increases in flow at Vernalis, existing restrictions on export pumping rates, export to inflow ratios, and negative flows in Old and Middle River are expected to minimize potential adverse effects on survival through the Delta and result in greater numbers of juveniles reaching the ocean. Please also see Master Response 2.1 regarding migratory corridors and the benefits of LSJR flow objectives in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.</p>
453	2	ATT:1: Contra Costa County's Detailed Initial Comments on Draft Revised Phase 1 SED	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.
453	3	<p>[ATT:1] Require flow objectives for the upper San Joaquin River from Friant Dam to the Merced River confluence</p> <p>The SWRCB is only proposing to restore streamflows for three of the tributaries to the San Joaquin River. The most heavily impacted section of the San Joaquin River, the upper section below Friant Dam, is being ignored. This was a salmon-bearing river before Friant Dam was built.</p> <p>This upper San Joaquin watershed contributes approximately 30% of the total unimpaired flow for the San Joaquin River. If the State Board only sets a flow objective of 40% of unimpaired flow on three of the four major sources of flow, the resulting flow at Vernalis will only be about 28% [i.e., 70% of 40%] of total watershed unimpaired flow. This is much less than the 60% that the SWRCB determined in 2010 was necessary to restore and sustain fish populations on the San Joaquin.</p> <p>In 2004, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals confirmed that Fish and Game Code section 5937 [footnote 1: Fish and Game Code section 5937: The owner of any dam shall allow sufficient water at all times to pass through a fishway, or in the absence of a fishway, allow sufficient water to pass over, around or through the dam, to keep in good condition any fish that may be planted or exist below the dam. During the minimum flow of water in any river or stream, permission may be granted by the department to the owner of any dam to allow sufficient water to pass through a culvert, waste gate, or over or around the dam, to keep in good condition any fish that may be planted or exist below the dam, when, in the judgment of the department, it is impracticable or detrimental to the owner to pass the water through the fishway.] does apply to the San Joaquin River below Friant Dam. This led to a September</p>	Please refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, and Master Response 2.1, for a description of the San Joaquin River Restoration Program, the relationship of the upper San Joaquin River to the plan amendments, and the unimpaired flow from the watershed. Please also see Master Response 2.1 for a discussion of the geographic scope of the plan amendments. Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, regarding the consideration of reasonable protection of beneficial uses of water. In addition, please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for a description of the expected benefits to fish under the plan amendments.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>2006 settlement agreement between the parties and development of the San Joaquin River Restoration Program.</p> <p>The SED assumes there will be Restoration Flows below Friant Dam that will contribute to flows in the Lower San Joaquin River. However, the Friant settlement agreement has failed to produce any significant sustained increase in flow upstream of the confluence with the Merced River (Stevinson) and we are concerned that any further progress on implementing the restoration flows could likely be blocked by the new federal administration and Congress.</p> <p>Setting flow objectives for only three of the main sources of flow at Vernalis will make it difficult to achieve the 60% of unimpaired flow objective the SWRCB determined was necessary in 2010. At the very least, the Board should not relax the existing Vernalis flow requirements on the assumption that the new tributary flow objectives will provide the necessary flow enhancements at Vernalis.</p> <p>Past State Boards' failure to require compliance with Fish and Game Code section 5937 below Friant Dam is also a problem because the SWRCB is likely to be asked in the future to make a decision on water rights permits for the Temperance Flat Reservoir. This new reservoir would be located on the Upper San Joaquin upstream of Millerton Lake (Friant Dam). Failure to set flow objectives for the upper San Joaquin could result in the present State Board "doubling down" on the mistakes of the past.</p>	
453	4	<p>[ATT:1] Protect and improve South Delta water quality</p> <p>Despite the detailed discussions of antidegradation in Chapter 23, the SWRCB's proposed relaxation of the April-August irrigation EC standard from 0.7 to 1.0 dS/m will result in degradation of water quality in the south Delta. The proposed increases in tributary flows from February-June may result in improved water quality during that period, but not in the remaining months of the South Delta irrigation season, i.e., July and August.</p> <p>The 2009 Delta Reform Act established as new State policy achievement of the coequal goals of ecosystem restoration and improved water supply reliability. The Act also established as State policy the inherent objective of improving water quality to protect human health and the environment consistent with achieving water quality objectives in the Delta (California Water Code section 85020(e)). Relaxing water quality objectives and thereby degrading water quality is therefore contrary to the policy of the State of California.</p> <p>If the State Board really believes the increased flows will improve rather than degrade water quality for irrigation in the south Delta throughout April-August, then it is not necessary to relax the existing 0.7 dS/m standard.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.3, Southern Delta Water Quality, for responses to comments regarding the justification of amending the SDWQ objectives and discussion of why the plan amendments will not cause degradation of water quality.</p>
453	5	<p>[ATT:1] Ensure impacts are not redirected to subsequent months</p> <p>Adoption of the Spring X2 estuarine habitat standard (February-June) by the SWRCB in 1995, which was an outcome of the Bay-Delta Accord, unfortunately had the effect of significantly reducing Delta outflows and increasing X2 in the Fall. This unintended consequence may well have contributed to the subsequent Pelagic Organism Decline. To correct this redirection of adverse impacts, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) established Fall X2 limits in the 2008 OCAP Delta smelt biological opinion.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, and Master Response 2.2, Adaptive Implementation, for information regarding the February through June period and protection of fish outside of the February through June period. Please also see Master Response 2.1 for modifications made to the plan amendments. In addition, please see the discussion in Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding year-round flows.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>If the SWRCB only sets new flow regulations for February-June, this could result in a reduction in flows in July and subsequent months. Contra Costa County alerted the SWRCB to this potential problem in its December 6, 2010 comments on the San Joaquin River and South Delta Salinity Draft Technical Report.</p> <p>The State Board should also set flow requirements for July-January to ensure existing flows are not decreased, and the new February-June flow objectives do not redirect adverse impacts on San Joaquin salmon and other key fish species to the July-January period.</p>	
