

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
684	1	<p>In the interest of time I actually have a letter that I'm going to submit to the Board. You know, frankly from my perspective the report is so riddled with inaccuracies and misinformation and flawed analysis that we put those in the longer letter. And I'm going to make some briefer comments right now, more general in their nature.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments.</p>
684	2	<p>These hearings have offered a very public forum to display the enormous disconnect that exists between protecting the San Joaquin Valley water supplies, environmental goals for fish populations, and what your Plan actually proposes. Environmental groups criticized this Plan at the first Sacramento hearing, for failing to demonstrate any legitimate benefit to salmon populations. And asked that the Plan incorporate non-flow measures, which they believe ecological goals cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Agricultural interests have leveled the same criticism. That without non-flow measures, the proposal before you today simply wastes precious water without any discernible benefit.</p> <p>You also heard from irrigation districts as well as local city and county officials, who explained in great detail that the proposal will jeopardize the drinking water supplies of one -and-a-half million people in one of the most disadvantaged areas of the state.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments. For discussion of non-flow measures, refer to Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, and Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures. Refer to Master Response 2.7, Disadvantaged Communities, Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, and Master 3.6, Service Providers, for information regarding disadvantaged communities and water supplies.</p>
684	3	<p>Where one in four live in poverty, where unemployment consistently remains five points above the rest of the state. In fact, the area put on the chopping block faces significant challenges beyond poverty. Challenges like being the largest contiguous health professional shortage area in California. Where life expectancy and educational attainment is among the lowest in the state, while violent crime rates, air pollution, and premature deaths are among the highest.</p> <p>We disagree about the number of job losses this Plan will cause as well as how severe the economic impacts will be. Although I must point out that while SED predicts removing 300,000 acre-feet of water from northern San Joaquin Valley will cost just \$68 million, your own economists working on the Delta Tunnels Project predict every 100,000 acre-feet of water has a total economic value of \$1.4 billion.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, acknowledging the concerns of elected representatives and community members. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) directed several economic evaluations on what was known as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP). These are not economic evaluation by or for the State Water Board. In 2014, DWR stopped pursuit of BDCP and began moving forward with what is now known as California WaterFix. As discussed in Master Response 1.1, General Comments, the State Water Board has a very specific and narrow role in the water right proceedings related to the request for a change in diversion location for the California WaterFix. In addition, as a foundational matter, the State Water Project and Central Valley Project service areas include a significant portion of the San Francisco Bay area, much of the Central Valley from Fresno to Bakersfield, the greater Los Angeles region, Orange County, and San Diego. Therefore, the scope of evaluation mentioned by the commenter is far greater than the scope of the Recirculated SED's analysis as described in Chapter 20, Economic Analyses.</p> <p>Given that the two studies look at vastly different geographic areas, it would be specious to apply the results of one study to the other. The State Water Board conducted its own independent analysis of economic considerations and factors for the purposes of the water quality control planning process. Please see Master Response 8.0, Economic Analyses Framework and Assessment Tools, for more information regarding the regulatory context for considering economics and the geographic extent of the analyses contained in the Recirculated SED. Please see Master Response 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model, and Master Response 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects, regarding local and regional agricultural economic effects related to the plan amendments; and Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, for a discussion of ecosystem services, municipal, hydropower, and recreational economic considerations related the plan amendments.</p>
684	4	<p>The only source of consistent agreement throughout these hearings has been that all parties prefer the more immediate and enduring option of reaching voluntary settlements. Unfortunately, because of your staff's refusal to engage in discussions during the drafting of this report, failure to respond to comments submitted on the prior version, and the disingenuous manipulation of the facts contained in the latest proposal there is a</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments regarding the public outreach process, voluntary agreements, and the consideration of comments provided on the 2012 Draft SED.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>strong and justified belief that you and your staff have not acted in good faith. The obligation to restore confidence that legitimate settlements can be reached to negotiations is squarely on your shoulders today.</p>	
685	1	<p>The communities in the 11th Assembly District and surrounding regions depend upon a healthy Delta ecosystem. The Board has taken on a massive responsibility by updating this Plan and Assembly Member Frazier would like to extend his sincerest appreciation for the time they have allowed for public comment. It is important that everyone feels as though they have reasonable time to voice their thoughts and opinions.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, acknowledging the concerns of elected representatives and other community members, and a discussion regarding the public outreach process. . Note that the public comment period was extended for a total duration of 6 months and five public hearings were held in the plan area to solicit public comments..</p>
685	2	<p>A few concerns have come up when reviewing Phase 1 regarding the proposed flow objectives and southern Delta salinity standards. The proposed 30 to 50 percent increase in flows in the current Phase 1 SED is alarming, since as has previously been discovered through the best available science, the higher flows are needed in order to save the native species that are rapidly declining in the Delta.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that generally oppose or support the plan amendments, a specific percent of unimpaired flow, or an LSJR alternative. Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the scientific justification for the plan amendments and the use of best available science as it relates to the fish analyses in the SED. The State Water Board used the best available science throughout the SED. A variety of data were obtained: quantitative data from peer-reviewed published literature on topics specific to the plan area; peer-reviewed published literature outside the plan area but on topics relevant to the plan amendments; unpublished quantitative data from within the plan area and from outside of the plan area; and/or qualitative data or personal communication with topical experts.</p>
685	3	<p>The Board should keep in mind the fact that these important fish populations, and the Delta's environment as a whole, have been disregarded in the past in order to benefit other areas throughout California. It is understandable that the Board must make their decision based on a careful balancing act between the competing needs from different regions. However, Assembly Member Frazier urges the Board to support water quality standards that are representative of best efforts to support the salmon population and other native fish that are currently suffering from previous decisions that supported water conveyance over ecological sustainability in the Delta.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, regarding balancing of beneficial uses.</p>
685	4	<p>There are apprehensions about the potential for the current proposal to weaken salinity standards in the Delta. The Delta communities rely on strong salinity standards in order to ensure a level of water quality that will not devastate the agricultural region, compromise rival drinking water, and destroy fisheries in this area. The Board should not take action that will put in place a system that will relaxes these standards to benefit agricultural businesses in the Central Valley while leaving the burden on the agricultural community in the Delta. Hurting this industry will inevitably lead to a loss of jobs in the Delta region.</p> <p>Public health is also at stake here. The Board should consider the direct impacts on the residents of the Delta communities and their water supply that would result from the weakening of salinity standards in the southern Delta. This is a major issue that cannot be ignored when considering the proposed revisions.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.3, Southern Delta Water Quality, regarding the justification for updating the southern Delta salinity objectives and why there will not be degradation in water quality. In addition, please see Chapter 5, Surface Hydrology and Water Quality, which includes a description of water quality in the southern Delta and why it is unlikely to be affected by the SDWQ alternatives.</p>
689	1	<p>I wanted to give you a little history that MID was formed in 1887. It was called the Wright Act, built La Grange Dam and completed it in 1893, and started our first flow of water in 1904 out of our main canal. That's the history I wanted to have, and now this is going to be mainly about the Tuolumne River.</p> <p>And I'm concerned about science, I'm concerned about modeling. I don't think anyone understands that Tuolumne better than I do and has lived it like I have. Now, I have watched this fish population fluctuate over years, okay? Since 1971, that I've been there</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>paying attention to these fish. And it's always done this.</p> <p>On these wet years you get a wet year -- I'll give you an example, 2011 -- we ran large flows down the river and no salmon for four years as you guys know. We've been in a four-year dry period. This year we had one of our biggest numbers in the last 15 years; 3,521 fish this morning. As of last year at this date, 500.</p> <p>So all that water or no water, no water, and we have all these fish this year doesn't add up, but it adds up to me. Because I've seen this happen for years, it's just like this, it doesn't matter. It's a roller coaster ride. Some years you have 3,400 fish, some years you have 3 or 4,000 fish. It's just the way it is.</p> <p>It is never due to the water, because we run the same flows of water consistently. Especially the last four to five years, those have been consistent flows. And when I heard somebody say earlier single-digit numbers, but it's always 100 CFS plus. And we add a little bit of water to those flows to show our best foot forward.</p>	
689	2	<p>I want to talk real quickly about doing restoration work on the Tuolumne. I introduced Dave and Allison Boucher, who is the Tuolumne River Conservatory, to a piece of land on the Tuolumne River 20 years ago. So if you scratch my back I've got a little enviro here, because I am a conservationist. I am an environmentalist. I want to preserve the land. I want to preserve the river, but we've got to do it in the right way.</p> <p>We've got to do it to where we don't do more harm in the river than we're doing now. I think what we're doing now, in the flows that we're doing in this river currently, are the answer. This is what's going on. You see the fish numbers each year.</p> <p>Also, we need to do more restoration projects. Allison and Dave did a beautiful restoration project on the upper Tuolumne at Bobcat Flat where they purchased this 200 acres of ground. And I helped them find this, get there, why would I do that? Why would I be working with an environmental group on the river? Because I want that river to be the river they want it to be. I want to see those fish.</p>	Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
689	3	<p>A contradiction to what you might have heard the other day and what I heard in one of the hearings -- the eagle, the Bald eagle and the beaver were the two comments I heard -- they're not seeing them like they did. Very untrue. We have such a beaver problem on the Tuolumne River it's unbelievable. And the Bald eagle is up there everywhere, everywhere on our ranch. So we're seeing them everywhere, so I just wanted to dispute the idea that we're not losing wildlife on the Tuolumne whatsoever.</p>	Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
689	4	<p>I'm real concerned that if we don't pay attention to this that we're going to shoot ourselves in the foot. When I see a large water flow, a lot of times we're not seeing the fish, because we screwed them up.</p> <p>One more thing I'm going to leave you with, I've never seen a smolt in that river after March 15th. There's no spring-run Chinook and by then all the smolts have been worked down the river, so I've never seen that. I want you to know that, so when you're talking about those after March flows they're very unnecessary. It's not there, it's just not there, why waste that block of water on something that's not there?</p> <p>It's working what we're doing. We'll continue doing what we're doing. And I promise you</p>	Master Response 1.1, 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
		that MID and TID are willing to do restoration programs on that river or anything besides those flow measures that will actually do more harm than good.	
