

From: Evan Jones <revwin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:10 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: twin tunnels

This is a hugely expensive solution to a simple problem...slow the planting of agricultural crops that require 80% of CA's water.

Evan Jones

From: Endless Summer <endlesssummer42@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:50 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Comments about the BDCP Plan

Dear BDCP/NOAA Representatives,

Regarding the Delta Tunnels and the incredible expense of the construction and maintenance of them to supply the increasing water demands of Southern California, it would be reasonable to ask that an unbiased comparison to the installation and operation of a desalinization plant has been considered. With Southern California so close to the clear blue water of the ocean (unlike the sediment ridden waters of Northern California and the bay/Delta region) it does not make much sense to incur the costs of these additional tunnels and their maintenance much less the destruction of land and marine ecosystems. There are already pipelines from the Delta region to Southern California which are obviously unsustainable. Cabo San Lucas, Mexico has been using modular desalinization technology to make clean drinking water from the ocean for 10+ years with claims of 95% efficiency and is modular to keep up with increased future demand. Please check out their web site at <http://www.energyrecovery.com/cabo-san-lucas-desalination-plant-mexico> Desalinization technology is proving its sustainability in other countries. Shouldn't this kind of science be utilized in California, a front-runner in technological advancement?

Thank you for your consideration

Deeply Concerned Voter,
David Opheim

From: Skiprett <skiprett@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:51 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Tunnels

I see no reason to send more water to SoCal. I watched the news today & saw water being totally wasted. I understand it was broken pipe but it makes no difference to me. We use our water to support crop growth to keep our farmers in business. We cannot water crops with salt water & without our farmers, everyone in the state will be in trouble. The salmon and other fish will die, wildlife will suffer, and on & on.....I think so cal should look into desalination programs.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Carla Blair <carlablair@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:54 PM
To: bdcg comments - NOAA Service Account
Subject: Re: Comment on the Draft BDCP and Draft EIR/EIS Re: Not want the tunnels please

Sorry don't want the tunnels

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 29, 2014, at 8:26 PM, "bdcg comments - NOAA Service Account" <bdcg.comments@noaa.gov> wrote:

Thank you for submitting a formal comment on the Draft BDCP and Draft EIR/EIS. All comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS will be considered in the Final EIR/EIS and decision-making process. For more information, assistance in locating the documents or if you have special needs, contact 866-924-9955. Additional information can be found at www.baydeltaconservationplan.com

From: John Anderson <captainjra@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:56 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Please do something else!

Please let the Sacramento River flow through the entire Delta before it is pumped south. Instead of the tunnels, create a core superlevee channel and greatly improved fish screens at Byron. Install an anti-back flow gate as used in Europe to prevent saltwater back flow during any emergency. The flow of ample fresh flushing water through the Delta absolutely vital to the health of the Delta's ecosystem and economic health. The Delta is a treasure for all Californians- indeed, all Americans- and must be preserved and restored. The Peripheral Tunnel plan does precisely the opposite.

Sincerely,
John Anderson
Isleton, Ca
95641

Typos courtesy iPhone

From: kenmckee54@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:12 PM
To: BDCP Comments
Subject: Re: Comments about the BDCP EIR/EIS

To Whom it May Concern,

Your EIR process has been a secretive, closed-door, unethical sham. No tunnels to divert Sacramento River freshwater to places where it does not belong.

Sincerely,
Kenneth McKee
A registered voter

From: kenmckee54@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:11 PM
To: BDCP Comments
Subject: Comments about the BDCP EIR/EIS

To Whom it May Concern,

Your EIR process has been a sham. No tunnels. Period. No tunnels to divert Sacramento River freshwater to places where it does not belong.

Sincerely,
Kenneth McKee
A registered voter

From: kenmckee54@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:08 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: No Tunnels

To Whom it May Concern,

No tunnels. Period. No tunnels to divert Sacramento River freshwater to places where it does not belong.

Sincerely,
Kenneth McKee
A registered voter

From: Jacquelyn Ross <jacquelynross@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 11:41 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan

Dear Staff,

I support the No Action Alternative. We need a plan that restores resiliency to the Delta. That's a long road but perhaps not longer than this huge BDCP document.

Thank you,

Jacquelyn Ross

From: Robert Arwine <robertarwine1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 7:54 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: CM15

Sirs,

I have actively fished the Delta for the past fifty years.

The proposed changing of the regulations will have dramatic negative effects, if implemented.

I am employed at Sweeney's Sports located in Napa. Thirty percent of Sweeney's business is involved with Large Mouth Bass and Striper fishing. This nearly fifty year old, family owned business has nine employees. It is likely that if the Large Mouth and Stripers are eliminated, Sweeney's will also be eliminated.

Stripers, Large Mouth, Salmon and Steelhead have co-habituated in the Delta for over 130 years.

What is the science that has indicated that if these two fish are removed, the Salmon and Steelhead numbers will rebound?

Respectively,

Bob Arwine

From: innov8@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:05 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: BDCP.Comments against further water diversion and desalinization as a a long term and nearer term solution

Another canal diverting water from the Sacramento River is not solving our drought problem. If there is no rain, the reservoirs are not going to be filled. The main beneficiaries of this project are the contractors who build the project, the politicians who support it and Southern California.

Desalinization can solve our drought problems in the near time frame. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not the solution. Desalinization plants will provide water long term and nearer term than the rain dependent reservoirs. It will also create jobs throughout the state. It will save our agricultural industry in the nearer term. We need water from desalinization plants throughout California as they have done in Australia, Israel, Saudi Arabia and even El Paso Texas.