453	6	<p>[ATT:1] Ensure sufficient flows for San Joaquin fish downstream of Vernalis</p> <p>The draft revised SED is inadequate because it fails to ensure that flows to help outmigrating salmon and attract returning salmon are available all the way through the Delta to the San Francisco Bay. It is not enough to enhance flows and habitat for fish species upstream of Vernalis if outmigrating fish are left stranded in the south Delta, or worse still are drawn to the export pumps.</p> <p>As part of the development of new Delta outflow standards in Phase II, the State Board should include contributions from the San Joaquin Valley, not just the Sacramento Valley. The contributions from the Sacramento Valley, San Joaquin Valley and east side streams could be based, in part, on the unimpaired flow contributions from each watershed. This would help create more natural flow patterns in the Delta.</p> <p>This would require that the Vernalis flows reach all the way through the Delta to Suisun Bay, not just to the South Delta and rediverted at the South Delta export facilities.</p> <p>The draft revised SED is also inadequate because it fails to analyze and disclose the environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed alternatives in the whole Delta and downstream. Flow modifications on the San Joaquin River and its tributaries could result in environmental benefits and adverse impacts throughout the Delta and San Francisco Bay.</p> <p>The Plan Area described on page 1-1 of Chapter 1 of the draft revised SED artificially limits the SED analysis of environmental impacts to the San Joaquin Valley (except upstream of the confluence with the Merced River) and the southern Delta, including the SJR from Vernalis to Brandt Bridge, Middle River from Old River to Victoria Canal, and Old River/Grant Line Canal from the Head of Old River to West Canal. The Revised SED must also analyze, amongst other things, changes in the flows in Old and Middle River, changes in water quality at key municipal and industrial and agricultural intakes throughout the Delta, and the changes in Delta outflow and X2.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 453-1 regarding sufficient flows for San Joaquin fish downstream of Vernalis and potential effects of exports. In addition, please see Chapter 7, Aquatic Biological Resources, for more information about Old and Middle River flows, Delta outflow, and X2.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 453-1 regarding the water quality control planning process and the independent processes under which the Bay-Delta Plan is being updated.</p> <p>Finally, please refer to Master Response 3.3, Southern Delta Water Quality, for a discussion of the protection of Delta water quality for municipal and agricultural purposes as it relates to the plan area. Please see Appendix F.1, Hydrologic and Water Quality Monitoring, Section F.1.7, Potential Changes in Delta Exports and Outflow, for information describing effects on Delta outflow and exports that result from implementation of the plan amendments.</p>
453	7	<p>[ATT:1] Should not set San Joaquin flow objectives as four steps</p> <p>At this time, the SWRCB is only proposing to set flow standards for three of the tributaries for February through June. However, this only addresses a portion of the necessary enhancements to the flows along the entire length of the San Joaquin River to protect fish and wildlife and to restore the ecosystem of the Central Valley, Delta and San Francisco Bay.</p> <p>At some time, preferably now as part of Parts I and II, the SWRCB will need to also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - set flow requirements for the upper section of the San Joaquin River from Friant Dam to the confluence with the Merced River; 	<p>Please see response to comment 453-1 regarding the scope of the Bay-Delta Plan process and the independent proceedings. In addition, please see responses to comments 453-3 and 453-5 for more information regarding the Upper San Joaquin River and July through January flows, respectively.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>- set the San Joaquin Valley flows necessary for the San Joaquin watershed's contribution to Delta outflow (Phase II); and,</p> <p>- set tributary and mainstem flow requirements for July-January.</p> <p>Because this is a contentious issue, Contra Costa County recommends the SWRCB take care of all these flow requirements at one time as part of a combined Phase I and Phase II process, instead of in four steps. Internal Delta flows, such as Old and Middle River flow and Delta outflow and Delta water quality are all affected by the flows in the San Joaquin River. The current Phase I issues are not independent of Phase II issues.</p>	
453	8	<p>[ATT:1] Any voluntary settlement agreements must achieve the new flow and ecosystem objectives</p> <p>Governor Brown's September 19, 2016 letter to SWRCB Chair Marcus urged the Board to move quickly to complete the remainder of their analysis on the Sacramento River basin. He suggested voluntary agreements could offer a faster, less contentious, and more durable outcome. Governor Brown asked the Board and staff to prioritize analysis and implementation of voluntary agreements. It is likely that settlement agreements will also be offered during Phase I.</p> <p>However, the last three major Bay-Delta settlement agreements have all failed to achieve the flow or ecosystem restoration goals for which they were developed.</p> <p>The Vernalis Adaptive Management Plan (VAMP) was a 12-year program, starting in 2000 that formalized the contributions of senior upstream water right holders to meet the SWRCB's flow objectives at Vernalis. The VAMP was unsuccessful because it failed to protect juvenile Chinook salmon migrating from the San Joaquin River through the Delta or double the population of anadromous fish. The flows during the VAMP were less than the flow objectives adopted by the SWRCB in the May 1995 WQCP.</p> <p>A second settlement agreement was developed in Phase 8 of the water rights hearings to allocate responsibility for meeting the 1995 Delta Water Quality Control Plan (WQCP) objectives. Water suppliers in the Sacramento Valley worked with the Department of Water Resources (DWR), US Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), and the Downstream Water Users to develop the Sacramento Valley Water Management Program. This involved development of groundwater supplies in the Sacramento Valley that would allow reduced upstream diversions from the Sacramento River at certain times to help DWR and Reclamation to meet Delta standards. On the basis of this settlement agreement, the SWRCB dismissed Phase 8 of the Bay-Delta Hearings (January 2003). However, the groundwater program was never implemented.</p> <p>The third example is the September 2006 San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement which settled an 18-year lawsuit to provide sufficient flows and fish habitat in the San Joaquin River below Friant Dam. However, 10 years later this settlement agreement still has not resulted in any significant and sustained flow releases. The impending change in the federal administration is likely to further delay implementation of this Restoration Settlement.</p> <p>The SWRCB should not accept any settlement agreements that do not guarantee achievement of the SWRCB's proposed flow objectives or achievement of the corresponding</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please also see Master Response 1.1, and Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, for information regarding voluntary agreements.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		ecosystem goals and objectives.	