690	1	Given the NorCal drought, please cease and desist in damaging NorCal rivers by adding concrete storage etcetera, avoiding concrete for groundwater.	Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
690	2	In local health from HMO reports there is more dust in the Delta Breeze now and increased soil salinity.	Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
690	3	We have financial losses for food crops to U.S.A. -- 50 percent from California and most of it Stanislaus and the San Joaquin County, I understand. And it impacts local jobs in related industry. Three, property for water rights, I'd heard 11 wells had gone dry in San Joaquin County two years ago and Chairman Marcus knew more facts about that than I did.	Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
690	4	<p>There was a talk of impact increases, of increased salt on soil salinity. My father said five years before the drought that there was more salt in our soil just 12 miles -- in the Delta Loop twelve miles from. And our pest control advisor is very informative, and we meet with him every week or two, and said that NorCal drought causes more drought. So we need to be careful in the area if we're already increasing salt in the soil. We don't need a concrete jungle in NorCal for various reasons given.</p> <p>I want to thank you very much for having these meetings and coming to us in support of Stockton, where we can increase Delta dredging for the flow and purify the water.</p>	Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
691	1	<p>I am Captain James Cox. I am President of the California Striped Bass Association and I represent the interests of thousands of Delta fishermen who are extremely concerned over the San Joaquin River flows and their effect on the Delta. I have fished, personally, the Delta for over 50 years, including 22 years as a professional fishing charter guide.</p> <p>I have watched the health of the Delta decline through that time. Part of the decline is directly attributable to the massive reductions in the San Joaquin River flows. In light of the passing of the Federal Drought Bill, establishing a realistic San Joaquin River flow and enforcing it, has become critically important.</p> <p>One of the things that it has affected, the salinity buildup in the south Delta, is the lack of flows. In the history of the Delta before man tried to reroute water, the flow of the San Joaquin River would have been measurable clear to Chipps Island. Now, it hardly even makes it to Stockton. And it is, as the Army Corps of Engineers has said, the third most polluted river in the country. And so we have replaced good water that thrived, that helped fisheries and all sorts of various aspects as we've heard today, and we've replaced it with some of the most polluted water in the country.</p> <p>If there was a freshwater flow, the south Delta would be a haven for striped bass spawns like they were for over a century. Your own panel showed I think the most important graphic, which showed the success rate of spawns. And all the spawns were successful in the highest flows, during the years of the highest flows. And that's not just salmon, that's striped bass, that's white sturgeon, green sturgeon, steelhead, American shad. All of the anadromous fisheries benefit from the high flows. When we restrict that we restrict the fish. So many people are trying to make this as a fish versus people type situation.</p>	Master Response 1.1, 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
691	2	<p>There are so many more benefits to the flows than just fish. There's the drinking water sources for all the counties that comprise the Delta. Like the panel was discussing earlier, it affects the discharge and the success of the discharge. If we continue to reduce the flows, and in light of the drought, we're going to have saltwater intrusion that will then make its way into the aquifer and will ruin groundwater for everybody's use. These points are critical for our future.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
691	3	<p>I would like to just make one comment to the Representative from Congressman Denham. California Striped Bass Association would like to say that we strongly object to the things that the Representative said. The point that Fish and Wildlife does not do studies. They haven't done studies that agree with Mr. Denham's point of view. They have done plenty of studies and the studies all show the same thing, that the highest impact on fisheries or on spawn survivals is water flow, not predation. Predation is the lowest impact. And Mr. Denham just wants to continue to study this until he gets the answer he wants, but his facts have been thrown out of court before as not being true science.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
692	1	<p>Your Board is fully aware of -- you've already shared that the current water use demands are greater than what the Delta ecosystem and at-risk aquatic species can sustainably withstand -- and you're obviously doing your best to try and determine how to comply with the Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Act mandates to take remedial action.</p> <p>The reason that challenges have lingered to this point is that whenever there is a proposal by the state there is a huge outcry. And in this situation, as you're already aware, water interests have collectively realigned, newspapers have stirred up opposition with editorials and articles, and water districts have blanketed urban and rural areas with signs urging to fight against any reductions of their water.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
692	2	<p>As someone who lives in the mountains where the water comes from I could argue that Valley interests take our water without regard for the consequences. Thousands of acres of dry land acreage in the Tuolumne, Stanislaus and Merced River basins have been converted to orchard or row crops even in the midst of the drought. And it is not likely that if you delay taking a strong action there will be less proponents for agricultural withdrawals of water in the future. The reality is, is the Water Board cannot allow the continuation of a status quo demands if you're to comply with legal mandates.</p> <p>So our Center strongly supports the SED scientific assessment that 50 to 60 percent of unimpaired flows would best restore dwindling salmonid populations and meet water quality objectives in the Delta. That would truly be what would be best ecologically. But our Center recognizes there needs to be a politically realistic and centrist balance that reduces impacts to water users as well. So today, despite trying to be a strong voice for the environment I do recognize that you have to seek balanced middle ground. And that you will have to adjust, to some degree, to minimize the impacts to users.</p> <p>I believe that the Alternative 3, 40 percent flow, even though it does not meet the ideal needs of salmon and water quality and Delta salinity and other values, that it does provide a good beginning point for moving forward. I ask the Water Board to stand behind the science and the legal obligations that justify no less than the proposed alternative that you're putting forward. And non-flow measures can clearly contribute to river and Delta ecosystem improvements, but increased flows and cooler temperatures are truly pivotal to finding a balanced, sustainable solution.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, 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
693	1	<p>We were responsible for cleaning the water in the river, so 200,000 people could drink it. I know what's in that water. As well, we have dams in the upper watershed, and was instrumental in being involved in the management of the relationship with the Bureau of Reclamation on New Melones, so I have a little bit of history with the river. And I'm now retired, happily retired.</p> <p>But I thought I should come today, because I have some concerns--a specific piece of information--and I gave a graph [see ATT1] that can be presented, but this is a dataset that goes back to 1895 on the river. And it shows the flow regimes every year. And there's a red line across the bottom that shows those years where there was not even 600,000 acre-feet of water. And what's telling here is the years shown from 1895 and 1975, an 80-year-old window, there were 7 times where there was not even 600,000 acre-feet of water. Now look at the 30 years or 40 years, 1975 to 2015, that happened 14 times. In the last 40 years, we've lost substantial capacity of the average annual runoff.</p> <p>Now, the modeling in the SED has a set that I believe goes to 1920. And what I would ask you is to seriously look at climate impacts in that watershed and the other watersheds under the SED, because you don't have the water that you think you have, that you're going to get from this reduction. You actually are looking at somewhere around 959,000 acre-feet, not 1.1 million acre-feet, because I believe you've got the wrong dataset.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2.5, Baseline and No Project, for information concerning the baseline, and Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, for a discussion on the modeling approach used in the Recirculated SED. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding climate change and the plan amendments and clarification of the unimpaired flow approach.</p> <p>The commenter states that “you are actually looking at somewhere around 959,000 acre-feet, not 1.1 million.” It is unclear which analyses the commenter is referencing for the cited number, because it is not provided. However, the proposed 30 to 50 percent unimpaired flow range does not mean that surface water supplies would be cut by 30 to 50 percent. It means that 30 to 50 percent of the unimpaired flow (with a starting flow of 40 percent of unimpaired flow) would be required to stay in the river. Table ES-14 provides mean annual February-June instream flow in the plan area by water year type. The unimpaired flow estimate for the Merced River in a wet year is 575,000 acre-feet. That represents a baseline flow in a wet year (i.e. without the plan amendments) of 541,000 acre-feet and an average annual increase in response to the implementation of the plan amendments of 34,000 acre feet, which is a 6 percent change.</p>
693	2	<p>SED ignores the impacts on imports. It significantly understates the groundwater impacts. As I showed in this graph [see ATT1] it ignores the climate impacts. And it ignores the impacts on the districts that can no longer operate the reservoirs that they paid for. No taxpayer dollars, no state, these are district paid for by the landowners. And they now have to be operated under a paradigm that deprives them or diminishes their capacity to earn revenues from power sales.</p> <p>And what you've already done by this hearing, by releasing this document, is damage their credit-worthiness. Because when you sit in front of a credit rating agency and try to issue public debt the first thing they ask you is the underlying premise that you're relying on for repaying that debt. And it's our water rights and this is a taking out of that.</p>	<p>It is unclear what the commenter means by impacts on imports; please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the purposes and goals of the plan amendments. Please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, for information regarding the groundwater impacts disclosed in Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources, of the Recirculated SED. Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, for additional information related to the Water Supply Effects Model and the reasonable representation of the plan amendments by the model. For information regarding climate change, please also see Master Response 3.2, and Chapter 14, Energy and Greenhouse Gases, Impact EG-5, Effect of climate change on the LSJR and SDWQ alternatives. Please see Master Response 8.0, Economic Analyses Framework and Assessment Tools, and Master Response 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects, for information regarding the framework and scope of the economic analyses and for information regarding potential fiscal effects. Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, for information regarding water rights and the authority of the State Water Board.</p>