453	9	<p>[ATT:1] The revised SED should discuss Areas of Concern and how they have been addressed</p> <p>Contra Costa County has previously submitted three focused comment letters to State Board on the proposals for San Joaquin River tributary flows, and South Delta salinities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contra Costa County comments on the San Joaquin River and South Delta Salinity Draft Technical Report, December 6, 2010 (Signed by Roberta L. Goulart) 2. Southern Delta Ag and Flow Revised Notice of Preparation, May 23, 2011 (signed by John Greitzer) 3. Contra Costa County Water Agency Comments on the Draft Substitute Environmental Document for the Bay Delta WQCP, March 28, 2013 (signed by John Greitzer) <p>Although the draft revised SED includes an appendix summarizing comments received (Appendix M), the SED does not address areas of concern or discuss why focused comments and suggestions by commenters, including Contra Costa County, have not been considered. The next version of the SED should discuss Areas of Concern and describe how the Board has addressed those concerns or why those concerns and focused suggestions were ignored.</p>	<p>Please see response to 453-1 regarding areas of known controversy and changes made in the SED. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for a discussion regarding the 2012 Draft SED and the basis for recirculation of the Draft Revised SED in 2016. A lead agency need only respond to those comments submitted in response to a recirculated revised environmental document and is not required to respond to comments previously received during the earlier circulation period on a previous draft. In its September 15, 2016 notice of filing, recirculation, and opportunity for public comment on the Revised SED, the State Water Board made clear that since “the SED is being recirculated in its entirety, new oral and/or written comments must be made and submitted for the SED. Previous comments to the 2012 Draft SED will be part of the administrative record, but do not require a written response. The State Water Board will only respond to those timely comments made and submitted in response to the recirculated SED.”</p>
454	1	Your proposal seems incredibly irresponsible and dumb to not save the water and use it for 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.
455	1	The environmental impact document released by the Water Board on September 15th 2016 called for 40% of unimpaired flow. This could be higher, and increasing the unimpaired flow would benefit the health and functionality of the surrounding bay 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.
456	1	Our wildlife, fish and ecosystems must be protected from wasteful water management practices that threaten many ways of living, including those of fishermen, wildlife enthusiasts and those of us who treasure the beauty of 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.
456	2	<p>Though it is tempting to drain the swamp and feed those with grass, we urge Californians instead to practice water conservation steps that will make it unnecessary to drain the Delta. We urge more work done by our officials to have thousands if not millions of residents wasting water on unnecessary outside irrigation.</p> <p>If even that was accomplished, we wouldn't need to deprive farmers of water. There would be plenty. It is quite well documented.</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.
457	1	I am apposed to your proposal of diverting local surface water for non- existing fantasy salmon for 300k to over 1 million dollars a fish! This is a blatant miss-use of this precious & valuable resource -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.
457	2	<p>The added feature of what happens to the water after you guys bleed out the reservoirs. My guess is the bleeder water gets sucked up by the two non-irrigating canals by I -5 (peripheral canals). The water board should know about the SMWD agreements with 4 other states to lose almost 50 percent of the Colorado River water rights. From close to 70 percent down to less than 30 percent. The picture is clear to me, 40 percent less of the Colorado River, means SMWD and your water board are partners in stealing the water from this area. A</p>	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		good example is Owens Valley water project, where 100 percent of that water, goes to the LA basin. Another older water grab/stealing.	
457	3	Anyone that would want this proposal would have to be unbalanced or not able to conceive any type of reality. You need to look not at your personal gains, but look for what's reasonable. Unless this board recognizes that, for every action, there is a equal, opposite reaction. I assume that you don't care about my area because you guys want to bleed my water for someone in San Diego area to take shower. And, that bathwater gets 'flushed' out to the sea. The people in San Diego should build desalination plants. They would rather transport my water (check assessment taxes for 60 years to build Don Pedro reservoir). Or maybe build more reservoirs or raising the reservoirs? No, no, you say, it's cheaper to steal the water than to pay for it.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
458	1	I am opposed to increasing unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River. Let locals manage local resources; do not allow a small board of outsiders to make decisions about how to manage the water. Most are not familiar with nor really understand how important water is to our local survival. Keep it local, keep outsiders from making decisions that only reflect ideas of people who do not have a clue.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
459	1	Your idea to increase river flows will cause much more harm than any conceivable good.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
460	1	The environment is always a concern in the beautiful State of California. Our wildlife and natural elements should be protected. Unfortunately, when protecting wildlife has the side effect of allowing farmland to sit fallow, jobs to be lost, food to no longer be grown, and the livelihood of many Californians to be cast aside, our fervor for nature has become extreme.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
460	2	We must protect our environment, but we must protect the people who depend on the environment. Food, jobs, and the agricultural bounty of our State should have priority over species of fish that can no longer survive in the wild. Labs at UC Davis and other fish hatcheries can protect these species, grow the population, and perhaps, when this drought ends, reintroduce the fish into nature. At this point, their numbers need to be grown in a protected environment, before they will be able to thrive in the natural world.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
460	3	We cannot continue to place animals above people, when our efforts have been absolutely ineffective. It doesn't logically make sense. The fish will not die out. There is a contingency plan for the fish. But, the farmland will be lost without water. The jobs and the crops will be lost, if we refuse to make them a priority.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
461	1	Salmon are the world's best source of protein, vitamins, minerals, and healthy oils for humans. Historically, California salmon used to provide about 8.5 million pounds of food every year for people living on the land we now call California. Not anymore. Salmon are also the foundation of the food chain for the wildlife in California, but we owe the world renowned fertility of Central California's agricultural land to salmon as well. Let me explain.	Please see Master Response 1.1, 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>For a long time, scientists were puzzled as to why the agricultural lands in California's natural floodplains were so rich with minerals only otherwise known to be found out at sea. As it turns out, when millions of salmon used to run up California's waterways to spawn during the spring and fall each year, they served as a food source for about 100 other species. The nutrients they carried from the sea would make it into the soil, either directly through the decomposition of their dead carcasses, or indirectly through the digestive systems of their predators, before eventually re-fertilizing the soil. This natural fertilization process that happens with two healthy salmon runs per year (plus unimpaired flows from California's rivers feeding water out into the estuaries) makes California soil some of the richest in the world. Over half of all the nation's fresh produce is grown here is a direct result. Salmon are the reason those nutrients made it from the into the land.</p> <p>However, over the last decades, at the same time while salmon numbers are only reaching a couple thousand in many California Rivers, the nutrient density of the agricultural products we find in most of our grocery stores is also consistently declining. That is, the rich vitamins and minerals that keep our immune systems functioning properly, rebuild our muscle tissue, maintain our bone quality, and keep our brains functioning at full capacity are disappearing from our foods. While a lot of California's food is imported/exported, the lack of local salmon available to the public, and subsequent decreased quality of local food that stays here for Californians, contributes to (among other things) more sick people, higher health care costs, and lower performance from our youth in schools.</p> <p>Restoring unimpaired flows to the Delta would improve the quality of food for California's people, through direct consumption of salmon, and the indirect re-fertilization of our agricultural lands.</p>	