693	3	<p>ATT1: New Melones Inflow</p> <p>Departures from Average (1,144,200 acre-feet)</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 693-2.</p>
694	1	<p>I fully recognize that there is a complex demand on fresh water flowing from the Lower San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers -- that the State Water Board must consider all beneficial uses for these three rivers and look for ways to balance all those interests. However, the collective demands on these three rivers from agriculture, industry, and public uses are not only decreasing flows, but contributing to diminished ecosystems and to the decline of the region's federally listed salmonids.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
694	2	<p>Natural production of adult fall-run Chinook salmon are in steeper decline in the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers than in any other tributary of Sacramento or San Joaquin River. Therefore, it's apparent that fish and wildlife beneficial uses are not being met. Therefore, I'm in support of the State Water Board's Alternative 4 to have sufficient flows during the important salmonid rearing and outmigration period, February through</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>June, at a range of 50 to 60 percent unimpaired flows. But I also support the State Water Board's proposed Alternative 3, with 40 percent as the starting point, if I am to consider all interests involved.</p> <p>Increasing flows will inherently have positive impacts on water temperature, dissolved oxygen levels, fine sediment loads, and improve habitat and floodplain, wetland and riparian zones, among other positive impacts. These improvements in turn will lead to enhancement in adult Salmonid migration, spawning, egg incubation, juvenile growth and outmigration and so on.</p> <p>In addition to increasing flows, I also emphasize the importance of implementing flows that better mimic the natural hydrographic conditions in terms of magnitude, timing and frequency of flows. I am also in support of the ten non-flow measures proposed in the draft SED. These non-flow measures may better improve fish and wildlife beneficial uses than increasing flow alone. I also support putting forth biological goals for the flow objectives as indicators of salmonid viability. And finally I support establishing base flow requirements for Vernalis, from February through June, to reasonably protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses, especially during the critically dry years.</p>	
694	3	<p>Regardless of our own priorities or values, we can all agree that fresh water is precious in California. Into the future we have a responsibility to practice water conservation at a commercial and private scale to safeguard California's fresh water for the benefit of all users, including salmon.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
695	1	<p>I'm very appreciative of the fact that our forefathers had great foresight to establish water storage in the Sierra Nevada. And that was paid for, as many speakers have said, by private funds. Food is an important thing to us. Sometimes I enjoy it a little too much. But it's something that is very important and it is something that has to take, I believe, priority over even some of these other issues like fish.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
695	2	<p>One of the problems with this SED is the fact that there has been a lack of collaboration. This should have been formed using your experts as well as the experts from the many organizations that could help with giving us great insight. I'm not an expert on any of this stuff, but I do know that I have looked at figures and tables and all kinds of things, and one person says one thing and another says another. There has to be some kind of truth that could be obtained through collaboration instead of "us" versus "them."</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
696	1	<p>We're currently experiencing an extinction event with the ecosystem. The last trawl for Delta smelt didn't turn up one smelt. Yeah, I would agree with the previous speaker that we should not pit farmer versus fisherman, I think that's a false choice. I think that there is plenty of room to work together, but if agriculture experienced a 99 or 100 percent decrease in production, you know we would have a serious problem. So the magnitude and the scale of this crisis for the ecosystem cannot be undersold.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
696	2	<p>The native fish are the canaries in the coalmine. Humanity does not exist separately and distinctly from the environment. If the Delta dies, we die. And this may not be in the next five days, the next five months, the next five years. In the next five decades absolutely, this will happen.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
696	3	<p>The freshwater exports from the Bay-Delta Estuary must be reduced. We need to maximize freshwater flows all the way to the ocean. That's the lifeblood of the entire</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>system. How? How do we do this? Do we divide and conquer? Do we pit Delta farmers and eastern farmers versus fishermen while Westlands and Kern get a free pass? Exporting massive amounts of water to Westlands and Kern planting nut trees in a semi-arid desert, while they rake in billions of dollars in profits, while the ecosystem dies and we're here battling each other seems a little crazy to me.</p>	<p>comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
696	4	<p>The monetary cost, environmental cost and opportunity cost of excessive freshwater exports from the Delta are currently being felt. If freshwater flows through the Delta are not increased we'll be looking at a cascading effect of negative consequences that will make Flint, Michigan look like a picnic. And what I'm talking about here is weakening of the salinity standards in the south Delta. Water quality standards must be protected to support agriculture, drinking water, municipal discharge, fisheries and groundwater recharge.</p> <p>Please, protect the people of the Delta and the Bay Area, protect fish, avoid incalculable monetary cost due to degraded water quality. Please, permanently reduce freshwater exports from the Delta.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
697	1	<p>A Bay-Delta that cannot support fish in wildlife cannot support clean drinking water, clean groundwater, clean irrigation water or provide safe, wild fish to eat.</p> <p>Please, please, protect the fish, water flowing all the way to the ocean.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
698	1	<p>The General Manager of South San Joaquin Irrigation District [and] General Manager, Oakdale Irrigation District.</p> <p>Together, the two districts represent 107 years of history on the Stanislaus River. We have the oldest and largest senior water rights on the Stanislaus River. Back in the early 20th Century the districts built a series of diversion dams and reservoir storage in Old Melones. And we built the three reservoirs in the '50s we call our Tri-Dam Project, which includes Donnells, Beardsley and Tulloch Reservoirs. Tulloch is just downstream of New Melones. We also worked out an agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation, which effectuated to build the construction of New Melones, which resolved the water rights, and our water rights, and delineated or described the usage of our water rights and the delivery of our water rights through New Melones Reservoir.</p> <p>As you can see, we have quite a history in the local region. And as a result of the water development and the diversion and delivery of surface water it's provided a significant benefit. And the history of many of the cities that are in and around our area, as well as the agricultural region, has developed as a result of that.</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>
698	2	<p>We're going to start off with some basic Stanislaus River facts. We hear very frequently that the Stanislaus River is over-allocated and it's true. And here's some of the reasons behind that. First off, our average annual runoff in the Stanislaus is about 1.068 million acre-feet. If you look at the annual releases to the river currently at--this is instream flow--that's about 439,000 acre-feet. Our diversions, OID and SSJID, are about 505,000 acre-feet. And then you have CVP contractors out at New Melones and the Bureau's contractors, Stockton East Water District and Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District, that divert on average about 107,000 acre-feet.</p> <p>If you were to subtract the current basin's annual runoff from its annual water demand</p>	<p>The commenter provides general concerns and facts about the Stanislaus River water supply and allocations to irrigation districts. 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 for a discussion of the programmatic approach to the analyses contained in the SED and a general description of total unimpaired flow as it relates to hydrologic conditions.</p> <p>Some of the water for the plan amendments is water that is already left in the river under current operations. However, as described in the SED, some additional water would be needed to meet the instream flow objectives of the LSJR alternatives. A summary of the estimated reduction in diversions</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>using all those numbers you would see that there would be only about 17,000 acre-feet left, on average, every year for other purposes. So as we're evaluating this Substitute Environmental Document, the SED, certainly we are wondering where the water is going to come from to meet that, the needs of additional flow down the river.</p> <p>Currently, we can categorize those flows into three basic categories: first, our instream flow requirements; second, the diversions to meet water user demands, both agricultural users and domestic water supplies; and then third, for the remainder or the leftover, it goes in storage in New Melones.</p>	<p>associated with the LSJR alternatives is provided in Table 5-19a.</p>
698	3	<p>There's little additional water to meet the needs of an unimpaired flow regime, so in order for an increase in unimpaired flow to occur in the Stanislaus it would need to come from either agricultural demands or ag and municipal demands or storage demands. And it's clear that the intent of the SED is to bolster instream flow requirements. So as a result, storage and agricultural, municipal demands are clearly in play.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 698-2. Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, regarding the requirements with which the State Water Board is complying and the fact that the State Water Board is currently undergoing water quality planning.</p> <p>In addition, much of the SED is devoted to discussion of impacts associated with potential changes in reservoir storage and changes in surface water supply for agriculture and municipalities.</p>
698	4	<p>The intent of our presentation today is not to focus primarily on the economic losses and not to focus primarily on fishery benefits. Although I would have to say I did agree with Chris Shutes from CSPA that there is no scientific basis for the 40 percent unimpaired flow. But what we are here to do is primarily focus on the economic losses or no, primarily focus on the surface water losses and the surface water impacts that we will be experiencing. Because we understand that those surface water impacts are a surrogate for not only the lack of groundwater sustainability that we will experience in the region, but also the economic losses that the region will experience if this Plan is implemented.</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. To review responses to comments submitted by other entities within the comment period on the 2106 Recirculated Draft SED, please refer to the index of commenters in Volume 3 to locate the letter number(s) of interest. Please review Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding a description of the plan amendments and please review Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the scientific basis for the plan amendments. Please review Master Response 8.0, Economic Analyses Framework and Assessment Tools, regarding a general discussion of the economic considerations covered in the SED and the tools used to address these economic considerations. Please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, regarding the relationship between the plan amendments and SGMA.</p>