461	2	<p>We have an unprecedented opportunity to breathe life back into the waterways of California. Delivering 40% unimpaired flows to the Bay Delta is massive step in the right direction to ensure the health and prosperity for all of California's inhabitants for generations to come. I urge you to use your position to protect the commons, and grant California the opportunity to get the most out of its waterways.</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>
462	1	<p>It goes without saying that effective allocation of water resources is essential to the future of this great state. Here I submit an appeal to reflect policies that could defy the odds and return some of our great rivers to their full glory.</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>
462	2	<p>Agriculture needs, residential demands and the challenges of an expanding Californian population make renewal of precious water resources daunting. But, I also know that we can do much better as a society working together on a host of fronts including better management of snowmelt, water efficient irrigation technologies and practices, and replacing lower-value, water-intensive crops and gardens with water efficient high yield crops and native, drought resistant gardens. Needless to say it will take a multi-faceted approach to succeed at this important task but I am confident that great achievements will ensue when we work together.</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>
462	3	<p>I urge you to put the resources and policies in place to return our precious waterways to their full natural and abundant potential and, in so doing, support the real possibility that we could return our runs of salmon and other natural riparian wonders to their full glory and move our minds from "if only ... " to "we did!"</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
463	1	Your plan to increase flows on the Stanislaus River will hurt our local economy by the decreased recreational visitors due to low water levels. Fishing has also taken a very noticeable and alarming blow since the pulse flows started. From New Melones to Horseshoe Bend and beyond, fish have been scarce and almost nonexistent. Please help us to save a local recreation and fishing especially before it's too late. Please do not increase the 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.
464	1	Talk to us about fish salvation when you eliminate the non-native striped bass you stock the Delta with for sports fishing.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
465	1	We need to keep our water. This is another money grab. I'm so sick of the greed going on in the world right now. Because it's about money after all. Please do not increase unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
466	1	I support a strong Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan that will support higher unimpaired water flows based on the best available science.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
466	2	The sustainability of our state's watershed and ecosystem needs to be maintained. We need a control plan that will: Protect the wildlife in the lower San Joaquin River and its tributaries. Improved habitat for salmon, which other species heavily rely upon.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
466	3	The sustainability of our state's watershed and ecosystem needs to be maintained. We need a control plan that will: Higher river flows for increased fish habitats and reduced concentration of pollutants. More efficiency in irrigation technologies and practices. Increased water conservation with more crop yields through better management.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
466	4	We support the position of the Tuolumne River Trust.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
467	1	I have read Assemblyman Frank Bigelow's letter to you opposing your 2016 Bay-Delta Plan Amendment and I agree with him, especially where he says, ". . . simply reallocating hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water for unestablished environmental goals to the detriment of all other water users is unacceptable."	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
467	2	Please consider a much more comprehensive approach which includes input from many, including the public.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
468	1	I am writing to ask you to support the criteria of 40% unimpaired flow from the Tuolumne River which is in the 2016 Bay-Delta-Plan Amendment. We are now looking at the option of giving the fish more water and it is imperative that we should do so to keep the fish populations healthy. This Bay Delta Plan Amendment is an opportunity that must be seized. Please support this 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.
468	2	For decades, what has most troubled me is that our priorities are out of balance. In our water allocations, we have not done enough to maintain healthy populations of our 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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Most of our fish are clearly going extinct. With no corrections, it is just a matter of time until they are gone forever. We have a chance to fix this situation, but we must act NOW before it is too late. The salmon that we are about to destroy are a true "gift" to us. They grow up in the ocean. The ocean fishing industry provides a large source of protein for us at little cost to us, except to keep the fish nurseries, the spawning streams and rivers, healthy and with enough water for the fish to reach their spawning grounds. If we deplete the fishing stock then the large fishing industry disappears and so does our large food source taken from our ocean.</p>	<p>comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
468	3	<p>The water that can now be assigned to our fish has been freed up by water conservation initiatives taken during the drought. We have learned that we can exist comfortably with less water and so it is time to allocate that saved water to the fish. Much of our water conservation is a permanent saving.</p> <p>Homeowners in my neighborhood have replaced their lawns with water-saving gardens. My lawn has been replaced by native plants and now requires no water. So I would like to dedicate my water savings to the fish. You can do this for me by supporting the 2016 Bay Delta Plan Amendment.</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>
469	1	<p>Your plan to increase flows in our rivers is bad because it will harm human lives and our economy.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
470	1	<p>Sending water to the ocean for these fish is uncalled for. Our valley farmers don't have water because of this environmental issue. This needs to stop. It's so ridiculous that this is even happening. Please reconsider what you are allowing to happen.</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>
471	1	<p>Your plan to raise flows on the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers is a water grab for SoCal and has nothing to do with helping the fish or groundwater. It would be a detriment to all farmers and employers in the Central Valley.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
472	1	<p>We (350 Bay Area Steering Committee) are writing to urge you to increase the unimpaired flow on the San Joaquin River and its' three major tributaries to at least 50%in the 2016 Bay Delta Plan.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1 for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
472	2	<p>Board issues 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. The current plan calls for only 40% flow, which is not sufficient to protect the Delta ecosystem.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for information regarding the Delta Flow Criteria Report and how it relates to these plan amendments. For further discussion regarding the consideration of beneficial uses please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, and Master Response 1.2.</p>
472	3	<p>As an organization focused solely on climate change, the 350 Bay Area Steering Committee are very aware that the dire water situation in California is due, in great part, to man-made climate change. The predictions show that the drought will only get worse over the coming years.</p> <p>While many people concerned about climate change think about rising sea levels, large storms or water shortages as it impacts humans, it is the loss of species that is the direct and most concerning threat from climate change. Humans can more readily adapt to change, but other species cannot. Changes in weather patterns and water availability can severely stress species and ecosystems. It is projected that we face up to a 30% species</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		loss globally on our current path with climate change.	