698	5	<p>The districts ran some models, much like the State Board did in the SED. But what we did was we modeled the 40 percent unimpaired flow project in front of the current backdrop of water rights, priorities and regulatory requirements in the state. We considered this, the endearing term is the naked 40 percent alternative, or the pure 40 percent alternative. If the project description is 40 percent then let's look at the actual effects of 40 percent on the river. What we see in the SED are dressed-up assumptions to help minimize the impacts of a 40 percent flow regime in the Stanislaus. So we are going to compare this naked 40 or pure 40 percent alternative to the SED modeling that's in the document. And try to dispel some of the fact or fiction that we see in the SED.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, regarding the WSE as an appropriate tool to evaluate water supply effects and potential environmental impacts for the programmatic analyses contained in the SED and the reasonable representation of the plan amendments by the WSE model, and the discussion of modeling analyses presented by commenters, for a comparison of commenter's assumptions and results.</p>
698	6	<p>We're going to focus on instream flow impacts. So for our modeling purposes we reconstructed the hydrologic record much like the document does, the SED document, the modeling that's done in the SED. And we assumed for all intents and purposes that New Melones was constructed in 1922; we all know that New Melones was constructed in the late '70s and put into service in the early '80s. But in order for us to evaluate and understand what a 40 percent recommended alternative would look like in terms of water supply impacts, instream flow releases, and storage impacts we had to reconstruct the record and assume that the record would be same, moving forward. Just like you guys did in your analysis.</p> <p>So this is current instream flow releases. [ATT:1 ATT:6] And you can see there if average annual inflow in the Stanislaus River is a little over a million acre-feet there's an existing</p>	<p>Since the WSE model is based on CALSIM, presumably the same global water balance framework used by the commenter for the years 1922-2003, it is illustrative to compare the commenter's results, described in Attachment 1 to letter 1031, to the model scenarios presented in the SED. A comparison of modeling assumptions can be found in Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, in the discussion of modeling analyses presented by commenters.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>significant current flow regime in the Stanislaus River. In fact, your document states that we are at about 40 percent currently. Although if we were at a truly 40 percent, per what is in the document, we wouldn't be seeing the additional losses we are projected to incur for via the SED.</p> <p>I'm going to toggle with what the 40 percent unimpaired flow looks like. And again this is the pure 40 percent unimpaired flow option. And you can see here if I toggle back and forth it's very clear that there is additional flow going down the river as a result of the 40 percent. Even though the Stanislaus is currently at 40 percent, what's being projected is that additional flow will go down the river.</p> <p>One thing to note, there's a number of colors in here. Red, yellow and green are primarily fishery benefits. Blue is instream flow requirements. And then there's light blue on the very top and that's spills. Under existing circumstances you would see during wet years after the reservoir fills, you would see spills.</p> <p>Under the projected recommended project there are very few, if any, spills occurring in New Melones Reservoir and primarily because the additional instream flow vacates space to accommodate the wet years. But unfortunately, it doesn't have the benefit of storing that water over into future years for water supply benefits. The difference between those two, the current and the pure 40 percent alternative, you see under the current scenario about 439,000 acre-feet flow down the river. Under a 40 percent scenario, a true 40 percent scenario, there would be about 511,000 acre-feet flowed down the river to meet instream flow requirements. Again as a true 40 percent, as modeled would suggest, what's actually in the SED as showing, is 622,000. So if you were to--</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: Can you just go back for a second and help me understand what you mean by the true 40 percent, just so that as we follow up we are clear on what the distinction is?</p> <p>MR. RIETKEREK: Sure.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: You may be about to get to it.</p> <p>MR. RIETKEREK: I will get to that, more so when we get to storage.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: Okay, I just wanted to understand it.</p> <p>MR. RIETKEREK: Yes. Yeah, but what we're seeing here is basically that the SED is proposing to release more than a 40 percent unimpaired flow, especially as an average annual effluent to the reservoir. What's really being modeled here is over 622,000 from the Stanislaus River being allocated instream flow needs. And the fiction in that is that there is this sense, and you've heard it in the room today, that the San Joaquin River and the Stanislaus being a surrogate for other tributaries as well in the San Joaquin River minimally contribute to instream flow requirements or fishery needs.</p> <p>Well, the fact is if you look at the entire basin and you look at flows at Vernalis, as a percentage of unimpaired flow Vernalis is already getting 40 percent. In fact, if you look at the record and what we're showing here, 1930 to 2008, over 78 years of record, approximately 48 percent of those--or sorry, approximately out of those 78 years, the entire record, the average is about 48 percent as a percentage of unimpaired flow. Not</p>	

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>the 15 or 20 that we're hearing, entirely.</p> <p>MS. D'ADAMO: It's hard to see this. And if I could get the PowerPoint on this--</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: Yes, we can do that.</p> <p>MS. D'ADAMO: --but what's the timeframe that you're looking at?</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: 1930 through 2008.</p> <p>MS. D'ADAMO: In months?</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: Oh, this is--</p> <p>MS. D'ADAMO: Is this average annual?</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: This is average annual, yes.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: Right. And so you're going to get to the distinction between an average that averages the wet years with the dry years?</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: We are looking at average annual here. And the project that you're proposing is also a 40 percent, February-through-June, but in all years on average.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: In all years, right. That's the difference.</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: Yes, and I'm looking--this isn't all years, on average. This is an average one. And if you look there are some distinctions. In this graph again this is annual, but if you look at some of even the critically dry years for the entire basin, about 41 percent of flow is hitting Vernalis as a percentage of unimpaired flow in the basin.</p> <p>One of the things we see as a justification for that is if you look at the document, the document is squarely focusing on flows in February through June. And what we think or what we believe is happening here is the state is basically taking the rest of unimpaired flow that's happening during the year, which can be a fairly large volume at times. And it's failing to--in acknowledging that a number of those flows are already being released, much of that flow is already being released down the river and then saying, "Well, we don't need to look at that, because that's already being met and being used to meet Vernalis flows."</p>	
698	7	<p>We [SSJID and OID] want to look at the February through June piece, because that's the flow that's most critical not only for temperature benefits, but also for storage. And frankly, that's the piece of time in which we are looking at. And we utilize, as agricultural water providers and municipal water providers, to provide water to our constituents during the summer months. So this unimpaired flow analysis, while February through June is a piece of the puzzle we're not looking at the entire pie as it relates to unimpaired flow.</p> <p>We were going to make the point here that in February through June it's pretty much asserted in the document that this is needed for environmental flows to benefit fisheries. But from our studies on the river in June, June runoff represents almost 40 percent of the volume of water between February and June, but yet in June 1 to 2 percent of the salmon that have not--are still only left in the river; 99 percent of them have already left. And so</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the importance of June for native fish. June does not represent approximately 40 percent of unimpaired flow between February through June as the commenter has stated. This number is 20 percent or less on average for each of the rivers in the plan area between 1984 and 2009. Please see Appendix C, Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives, Tables 2.5, 2.13, 2.17, or 2.21, for more information on unimpaired flow estimates between 1984 and 2009.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>the value and benefit of taking June water is, well it's a point of contention for us. We understand the State Board wants to have this bucket theory that we're going to move this bucket back. But we think it's that bucket theory that gets you--what we talked to you [about] earlier--about 622,000 acre-feet. It allows you to accumulate water that you normally wouldn't accumulate. And that's just a point that we have a disagreement on and believe needs to be further evaluated as to the true value of taking June flows for fisheries.</p>	
698	8	<p>MR. MOORE: I wanted to reconcile a couple of things. And whenever I look at these data--I've been doing this here now four-and-a-half years--I'm always sensitive to the years you're looking at. So when you use your dataset, 1930 to 2008, and make that analysis and come up with that conclusion, I think a lot of those years we were meeting biological goals for salmon, for instance. And it might be more of a pertinent analysis--and please, answer what you think about this--but to actually choose a different timescale. Where, you know, you're looking more like since the State Water Project came along. Or maybe it's more relevant to look since 1980 when theories of impacts on flow diversions to biological productivity have come to the forefront. So I'm concerned it might be a little misleading to characterize this system going all the way back to 1930, but--</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: Well, in this case we're not trying to make the comparison to biological impacts as a result of unimpaired flow. We're looking squarely at the record, and records available to us, in trying to make the distinction between what's in the Plan versus what we're seeing on a local level and in the basin.</p> <p>MR. MOORE: Yeah, and I see the relevance of that, because we do look at the hydrographic record, going back to try to predict the future. Although we all know that's problematic with climate change, but it's something we can use to try to do the statistics on flow. So we'll be clear on that. But in terms of sort of the record and the analysis and the relevance I think collectively we're looking at answering the question, why are the biological indicators sliding when all these other things were still in place all those years ago?</p> <p>MR. KNELL: Just for clarification that table we presented--and the writing is very small--it comes from the Southern Delta Salinity Technical Report that was produced, so that's why. We didn't pick that period of time, that's an actual study supporting the fact that 48 percent is already in the river.</p> <p>MR. MOORE: Good, no that helps answer that question.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments.</p>