472	4	The Bay Delta is a critical ecosystem, our local ecosystem, that we must protect. It forms the West Coast's largest estuary, providing habitat for more than 500 species of wildlife. It serves as a major stopover for the Pacific Flyway and as a migration pathway for salmon, steelhead and sturgeon traveling to and from their home streams to the Pacific ocean. It is currently severely water stressed and at risk.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please refer to Chapter 7, Aquatic Biological Resources; Chapter 8, Terrestrial Biological Resources; and Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, for information regarding aquatic and terrestrial biological resources. Please also refer to Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, for additional information regarding fish benefits.
472	5	Historically, populations of spawning salmon may have exceeded 400,000 fish in the San Joaquin River Basin. But, in many recent years, that figure has plummeted to just a few thousand. Salmon are a keystone species, providing food for other animals and transporting nutrients from the ocean to upland habitats. More than 100 species depend on salmon.	This commenter is generally describing historical and current abundance and ecological importance of San Joaquin River salmon populations. The commenter does not raise significant environmental issues or make a comment regarding the plan amendment; no further response is required.
472	6	As the species clearly responsible for the problem, it is our responsibility to do everything we can to protect the habitats and species at risk. We cannot change the rainfall levels today with policy. However, we can ensure that we provide enough water to continue to support the abundant and amazing ecosystem we have in the Bay Delta and watershed. We should be looking for every way we can to increase our conservation and reduce our own water use, not reduce water flows to the point of threatening our local ecosystem. Conservation is possible and it works. In just the last ten years, water use in the Hetch Hetchy service area was reduced by 30%. The agricultural sector, which uses 80% of the water, can reduce water use significantly through efficient irrigation practices. We have immense opportunities to conserve costs, effectively, that have been untapped. We must pursue these options first before threatening the amazing and abundant life in our backyard. Thank you again for all your work to protect our precious local ecosystem and resources.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. In addition, Chapter 11, Agricultural Resources, and Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources, acknowledge that the use of efficient irrigation practices could reduce impacts on various resources, including agriculture and groundwater.
473	1	If you all keep it up . . . Taking water from agriculture . . . To grow fish . . . there will be nothing in the end	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
474	1	An increase in unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River harms our farms. Let's save "unimpaired flows" for non-drought years. Oh--and let's stop categorizing these unimpaired flows and fish-motivated water flows as "agriculture." They're not, and miscategorizing them this way is dishonest to the public and unfair to our 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.
475	1	I believe our water districts are doing an excellent job managing/protecting our water resources. The state's unimpaired flow puts all in this area at risk with little proven benefit to 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.
476	1	We need a conservative, well thought out water management plan. One that takes issue with saving water for people, rather than just sending it into the ocean. Our water system is terribly low, and increasing the flows on the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers at this	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>time does not make any sense. Instead, we should be saving as much as we can, and intelligently using our water resources for human and business use. The economic impact of this will be terrible, and it will drive too many people out of work.</p>	
477	1	<p>I am sending this e-mail to express my opposition to the recommend flow rates stated in the WRCB's Bay/Delta Plan Phase 1 Revised Draft SED.</p> <p>There is no scientific evidence nor any proof, that releasing more water to flow into the sea, benefits any Delta species.</p> <p>There is proof that the release of more water causes economic and irreversible harm to people, communities and the economy of the State of California.</p> <p>There are many problems with the Delta Ecosystem. (Pollution, depredation by non native fish etc.)</p> <p>Releasing more water is not the solution.</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>
478	1	<p>The proposed Bay-Delta plan to send more fresh water into the bay will definitely draw the attention of the Feds. You already know how unpopular your plan is, and you can bet when the flood of letters from local farmers reach Washington, the Trump administration will apply political pressure on the state. If the pressure is great enough, the politicians in Sacramento may toss the water board members under the bus.</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>
479	1	<p>I just read where only 17% of Americans feel they can trust their government. Your decision to take water from the central valley only adds to my contempt for our modern day government, and most everyone I talk to agrees the government operates only to satisfy big money; think Los Angeles, CTA, and big pharma as just a few examples. You state you want water flows to be equivalent to pre-dam era. Hey, while we're at it why don't we get rid of all cars so we can get back to pre-car CO2 levels? That's the inanity of your decision, and everyone knows it is just an excuse to give LA more water. I often wonder how someone making such ridiculous decision can sleep at night. Do you have no common decency or common sense? I give it ten years before we all take up arms, and in case you are unaware of a document known as the Bill of Rights it is actually our right to overthrow a repressive government. Your decision is exactly what a repressive government does.</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>
480	1	<p>Your plan to increase unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus and other rivers will create a collapse of the valley economy, destroy the aquifers in the valley and water for wetlands, and the population of most cities.</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>
481	1	<p>Please do not allow any more water to be taken from the San Joaquin River or its tributaries to assist salmon or twin tunnel needs.</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>