698	9	<p>We'll move on to storage impacts of the 40 percent. Under current storage regime if you look at the record--again, our record is about 94 years that we run here, from 1922 to 2015, it's a slightly longer than what I believe is in the record for the SED--you'll see that New Melones Reservoir fills approximately 5 times in 94 years. That's in part because the reservoir is fairly large as compared to its watershed. It can hold more than twice the average annual inflow into the watershed. But still it does provide an opportunity for, frankly, all three categories of water. And primarily environmental and water users, human water needs, to weather some of the droughts that we have experienced over the significant record. If New Melones was built in 1922 you would see that it would only go dry in three years under the current storage regime or under the current regime and under current flow regimes now.</p>	<p>Please see response to Comment 698-10.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>If the SED's 40 percent unimpaired flow recommendation was put in place, and again not looking at any mitigating factors, we would see that storage would drop to 0 in approximately 13 years under the 40 percent. And for us on the Stanislaus we always look at New Melones as an indicator of drought. Today we're sitting at about 40 percent of historical average for this time of year; it's still relatively low. And a reason for that is because we have significant demands, but we also have significant instream fishery needs that are being met during this time of year, keeping storage depressed as compared to some of the other reservoirs. Additional flow down the river will just make that significantly worse. Again, most of the drought periods that we experienced if you toggle back you'd see that we would weather most of the significant droughts, at least from a storage standpoint. Especially those in the early '30s, '60s, even '76-'77, is survivable under our current operations. And we would go dry in '91, '92. And we would start getting yearly close to empty in 2015. At 40 percent you'll see that all of the drought periods, all of them, just about every drought period we experienced in California and on the Stanislaus River, would be significant and would be extended as a result of flowing 40 percent down the river.</p> <p>So the simple math of, obviously, in the previous slide where we started with, is there's only three places water goes. [ATT:1 ATT:4] And if you're going to put more water down the river you're either going to impact storage or you're going to impact deliveries. And what our slides show here is that modeling New Melones forward under this regime your droughts are going to be longer and you're going to be deeper, which makes recovery time more difficult. Which means that droughts just last longer and it's just harder on us. And we're going to get to the repetitiveness over time; what that's going to mean for all of us.</p> <p>Comparison between the current and the 40 percent for storage, average annual storage maintains at about 1.182 million acre-feet in New Melones under the current storage. Under a true 40 percent, unimpaired flow--and that's not shifting blocks of water and not maintaining a minimum storage carryover, which we'll go to next--you would see about 748,000 acre-feet.</p>	
698	10	<p>In the modeling analysis for the SED, and this is where we believe there is some fiction put into play, there's two parts to the SED. There is the project description, which is 40 percent, and then on what we see as an adaptive implementation or a Program of Implementation, that's a separate activity that is not currently under Phase 1. The language itself, you'll see that the State Board analyzes a carryover storage and refill requirement that doesn't exist in the proposed rule nor exists in any precedent for regulation or law. If you read further in the analysis--and the language is a little small here, but I'll paraphrase, under additional stream-flow requirements changes in water availability require adjustment of parameters to assure feasibility for the 82-year simulation, so that reservoirs are not drained entirely in the worst droughts on record. In addition, carryover storage guidelines have been increased for New Melones Reservoir to minimize impacts on instream temperature that would be caused by lower reservoir levels and a limited coldwater pool. An implementation plan developed in a future proceeding would need to identify and evaluate supply storage and temperature conditions and appropriate operational objectives, to best protect beneficial uses and avoid adverse effects where feasible.</p> <p>What we read this as, basically under the Program of Implementation with a 40 percent</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the programmatic scope of the SED and State Water Board use of best available science throughout the SED. Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, for clarification of the LSJR program of implementation, including discussion of carryover storage. Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, regarding modeled reservoir operation assumptions, including carryover storage. Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, regarding implementation of the plan amendments through separate water rights proceedings. Please Master Response 2.3, Presentation of Data and Results in SED and Responses to Comments, regarding the use of averages and percentages in the SED analyses.</p> <p>Appendix F1, Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling, provides a detailed description of the approach and methodology the State Water Board used to construct the Water Supply Effects (WSE) model.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2.1 Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding the carryover storage requirements. The program of implementation provides a framework that provides maximum operational and implementation flexibility for achieving the best biological outcomes. The State Water Board appropriately modeled potential reservoir operations (including carryover storage) to show the range of potential environmental impacts in such a way that the public and the State Water Board can compare the relative effects. The program of implementation does not establish specific carryover targets</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>recommended project the state at the same time threw in modeling assumptions to minimize and avoid showing the impacts of a true 40 percent alternative. If we are called as public agencies to provide a CEQA analysis for any project that we put forth typically we provide that analysis. And we show all of the impacts of the project. Then we turn around and show the mitigating effects to try to minimize those impacts. What we're seeing here, and what was modeled, was a 40 percent flow with all the mitigation at the same time. In fact, I believe in prior proceedings the State Board staff has indicated that they have not actually modeled a 40 percent under the current regulatory flow regime. And we would like to argue that the--we will argue if we have to that the implementation, the Program of Implementation, there is no legal precedent for it. So to put forth mitigating factors without having a legal precedent to do so and not showing the flaw that the actual impacts of a 40 percent recommended flow regime on the Stanislaus River, and likely on the other rivers as well, to me will not or not should not pass CEQA analysis.</p>	<p>to avoid constraining future implementation. However, the carryover storage requirement is part of the program of implementation, not a form of mitigation, as seems to be suggested by the commenter.</p>
698	11	<p>This is what it looks like [ATT:1 ATT:1] as a result of putting in carryover storage, a requirement in the Stanislaus River, as it relates to storage. So the blue bars is the 40 percent unimpaired flow analysis as we have done, and with the current backdrop of existing regulations and water rights priorities and environmental requirements. And then the red line is the State Water Resources Control Board's 40 percent with adaptive</p> <p>25 adjustments or adaptive implementation. And basically, you see in the red line that from a storage perspective it looks great. Storage never drops below 700,000 acre-feet throughout the entire historical record. And it frankly masks, as a result it masks the actual impacts of the proposed project without implementation being studied separately after the project is studied by itself.</p> <p>And frankly the storage, if it's maintained at 1.186 under adaptive adjustment, that is nearly identical to baseline conditions. So again as a mass balance the water has to come from somewhere. And frankly, it's coming from water users and in significant quantities during drought periods in order to maintain minimum carryover storage.</p> <p>We think this truly masks the impact to storage and also masks related impacts. [ATT:1 ATT:18] Recreation, fuller reservoirs, we don't have to deal with recreation impacts now. Hydropower, the reservoirs stay full we can still generate hydropower, so we don't need to analyze that. Greenhouse gas emissions and groundwater, you know, seepage as a result of reservoirs staying full. And instream water temperatures. Frankly, there was no analysis done for a 40 percent project, recommended project, on water temperatures as if there was no adaptive adjustments made in the Plan. And we think that's dubious and not transparent to local public for one, because it does not show the actual impacts that the 40 percent will provide absent any mitigating measures.</p>	<p>Please see response to Comment 698-10.</p>
698	12	<p>We're going to move on now to our [SSJID and OID's] water supply impacts. And we have our CVP contracting partners in the room and I'm not going to go into the numbers too much on this one. They can explain the losses that this Plan will exact on them. But CVP contractor changes in water delivery, as you could see this is their current deliveries over the historical record if they were receiving water in through the entire hydrologic record. [ATT:1 ATT:20] And then under a 40 percent scenario, this is what we look at. [ATT:1 ATT:21] So if I toggle back and forth a few times you can see that the water supply reliability afforded to them under their current CVP contracts diminishes significantly.</p>	<p>The impacts assessments in the SED are based on various metrics including frequency of occurrence, cumulative distributions, averages, medians, and a combination of these. Please refer to Master Response 2.3, Presentation of Data and Results, for responses to comments related to data, presentation of data, and the various methods used in the SED to assess effects of the proposed plan amendments and determine impacts. Please refer to Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, for discussion of the water supply effects presented in the SED. Please refer to Master Response 3.5 for response to comments related to agricultural resources and Master Response 8.1 for responses to comments related to the local economic effects.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>CHAIR MARCUS: And which is--what's red and what's yellow?</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: So red would be Stockton East Water District's available contract supplies. And yellow is Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District supplies.</p> <p>MR. KNELL: This slide really depicts one of the issues we have with the [SED] itself, because everything is so much averages, averages, averages. But when you look at these gaps in the 40 percent unimpaired flow, seven years of no water is not something you can average away. For agriculture seven years without water is an impact that needs to be addressed for the very fact that it's occurring in those periods of time. And to average it out against those years in which you get water, I think is disingenuous in the presentation of the material. And the thought process that's used in this document is averages, averages, averages.</p>	
698	13	<p>The difference between those two again, current and then 40 percent, what we see is a drop from 107,000 acre-feet on average for deliveries versus 74,000 acre-feet. [ATT:1 ATT:22] But one thing to note, you can see in the last 10 years--and I'm just picking on Stockton East a little bit, but if you see there the amount of water that they would be entitled to over the last 10 years. Under an average condition it's 1 in 2, 50 percent reliability. Under the 40 percent it drops to 2 in 10 years, so you just went from 50 percent reliability to 20 percent reliability.</p>	<p>The SED Baseline results for the CVP Contractors (SEWD and CSJWD) compare very closely to the commenter's Baseline, at an average of 106,000 acre-feet and reliability of full allocation of 48 percent (vs. 107,000 AF and 50 percent as shown by commenter). As shown in Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, differing assumptions in the commenter's 40 percent scenario result in divergent storage levels in New Melones Reservoir. Since CVP Contractor allocations from USBR are determined based on the New Melones Index (NMI = reservoir storage March 1 + forecast inflow), this divergence results in lower allocations in the commenter's Baseline. In LSJR Alternative 3, i.e. the 40 percent unimpaired flow scenario in the SED, CVP Contractor allocations average 91,000 AF with reliability of 35 percent for the full allocation of 155,000 AF, and reliability of 59 percent for half of the full allocation (comparing to SED Baseline, where half of the full allocation is deliverable in 70 percent of years). (Results extracted from WSE Model). Refer to Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, for more information on the relationship of water supply results to model assumptions regarding reservoir operation.</p>
698	14	<p>Moving on to OID and SSJID's water use, if we toggle between the current flow regime [ATT:1 ATT:23] this is OID and SSJID's historical diversions over the record. If you look at 40 percent [ATT:1 ATT:24] you can see that we see very significant and drastic cuts in water supply specifically during drought periods, namely in the '30s and then again '91,'92. And you can see again in the current drought we're in, as well. That would equate for us. You would see under our current situation we currently divert about 505,000 acre-feet, on average. And under a 40 percent you would see, on average, a reduction to about 480,000 acre-feet. [ATT:1 ATT: 25]</p> <p>You know, a note on 505,000 acre-feet, the districts' water rights per our '88 Agreement are for a total of 600,000 acre-feet. The reason why the districts have reduced our diversions is in part because of state requirements to conserve, but also in part, because the districts' desire to modernize our systems and promote conservation where we can. So we've seen a significant reduction in our average historical annual diversions over the years, because of those system investments. Those investments have resulted in conserved water. And that conserved water has been made available, which is fully within the California Water Code for us to do so, made available to areas of need.</p> <p>And at the same time we've been able, frankly, as an example of good water stewardship within the state of California, we have the ability to release that water and time it such that it also meets environmental needs as well. The last few years have been great examples of that.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding comments that do not raise any issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, regarding the modeling conducted for the SED.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
698	15	<p>On average, if we [SSJID and OID] have to reduce our diversions under the 40 percent, you would see over the last 10 years \$100 million in capital investments from the two districts that we've reinvested in our system, lost. We wouldn't have the ability to do that.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, regarding water supply uncertainty and effects of the plan amendments on water supply infrastructure and planning, including stranded capital costs.</p>
698	16	<p>It certainly makes you wonder if the end-game of water conservation is to allow others to take the water away from us. As opposed to having the ability to redistribute the water, be benevolent with it, and provide it to areas that need the water, as well. And we've been able to do that through--frankly, we've been able to move water around not only within basin, but also to other areas on the west side of the Central Valley, as well.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the consideration of beneficial uses by the State Water Board.</p>
698	17	<p>Some of the impacts, just average impacts in the SED, from SSJID's perspective we have municipal water customers...nearly 200,000 customers in Lathrop, Manteca and Tracy and Escalon. And that water treatment plant for us under a 40 percent scenario, would be a stranded asset. We currently have booked capital. This is net depreciation of \$127 million for that plant.</p> <p>Under a 40 percent scenario, we would suspect that approximately \$63 million in assets in that plant would be stranded. And that's because the plant was built not only to meet existing needs--and some of those cities currently use 50 percent of the water--currently that plant meets 50 percent of the total drinking water needs of that city, of the cities that we partner with. But it also has built-in flexibility for future expansion in an economic manner. And so by exacting a 40 percent unimpaired flow regime on us you are looking at stranding approximately \$63 million. That's a significant number. And at the same time, you'll leave city residents not only with permanent drought conservation, you also leave them with increased bills, because the debt service is still being covered on the bonds that were taken out for those projects.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 698-15 regarding ratepayer and municipal economic effects.</p>
698	18	<p>MR. KNELL: These two districts [SSJID and OID] invest about \$10 million a year in modernizing and rehabilitating our system.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: Right.</p> <p>MR. KNELL: That \$10 million is generated through water sales that we move across Valley that both benefit fisheries, because they're timed--</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: Right.</p> <p>MR. KNELL: --correctly and they benefit the west side in an area that needs water. Taking this unimpaired flow water away from us will reduce our ability to do infrastructure improvements, do modernization. That \$10 million in a locally roll-up, economic stimulus to the--is really truly \$30-40 million of lost economic stimulus in our communities. And so really question this \$64 million value of impacts that the state has put on this document. Just us alone, we're in the \$30 to \$40 million of economic stimulus that will be lost in the region. And we're just but one river of three that will question the economics that was presented in the report.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: Are you in this--I don't want to belabor the point, I just want to understand the point, because that number is a pretty big part of the cost--are you then assuming that you would cut back your municipal deliveries at the same percentage as everything else?</p>	<p>The comment states that it will lose the ability to profit from water sales and that the SED analysis is lacking by not recognizing the economic benefit to SSJID and OID of its sales of water across the valley (claimed as \$10 million per year) and the accompanying economic stimulus effect in the region (claimed as \$30 to \$40 million).</p> <p>The waters of California belong to the public and cannot be owned by an individual or entity. A water right is granted for reasonable and beneficial use of the state's waters, but does not constitute ownership of the waters. This means that the entitlement extends only to the use of water, but not to indefinite benefit of any excess water.</p> <p>Water right transfers are encouraged in the state as a way to support efficient uses of water. While it is laudable that the water sales by the two districts are applied in a manner that is beneficial to fisheries (as noted in the comment), it is also done at the discretion of the parties involved in the transaction, and the transaction terms could be changed to remove any fishery benefit. Furthermore, the districts could also choose to revise how it uses the sales revenues, instead of applying them to system rehabilitation or any other use. In contrast, the plan amendments will more directly result in lasting benefits fish and wildlife by requiring unimpaired flows on a schedule that more closely mimics the variability of a natural hydrology.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 13, Service Providers, for a qualitative discussion of potential effects on service providers under Impacts SP-1, SP-2a and SP-2b. In Chapter 13 (Impact SP-1) potential impacts due to surface water reductions are considered within the general context of water supply agreements and contracts, and also within the context of the water code. Please see Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, for clarifying information regarding service providers and potential effects and Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, for additional information regarding municipal</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>MR. RIETKERK: Yes.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: I mean it's not 40 percent from where you are, it's whatever the additional increment is. But are you assuming everybody treated equally, and that you don't prioritize your municipal deliveries?</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: We have an agreement with the cities for operating the water treatment plant. And the agreement is that any reductions in water supply to our agricultural customers are shared equally with our municipal customers. So these are water losses across the board with no distinction between ag and M and I.</p>	<p>uses of water and economics.</p>
698	19	<p>The point we're really trying to make is we think the [SED] averages are truly hiding the drought impacts and in part, because of the carryover storage requirements that are in the reservoir. If you look at the drought period that we just talked about before, can we have the water right of 600,000 acre-feet annually? If we assume the model use is correct, at 535,000 acre-feet annually under a current flow regime and you look at the 40 percent, what's being proposed with carryover storage, you'd see our diversions drop significantly. But basically, that 40 percent would result in a 40 percent reduction from the water that we've typically had available to us in prior years.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: Again, I'm just trying to understand. So you're assuming 40 percent off your water right as opposed to 40 percent unimpaired flow left in the stream? I mean, there are a lot of water rights on it. I know you're the most senior, but--</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: We are also--</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: --you are the most senior, which protects you more than others.</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: Correct. Under this scenario, what we're showing is under the 40 percent and this does include the carryover storage requirements. Our water rights would be reduced from modeled use, assuming that we were also reducing our diversions during drought periods to some extent for conservation purposes.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 2.3, Presentation of Data and Results, for responses to comments regarding impacts to water supply during drought periods. Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, for a discussion of carryover storage guidelines and drought impacts.</p>