481	2	<p>It is imperative to allow even greater flow of water to aid farming endeavors and residents of the Central Valley as opposed to aiding salmon not raised in this economy system.</p> <p>The devastation to farming and tremendous loss of jobs and revenue value as well and the general impact to residents would cause a collapse in our area.</p> <p>This area is responsible for billions of dollars in again sales throughout the country and the world and our jobs depend on Ag.</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
482	1	<p>Fact Check: Reduced Harvested Acres Means Reduced Employment.</p> <p>Every time there is a threat to the status quo of agriculture, the supporters roll out the employment loss argument. A review of the recent facts should suggest greater scrutiny in the future of these employment loss claims. From 2011 to 2015, harvested acreage in California decreased by about 1,049,400 acres. With acreage losses primarily in field crops which are less labor-intensive. Contrary to popular opinion, the acreage decreases did not reduce employment. In fact, from 2011 to 2015, employment in the California agriculture sector increased by about 48,630.</p> <p>For verification, the crop and employment data are from the following sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Crop data: https://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/MannUsda/viewDocumentInfo.do?documentID=1047 2. Labor data: http://www.bls.gov/cew/datatoc.htm 	<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>
482	2	[ATT1: Table of California Crop Acreages.]	<p>The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.</p>
482	3	[ATT2: Table of Employment in the California Agricultural Sector.]	<p>The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.</p>
483	1	<p>We are writing to plead with you to stop the proposed Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan SED and instead, consider implementing the alternative Merced River S.A.F.E. Plan. This plan will support salmon and the environment without degrading our local drinking water quality or devastating our local economy.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
483	2	<p>The projected economic impacts to our community under the Bay Delta SED water plan would be as high as \$231 million. Job losses would be as high as 1,000, and our community is already among the most disadvantaged in the state or nation. Increasing unemployment will have a severe impact on the overall well-being of our community, including crime, mental health and more.</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>
483	3	<p>Please consider the multi-benefit approach of the Merced River S.A.F.E. Plan as the better, fairer alternative.</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>
484	1	<p>Adam Gray's letter dated 1-3-17 says everything you need to know about this incompetent, grossly flawed report. So flawed that persons presenting this report actually acknowledge this. The fact that you deny to meet and even discuss these flaws tells the great people of San Joaquin Valley, the breadbasket of the nation which you serve, good reason to question the end game.</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>
484	2	<p>As I'm writing this comment I'm watching billions of gallons of water flow unimpeded out into the ocean. If as much effort was made for retaining water, retention which is going to be implemented as sure as the sun rises (no matter how much the environmentalist may resist this), as was made for implementing a terribly flawed water plan, we may not be in this situation.</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>
485	1	<p>We would like to express our opposition to the suggested flow requirements stated in the</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
		State Water Resources Control Board's Bay-Delta Plan.	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
485	2	California's communities and industry need reliable water supplies and reallocating hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water for unestablished environmental goals will put us out of business.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
486	1	Nature takes care of itself. Pulse flows happen naturally, but they happen when it rains. The dams are for storage and flood control and are essentially wide spots in the river. During drought years fish would not come up the river if there was no 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.
486	2	Mimic Mother Nature when it rains: store some and release. As snow melts, store some and release. Open the season and limits on predator fish (stripers and squaw fish) to increase the salmon run. Probably nothing you haven't already heard. Let the river and Mother Nature do their job at right time of the year while keeping enough water to support the local area and local 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.
487	1	As a resident of the Lake Don Pedro Area, I strongly oppose the diversion of 60% of the water from Lake Don Pedro and especially Lake McClure (our only source of drinking water for the area residents) to flow into the San Joaquin River to help save the fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
487	2	Last year and for the last few years, this diversion has taken place and the residents of the area have suffered massive water rationing. Lake McClure was down to below 5%. I ask, "What/Who is more important, fish or people?" I understand the conservation aspect of what is trying to be achieved, but this is ludicrous! Not only to the people need the water, but also local growers and livestock farms. I urge the Water Board to vote no on the new water bill.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
488	1	I am writing in support of a minimum 40% (ideally 50%) unimpaired river flow for the Merced, Tuolumne, Stanislaus and San Joaquin river network. Since the Flow Criteria Plan for the San Joaquin-Sacramento Delta Ecosystem [Footnote 1: "Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem," State Water Resources Control Board, California Environmental Protection Agency. Phil Crader et al. (2010)] itself recommends an unimpaired flow of 60% (February through June) as necessary to provide for recovery of the river ecosystem to a level sufficient to support wildlife (especially the salmon populations) and the associated riparian habitats, arguing for 50% unimpaired flow hardly seems illogical. There are many reasons for supporting a 50% unimpaired flow level.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments in general support of the plan amendments, a specific percent of unimpaired flow, or an LSJR alternative. Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding a description of the plan amendments and Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the scientific justification for the plan amendments to reasonably protect the beneficial uses of fish and wildlife.