698	20	<p>Under our modeled use we would see a 40 percent reduction. It's even higher if you look at reduction under the 600,000 acre-foot total. So we are looking at--these aren't reductions, these are actual usage. So assuming a modeled use of 535 we would see a--and then the 40 percent recommended project--we would see the availability of approximately 325,000 acre-feet of water for our region. You can compare between 600 and 535, but basically what is in the modeling is at 325,000 acre-feet is available. Not just from my district, but to be shared jointly between the two districts.</p> <p>I think the emphasis we're trying to make here, and your [SED] portrays this, I mean about 60 percent of the time, if I remember the graphic correctly, at least for our district life would be relatively unimpacted. But for that 40 percent of the time life's hell. In an agricultural area where you have to grow crops and you have no water that 40 percent is very difficult for us.</p>	<p>Commenter correctly identifies the potential of lower water availability for diversion in drought years, as described in Executive Summary, Chapter 5, Surface Hydrology and Water Quality, and Appendix F.1, Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling.</p>
698	21	<p>I'm going to go on to the drought impact summary. [ATT:1 ATT:27] Well, it's very similar to what we would be experiencing here under drought impacts. On the average it shows that</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, regarding water supply reliability, and Master Response 2.3, Presentation of Data and Results regarding the cumulative distributions</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>yes, SSJID and OID and the Stanislaus River are currently at a 40 percent unimpaired flow regime on the Stanislaus. But on average, our reductions would be minimal. But during the most critical times, during the drought periods, they would be drastic and dire and devastating for us. And you're basically asking the water user community, the agricultural customers and domestic customers, to hold their breath for five-to-ten years at a time and hope that on the back end of it we'll be able to come out okay. And so when you're looking at the averages just keep in mind that the drought impacts are truly what drive the sustainability and viability of our community.</p> <p>And one of the things in addition to that, I think--and we've been an advocate for this planning document--at some point you need to have dry year off-ramps for communities. Mother Nature is always going to deliver us a hydrologic event that we can't outlive to. At those points in time when we get there the State Board needs to consider off-ramps from all this regulation to allow us to survive. And we think that needs to be in the document.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: Yeah, my understanding is there is something in the document that's controversial with others, as similar to the TUCPs we did during the unprecedented drought we went through and we undoubtedly will go through again.</p> <p>MR. KNELL: Mm-hmm.</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: I think we've beat this one to death here, but the reductions are significant during drought.</p>	<p>presented in the impact analyses and use of cumulative distributions to identify drier years. Chapter 21, Drought Evaluation, describes the frequency and severity of dry years, using the annual percent of average runoff as a metric for identifying (and normalizing) the sequence of runoff during the 1922-2003 analysis period and the more recent 2004-2015 period. The WSE model captures several 3-year, 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year droughts in the 1922-2003 analysis period. The WSE model results presented in Chapter 5, Surface Hydrology and Water Quality, and also in Appendix F.1, Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling, describe that implementing the LSJR alternatives would result in more years with reduced water availability and reduced water supply diversions, and recognize the largest water supply effects would occur during a multi-year sequence of low runoff years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2.3, Presentation of Data and Results in the SED and Response to Comments, for information regarding the cumulative distributions presented in the impact analysis and the use of cumulative distributions to identify dry and critically dry years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3.5, Agricultural Resources, regarding the criteria used to evaluate impacts on agricultural resources and a discussion of dry year management as it relates to different crops, and Master Response 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model, regarding agricultural economic effects.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding emergency provisions and modifications to the plan amendments, and Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for response to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
698	22	<p>MR. RIETKERK: Between the two districts [SSJID and OID], if we are at 162,500 acre-feet during drought periods, that's critical. And that's not survivable, especially if droughts are extended and deepened with a 40 percent flow. And it doesn't just occur during that drought period we just studied, 1924 through 1935, it occurs in every drought period. So we'd be looking 1960 through 1964, '76 and '77, '87 through '94, 2002 through 2005, and again in the current drought period in 2012 and 2016 as well.</p> <p>CHAIR MARCUS: Right. The challenge is the same thing happens to the fish, so that's the challenge in the balance.</p> <p>MR. RIETKERK: I hate to be a little ironic and I'm not going to really go into it because it isn't in the topic of our fishery deal, but the Stanislaus has actually seen a record run of salmon this year. And the last two years have basically doubled in population, at least in salmon run, without additional flow. So we think there's other factors at play other than flow. And our current science that we're seeing on the river would suggest that there are other stressors out there and other things that are being done through hatchery management and otherwise that are seeing great results, as well.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 698-21 regarding SED consideration of drought periods and dry years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding current fish decline, the benefits to native fish populations from increased flows from February 1 through June 30, SED consideration of other stressors, including hatchery management and predation. Appendix C, Technical Report on the Scientific Basis for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity objectives, provides information regarding fish population responses to flows, and explains that one or two good years, which have occurred in the past, does not necessarily show an overall increasing trend in species' populations. Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding adaptive implementation and non-flow measures.</p>
698	23	<p>We think that there's some significant issues with the analysis of the SED document. Especially on the unfounded modeling assumptions, the carryover storage requirements, we think the methodology appears to mask and avoid disclosure of the true impacts of the project. Averages and percentages don't make for the true story.</p>	<p>Please see response to Comment 698-10.</p>
698	24	<p>If this Plan is implemented the true impact will be that when the next regulation--when this adopted and implemented--all the water users on the Stanislaus River will be devastated when the next drought hits. And we will sustain a bit with groundwater</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding consideration of beneficial uses, a general discussion of the impacts presented in the SED, and a general discussion of the economic considerations and effects presented in the SED. Please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, for information regarding the plan amendments and their relationship to</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>pumping until SGMA hits and we'll be devastated, as well.</p> <p>The Board has a choice here basically to achieve a sustainable and achievable balance on water flows in the system. This is a water quality process and you are required to go through balancing. Although this isn't an ESA process one of the beneficiaries of water use is the environment and so you are considering that. And your job again is not specifically to save salmon. Technically again that's the responsibility of other agencies, but you do have a responsibility to consider that.</p> <p>And finally, there's plenty of evidence in the record to show that the impacts to our local region far outweigh the few potential benefits that are shown in the Plan for fisheries. And really, what we're seeing is a heavy-handed approach to potentially make that work out against our needs of water.</p>	<p>SGMA. Please see Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the potential benefits to native fish populations associated with the plan amendments.</p>
698	25	<p>What we are suggesting, and we have suggested, and will continue to suggest, there are other measures and other opportunities out there. Non-flow measures and other things we can be doing, some of the examples that we have provided over the last few years, to be able to provide a solution that's sustainable for our region not only for groundwater and for regional economics and for surface water viability. But also measurable and successful for local habitat and local fishery needs, as well.</p>	<p>The State Water Board also recommends a suite of non-flow measures complementary to the flow objectives for the reasonable protection of fish and wildlife. Please see Appendix K, Revised Water Quality Control Plan, for a list of the recommended non-flow measures, and Chapter 16, Evaluation of Other indirect and Additional Actions, Section 16.3, Lower San Joaquin River Alternatives–Non-Flow Measures, for a description of these actions and their associated cost and potential environmental impacts. In addition, for a discussion on non-flow measures, please see Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures.</p>
698	26	<p>MR. MOORE: I hear your points about a disclosure of impact. I've also got two years' experience doing CEQA documents professionally. So the spirit of CEQA and your point about disclosing potential impacts on the timescale, I hear those things. One thing I'd like to give you the opportunity to do now as you've looked, you've drilled down on water supply and water quantity impacts, as we have this discussion and dialogue between our staff and you and the different tools, the work we're doing. What can you say about water demand management in the irrigation districts? Because there is in your assumption, in your model assumption, you are assuming that those deliveries need to be made for agricultural productivity and economy.</p> <p>And we've learned in the last 20 years that the relationship between volume of water applied and economic output has changed through water efficiency measures. And could you describe water efficiency measures you're doing and planning to do? And, how that might affect your water demand that you'd predict outward, because all you've given me here is water supply.</p> <p>MR. KNELL: I think specifically for Oakdale we are a region that--or an irrigation district--that is still 50 percent non-permanent crops and 50 percent permanent crops. There's a huge evolution in California only because really the regulations and the difficulty it is to become farming, farmers are moving to higher-valued crops in order to make ends meet, pay their bills, and engage in the life that they chose to do. So you are moving to higher efficiency systems. I think gradually our community is. We have 2 to 3,000 acres a year we are losing of that non-permanent ground going to permanent crops and firming up water supply, firming up water demand and actually freeing up water. That non-permanent crop, we have a huge pasture component. And I'll tell you pasture people like being pasture people. And they like raising cattle, they like that culture or life, but there is an awakening amongst them that this may not be a business environment that they can compete in and be successful anymore. And so they're converting over. But when you change over a pasture, which might use five, five-and-a-half acre-feet per year to a</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan, regarding SGMA. Please see Master Response 3.5, Agricultural Resources, regarding applied water use for crops, water demand techniques, including irrigation efficiencies, and crop mixes. Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the scientific justification for the plan amendments and the use of scientific literature and data regarding fish, fish needs, or fish habitat in the SED. Please also refer to Master Response 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model, regarding the economic analysis and estimates of district irrigated acres and crop distributions. Please also see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, which describes the requirement for periodic reviews of the Bay-Delta Plan. The State Board recognizes that circumstances change, those changes will be accounted for in future reviews of the Bay-Delta Plan.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>permanent crop like almonds and is using like three-and-half feet per year, there is a conservation component that changes your demand within the District.</p> <p>And what it used to take us--when I came to the District in 2002, we were fully using 260,000 acre-feet in order to make water demand diversions. Last year we didn't have any allocations, it was an average year. Our water use was 190, so that's your demand change. And I think as we go forward and there's more innovation, there's more efficiency, I don't know a crop that doesn't go back in that doesn't have better efficiency, land-leveling, all those types of things that we should be doing in agriculture. But when those crops rotate out those practices are being implemented. You see demand going down in our region. And I think that's going to be of benefit both for the transfer opportunities, making water available both locally too, because we have a SGMA component.</p> <p>You know, we have to get more efficient to address SGMA. We're going to have to be putting more of our surface water in the ground, but we've got to make sure that surface water is there in a quantity that we can use.</p> <p>MR. MOORE: And that's a great discussion. And I think from the State Water Board's standpoint all those aspects you mention we're very aware of and supportive of. But then also where does the surface water instream flow component come in? And as we go back and forth and talk about potential voluntary agreements and that sort of thing, I would encourage you to own those outcomes as you have. You all are stewards of the river and have insight there. But when you describe that when the water is made available due to efficiencies it's not just for groundwater management. It's for sustainable, healthy rivers in your area, as well. Thank you.</p> <p>MR. KNELL: Thanks, I could say that we invest a million dollars a year in science on our river, each and every year. We are firm stewards of our river. We believe that science speaks louder than words. And local science should have a little louder voice at the state office, as opposed to other research they are using.</p>	
698	27	<p>MS. D'ADAMO: So I have a question about June. You talked about 1 to 2 percent of the benefits. And I know at the workshop, at the staff workshop, that issue was discussed as well. So could you comment on the source of your information on 1 to 2 percent?</p> <p>MR. KNELL: We ran a rotary screw trap on the river, so we have a long--in fact, we have the--on the Stanislaus is the longest operating rotary screw trap in California. We have a long, long history of out-migrating fish in tracking that. And it's those readings that we get in June that are showing that there's very few fish out-migrating at that time. And our fish biologists believe there's very few out-migrating fish waiting to migrate out that late.</p> <p>MS. D'ADAMO: Could you provide in your comments some detailed information about the source and the numbers? Even down to, if you have it, by day? What are you seeing? At what point are there no fish in the system? I don't know if you are able to collect and provide that information, but I think it would be helpful. I know that staff provided some information and I think that their numbers were a little higher, but it may have been in different year types. I think it was just maybe some selected years, so it would be helpful to have a maybe more complete information from you on that.</p> <p>MR. KNELL: Very good. We can do that.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the importance of the month of June for native fish.</p> <p>Very little rotary screw trap information has been made publicly available for the Oakdale rotary screw trap since 2006. Production of annual reports that describe the methods used and the data that was collected for the Oakdale rotary screw trap would be beneficial.</p>

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
698	28	[ATT:1] State Water Resources Control Board Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan Public Hearing -- December 16, 2016	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.
698	29	[ATT:1 ATT:1] Stanislaus River Basic Facts	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.
698	30	[ATT:1 ATT:2] If you subtract the current basin's annual runoff...	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.
698	31	[ATT:1 ATT:3] Intent of UIF Project = To Put More Water Down River	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.
698	32	[ATT:1 ATT:4] Presentation Outline	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.
698	33	[ATT:1 ATT:5] Instream Flow Impacts Fact vs. Fiction	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.
698	34	[ATT:1 ATT:6] Fact: More Water Down the River Looks Like: Current Releases	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.
698	35	[ATT:1 ATT:7] Fact: More Water Down the River Looks Like: Projected 40% UIF	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.
698	36	[ATT:1 ATT:8] Down the River Flows	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.
698	37	[ATT1: ATT:9] Fiction The San Joaquin River (and its tributaries) minimally contribute flow for instream flow requirements (fishery needs)	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.
698	38	[ATT:1 ATT:10] Fact: Vernalis is already getting 40% of the UIF!	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.
698	39	[ATT:1 ATT: 11] SED Unimpaired Flows Analysis	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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
698	40	[ATT1: ATT:12] Storage Impacts Fact vs. Fiction	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.
698	41	[ATT:1 ATT:13] Fact: New Melones Storage: Current Storage	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.
698	42	[ATT:1 ATT: 14] Fact: New Melones Storage: Storage at 40% UIF	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.
698	43	[ATT:1 ATT:15] Storage Changes	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.
698	44	[ATT:1 ATT: 16] The Fiction The State Water Board analysis has a carryover storage and refill requirement that [does not exist] in the proposed rule, regulation, or law.	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.
698	45	[ATT:1 ATT:17] Fiction: SED Storage in New Melones	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.
698	46	[ATT:1 ATT: 18] Fiction: SED Storage in New Melones	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.
698	47	[ATT:1 ATT: 19] Water Delivery Impacts Fact vs. Fiction	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.
698	48	[ATT:1 ATT:20] CVP Contractors Changes in Water Deliveries Current Deliveries	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.
698	49	[ATT:1 ATT:21] CVP Contractors Changes in Water Deliveries 40% UIF	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.
698	50	[ATT:1 ATT:22] CVP Contractors	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.
698	51	[ATT:1 ATT: 23]	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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		OID/SSJID Water Use Current	
698	52	[ATT:1 ATT:24] OID/SSJID Water Use 40% UIF	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.
698	53	[ATT: 1 ATT: 25] Oakdale Irrigation District/South San Joaquin Irrigation District	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.
698	54	[ATT:1 ATT:26] OID/SSJID Average Impacts of 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.
698	55	[ATT:1 ATT: 27] Averages Hide the True Drought Impacts Proposed in 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.
698	56	[ATT:1 ATT: 28] 1924-1935	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.
698	57	[ATT:1 ATT: 29] 1922-1940	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.
698	58	[ATT:1 ATT:30] Drought Impact Summary	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.
698	59	[ATT:1 ATT:31] Either way you look at it in a deep drought	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.
698	60	[ATT:1 ATT:32] This occurs again	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.
698	61	[ATT:1 ATT:33] Concluding Remarks	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.
698	62	[ATT:1 ATT:34] Achievable and Sustainable Balance is Up to You	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.
698	63	[ATT:1 ATT:35] Achievable and Sustainable Balance is Up to You	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.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
699	1	<p>I'd like to speak to you, not about the fisheries of the Delta so much, but more about the people of the Delta that support, that depend on those fisheries. I've been fishing in the Sacramento-San Joaquin area ever since the 1960s. And I remember when I was a little kid we'd cross the Rio Vista Bridge in the fall and see as many as 200 boats in the river, all fishing for stripers during the StriperFest. And now if you cross the river during that same time, that same event, there are maybe 25 or 30.</p> <p>When I drive through the Delta I see closed stores that were once bait shops, I see closed stores that were once local, little grocery stores. I see, when I'm out on the water in my boat, there's no longer any restaurants to go to that are on-the-water restaurants. Those are closed. When I look at the marinas I see lots of boats that are covered with debris and for all purposes abandoned. There's open slips. And all of those people relied one time on the fisheries of the Delta.</p> <p>There's no doubt that our fisheries in decline. The salmon population is 5 percent of what it used to be. Striped bass are even worse, they're about 4 percent of what they used to be. California fishing licenses have declined by about 55 percent. All of those people supported the businesses that I spoke about.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>
699	2	<p>The people, when stores closed, when the bait shops closed, when the restaurants closed, and when the little grocery stores closed in the small communities, they didn't get subsidies from the state to run their businesses. They didn't have crop insurance to sustain them in the tough years. They just closed and went on their way. They didn't have water districts to advocate for them, they didn't have banks of attorneys to appear for them. They were little mom-and-pop businesses that just went out of business and some of them lost their fortunes. Some of them have very little to exist on as far as in their senior years. Restoring the flows on the Delta will do much to restore the fisheries and it will do a lot to restore the economy of the Delta, as well.</p>	<p>Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.</p>