488	2	The reduced flows that have operated throughout the Delta and its associated input river networks over the past 15-20 years have taken tremendous tolls on the health of this complex ecosystem. On average less than 50% of the aggregate freshwater flow from the San Joaquin river network ever reaches the Bay, and in some years less than 35%. This reduced freshwater inflow shifts the shape, size and location of the salinity mixing zone within the Delta, ultimately affecting everything in the food chain from plankton to marine mammals. [Footnote 2: "Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem," State Water Resources Control Board, California Environmental Protection Agency. Phil Crader et al. (2010), see also "San Francisco Bay: The Freshwater-Starved Estuary," The Bay Institute. See also "Saving the Lower San Joaquin River and Its Tributaries: The Importance of Instream Flow," National Resources Defense Council, Issue Brief (May 2016).] And this detrimental mixing zone shift is now a chronic feature of the Bay-Delta system,	The State Water Board acknowledges that reduced flows have negatively affected the LSJR, and the fish and wildlife species dependent on it. Please refer to Appendix C, Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives; and Chapter 7, Aquatic Biological Resources, Section 7.2.2, Reservoirs, Tributaries, and LSJR, for additional information. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for additional responses to general comments on the plan amendments.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>accruing incremental biological/ecological damage over time as native species (from bacteria to invertebrates to fish and plant life) are out-competed by invasive ones better suited to the altered salinity zones now present in the Bay- Delta system. In some cases it is not simply a matter of competition but outright toxicity. These detrimental effects on the Bay-Delta region as a result of low flows, however, are exacerbated by even greater flow restrictions in the three major tributary rivers feeding the San Joaquin. Between 1986 and 2009, for example, from 60% to nearly 80% of the February to June unimpaired flow was diverted for agricultural, urban and/or industrial use which, in the case of the Tuolumne River allowed only 21% of the water to flow downstream. [Footnote 4: State Water Resources Control Board, "Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan Draft Substitute Environmental Document (2015)," as cited in "Saving the Lower San Joaquin River and Its Tributaries: The Importance of Instream Flow," National Resources Defense Council, Issue Brief (May 2016).]</p> <p>Predictably, these severe flow restrictions helped generate disastrous effects upon the river ecosystems. The resultant impediments to fish migration, reduction in access and/or availability of floodplain habitat (important to many juvenile fish in foraging and protection from predators), reduction in spawning sites, the raise in water temperatures, decrease in river current and aeration, decrease in dissolved oxygen, concentration of pollutants (pesticides, herbicides, fertilizer components, industrial pollutants, etc.) as a consequence of the reduced water volume, altered migratory cues to fish, etc. were certainly part of the well documented decimation of the salmon populations that historically utilized those rivers. [Footnote 5: Zeug, S. Sellheim, K. Watry, C., et al, "Response of Juvenile Chinook Salmon to Managed Flow: Lessons Learned from a Population at the Southern Extent of Their Range in North America," Fisheries Management and Ecology, vol. 21, no. 155, p155-169 (Apr. 2014). See also Marchetti, M. and Moyle, P., "Effects of Flow Regime on Fish Assemblages in a Regulated California Stream," Ecological Applications, vol. 11, no. 2, p530-590 (Apr. 2001).]</p>	
488	3	[ATT1: Table 1. Median Percentage of Unimpaired Flow in the Lower San Joaquin River Tributaries.]	The commenter is providing 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.
488	4	<p>The agricultural sector in the San Joaquin Valley and associated watershed needs and deserves use of some of the water that is the lifeblood of the San Joaquin River network and a key component of the Bay-Delta ecosystem. What must be reasoned out is what level and types of agriculture are sustainable, given the finite amounts of water present and the simultaneous necessity of sustaining healthy river ecosystems. The extent of agriculture, its predominant crop types and its practice and technology have changed greatly over the last 100 years, and especially so since the mid-to-late 1800s when water rights were first starting to be established across much of the Central Valley. [Footnote 7: Olmstead, A. and Rhode, P. "The Evolution of California Agriculture 1850- 2000" in California Agriculture: Dimensions and Issues, ed. By Jerry Siebert, University of California Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (2003). See also Johnson, R. and Cody, B., "California Agricultural Production and Irrigated Water Use," Congressional Research Service Report 7-5700 (June 2015).]</p> <p>As agriculture changed (both with respect to the type of crop grown, the availability of tractors, harvesters, combines and the like, the development of powerful and efficient pump technologies, etc.) more and more land was irrigated [Footnote 8: Ibid.] and the demand for water expanded accordingly. By the early-to-mid 1900's groundwater pumping</p>	Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, for information on the consideration of beneficial uses. This comment does not make a general comment about the plan amendments or raise significant environmental issues. No further response is required.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>for irrigation had become so excessive that dramatic and damaging land subsidence was occurring throughout most of the Central Valley...but agriculture continued to expand. The federal Raker Act (1913) permitted the first serious round of dam constructions in California, but that too was insufficient. The resultant demand for water by the agricultural sector drove the formation of the California Water Project (1933) and the damming of most of the major rivers draining from the Sierra mountain range. These actions allowed a degree of river flow reduction and diversion to agricultural use that has now become incompatible with continued viability of the San Joaquin river system network.</p>	
488	5	<p>We have drained dry great lakes (Tulare Lake in California...the largest lake west of the Mississippi and one we drained dry by the middle of the last century...is one ignominious example) and entire seas (the Aral Sea disaster is our shameful example) to feed agriculture's insatiable thirst, while submerging our most beautiful canyon systems (Hetch Hetchy Valley and Glenn Canyon systems, for example) to supply our continued and unsustainable urban development. We must take a different route now. As the planet warms we must undertake every effort to preserve in perpetuity those precious, critically important natural ecosystem that sustain us.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, for information on the consideration of beneficial uses. This comment does not make a general comment about the plan amendments or raise significant environmental issues. No further response is required.</p>
488	6	<p>In the 1983 decision "National Audubon Society v. Superior Court" (Audubon, 33 Aal.3d 419), the California Supreme Court ruled that California water law is an integration of the public trust doctrine and the appropriate water right system, and that the State had an affirmative duty to take the public trust into account in the planning and allocation of water resources. Beyond this legal requirement, there are moral and philosophical imperatives. Rivers and river ecosystems are in fact a legacy for future generations, and our actions must not jeopardize the quality or viability of this national heritage. So how can we strike a balance in water use that sustains both the agricultural community and the rivers on which all are dependent?</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for a discussion regarding the consideration of beneficial uses and the Public Trust doctrine.</p>
488	7	<p>Estimates undertaken by the State Water Resources Control Board indicate that a 40% unimpaired flow through the San Joaquin and its tributaries will result in a small (1.5%) drop in crop revenue as well as a similar decrease (1.5%) in aggregate agricultural economic output and (1.5%) loss in agricultural jobs. [Footnote 9: See "Saving the Lower San Joaquin River and Its Tributaries: The Importance of Instream Flow," National Resources Defense Council, Issue Brief (May 2016) and references therein.] If the unimpaired river flow is increased to 60%, crop revenue, agricultural economic output and job loss increase to 4.5%.</p> <p>A linear projection between these two estimates thus infers a 3% decrease in all three categories (crop revenue, agricultural economic output and jobs) if the flow through the Stanislaus, Merced, Tuolumne and San Joaquin river complex was targeted to a net 50% unimpaired flow. Leaving, on average, half of a river's water in the river will give it a fighting chance at recovery. Clearly, for ecological purposes the flow rate on any of these rivers on any specific day will probably need to be adjusted (to optimize fish migration and spawning opportunities, to allow for floodplain inundation at the most opportune times, etc.), but the adoption of a net 50% unimpaired flow provides an adequate framework. Adoption of a net 50% unimpaired flow through this river network will greatly facilitate recovery and health of this vital river ecosystem and, while the 3% or so loss in crop revenues, jobs and aggregate agricultural economic output will undoubtedly be painful, by this approach both the rivers and agriculture can survive together, and both will be sustainable over the coming decades and centuries.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments about setting higher flow requirements. Also, please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, for discussion of the balancing of beneficial uses.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
488	8	[ATT2: Table 2. Predicted Agricultural Impacts Under Two Unimpaired Flow Standard Scenarios]	The commenter is providing 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.
488	9	I respectfully recommend that flow through the Stanislaus, Merced, Tuolumne and San Joaquin river complex be targeted at a net 50% of unimpaired flow.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments in general support of the plan amendments, a specific percent of unimpaired flow, or an LSJR alternative.
489	1	We are definitely opposed to your plan to increase river flows because of the economic effects it will have on agriculture and farming in multiple 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.
490	1	Your idea to increase river flows is a huge waste of a precious resource. There are other ways to save fish. People are more important than the few fish this process will save. Stop the insanity. Stop the smokescreen of saving fish. You plan to make money off 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.
491	1	The impact of your ill-advised plan to increase river flows on even the overall state economy would be terrible due to the adverse affects on the state's huge agricultural segment. Cutting water to farmers would inevitably result in more groundwater pumping in order to try to protect the huge long-term investments in orchards that take up to 5 years to come into production. The increases in water flow already implemented have not solved the problem. The timing of flows, and reducing the predators. As much as I sympathize with bass fisherman, the introduction of the striped bass has had a very bad effect on our native species.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
491	2	The cost of doing business and living in California could be protected or reduced if the water releases were done when both water releases and electricity are in huge demand due to the summer season.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
492	1	More Water Does Not Equal More Fish. Simply flushing water down the river in the spring and fall does not work a fact supported by more than two decades of proven science. Raising unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus and other rivers will not work.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
493	1	I am opposed to increasing flows in the Stanislaus River because I believe it will cause more stress on our groundwater supply. I am also concerned with the potential loss of jobs.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
494	1	We need to protect our rivers not only for the enjoyment of the current and future generations, but for the health of the wildlife that depends upon them and for the economic stability of our fishermen. The precipitous decline of salmon populations in our rivers is an indication that our policies and practices regarding our rivers are failing. The salmon are an important source of food not only for humans, but for over a hundred other species as well. When the salmon are in trouble, the whole food chain is in trouble. If we continue down the path of "business as usual" our rivers will die, and we as a people will have failed. We need to reverse this trend before it is too late.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
494	2	According to the 2010 report "Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem" we need approximately 60% of unimpaired flow between February and June to fully protect the fish and wildlife in the lower San Joaquin River and the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced River tributaries. Therefore, I urge the board to adopt this recommendation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
496	1	It is appalling that New Melones lake level is so low considering the nearby Tulloch and Don Pedro lakes are filling. Considering the increase in rain in January 2017, more analysis should	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
		be done in how much water is being released from Melones compared to the nearby lakes. It seems that Tulloch never goes down, even in the summer when there is no rain. Is this because of the million-dollar homes lining the lake?	comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
496	2	The recreational use of Melones during the summer months has decreased to a point of non-use. It is causing an income loss to the marina, the houseboat rentals, the value of the surrounding homes. It is not fair. It is difficult from an individual consumer view to understand if adequate analysis is being done on a continuing basis. If agriculture and hydroelectric power is needed by Melones, how much is needed and how much is being drained? Stop the excessive draining of Melones, unless it is really necessary.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
497	1	Responsible water management is key in protecting our farmers' ability to provide food that feeds the nation and the world! I do not like your proposal to put waste more water in our rivers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
498	1	I know there is still so much to be done regarding the protection and quality of California's natural waterways. I am writing to you today with an impassioned plea to please improve protections for the San Joaquin River. As the State Water Resources Control Board you have the power to update flow standards in the state's 2"d largest river and one that has been declared the most endangered river in America.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
498	2	The best available science shows that at least half of the natural flow from the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Merced and lower San Joaquin Rivers should make it to the Delta. There is no evidence that that Board's current plan (an average of 40% of this "unimpaired flow") will be sufficiently protective of the rivers or their 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.
498	3	I am an avid backpacker, rock climber, and boater in California. Being able to take a weekend trip out of the city and into the diverse and healthy ecosystems of California's wilderness makes all the difference to my own sense of wellbeing.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
498	4	Walking along a creek filled with native fish populations and full flow I can imagine a living landscape that my children might be able to enjoy one day, and this puts my mind and heart at ease. But this is only possible if we continue to improve the current environmental situation in California. The Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to improve protections for the San Francisco Bay, the Delta, the rivers that feed them, and our salmon (among other wildlife populations).	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
499	1	My family has been farming in this basin for over 76 years. We have third generation and soon to be fourth gen involved in the agriculture industry. If this Bay Delta SED passes, our livelihood will be at risk and our futures will be affected.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
499	2	We have supported MID's efforts (at great expense to all of the district) to come up with a workable solution to the State's water issues. Beyond storage, this is a workable 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.