John Brueck

5391 Cribari Crest

San Jose, CA 95135

From: tina holt <holtart4u@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 10:09 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Opposed to Flawed BDCP for Delta Tunnels

In researching information compiled pertaining to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan I see the Propsed Action (Tunnels) is in direct conflict with the California Water Code 85021; Violating the directive to stop reliance on the Delta for water needs. Also the violation of CWC 85021b will negatively impact the Delta as "Place" through the loss of species and habitat.

The redudtion in River flows will allow salt water intrusion into the Delta. Recent reports from the California Water Foundation state the following:
The state's growing groundwater overdraft problems have resulted in a number of adverse consequences, including saltwater intrusion. Furthermore; Failure to provide meaningful ground water management will also increase energy costs due to pumping from greater depths, environmental degradation, and land subsidence that results in costly damage to infrastructure.

The BDCP 7.10.3, pgs. 7-21 Funding: Fails to adequately identify funding and wrongfully expects the taxpaying citizenry to accept an empty promise of fiduciary actions in an after-the-fact manner and not in the forthcoming and transparent path that is to be legally expected.

The BDCP chapter 7 Impementation Measures: The Authorized Entity Group (AEG) appears to fail to represent all vested interests as well as fails to adequately identify the stakeholders and their interests and ALL affiliations.

I have personnally witnessed the profound abuse of water resources by Central Valley growers in their use of sprinkler systems during windy days experiencing sustained winds of 20-30 miles an hour. No significant water made it to the intended crops and just blew away.

The planting of inappropriate crop products in an arid location defys intelligence, to demand water be diverted from its natural flow in the Delta to support inappropriate farming is counter to best management practices.

I am opposed to this proposed project to divert water resources from Northern California to Central and Southern interests who repeatedly demonstrate willful abuse of water resources and wasteful practices.

Submitted by,
Tina Holt
11655 Clay Station Rd
Herald Ca
916-984-7182

From: Lauren Mills <lauren.m.mills@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 3:34 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: comments on BDCP

Hello,

I wish to comment on the issues with the BDCP.

I am not really sure how the "bay" is effected after reading several chapters and highlights of the document.

I grew up in Sacramento and have witnessed the decline of riparian landscape and aquatic life over my 28 years.

Currently water in the Sacramento and American rivers is at an all time low.

Simultaneously, farming and wetland around the Sacramento delta has made a stunning comeback through the efforts of truly sustainable farmers and pioneers in the area. UC Davis has contributed significantly to these efforts.

I do not support any falsely named "conservation" plans that would divert yet more water from the Sacramento Delta.

I don't believe this will help our salmon populations any. I believe the proposed diversions and construction of the twin tunnels will only cause more damage to already sensitive salmon populations.

My friend did some of the research for NOAA and CA Fish & Game that helped to close the commercial salmon fishing down for a season in 2008. As I'm sure you are aware, Chinook numbers were lower than they had been in California's history. Please consider this report from University of the Pacific:

Recently, there has been much discussion in California about the relationship between water and jobs. Water deliveries from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta have been reduced due to drought and environmental protections for fish including Salmon that are harmed by the powerful pumps which generate reverse flows on some rivers in the Delta. The decrease in water deliveries resulted in fallowed fields and reduced agricultural production in some areas of the San Joaquin Valley supplied by Delta water. California's salmon fishery was closed in 2008 and 2009 due to collapsing fish populations. The political battle over pumping restrictions has been characterized by some as fish versus farmers.

We estimate the salmon fishery closures resulted in the loss of 1,823 jobs and \$118.4 million in income compared to the level of the salmon fishery in 2004 and 2005.⁴

We don't need to supply Southern California with more water from the delta. What needs to happen, is smarter residential and industrial water practices down south, more efficiency, and more sustainable agricultural practices.

The water in the delta is a finite resource. This BDCP is essentially the same as not addressing our countries wasteful over reliance of oil, and before addressing efficiency and actual conservation, attempting to pump

more of it by drilling in Alaska. The restoration of vernal pools and seasonal wetlands is unlikely to aid the salmon populations, especially no more considering the stressors created by diversions.

Please put this project on hold. The water crisis is already bad enough, this will only compound issues and provide a temporary relief.

I propose no modifications and no increase to delta outflow for the time being. This is too grave a project to carry out without the majority of Californians being aware of the issue and having a say in it.

Thank you,

Lauren Mills
4100 Mera Street
Oakland, CA
94601

From: Lauren Mills <lauren.m.mills@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:22 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Re: comments on BDCP

I forgot to add, that we as a state cannot afford such a massive public works project. I would rather we put \$10 billions towards actual water efficiency measures and conservation in agriculture and urban settings. That would at least create jobs and actually benefit our sensitive water resources.

"“Paying for the \$25 billion project -- which is certain to face years of lawsuits and probably a statewide ballot measure -- is also uncertain. State officials say water agencies will pay for about two-thirds of the cost through higher water rates. The rest they project to come from a state water bond on the November 2014 ballot and money from Congress, neither of which is guaranteed.”

Lauren Mills
4100 Mera Street
Oakland, CA 94601

On Tue, Jul 29, 2014 at 3:33 PM, Lauren Mills <lauren.m.mills@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello,

I wish to comment on the issues with the BDCP.

I am not really sure how the "bay" is effected after reading several chapters and highlights of the document.

I grew up in Sacramento and have witnessed the decline of riparian landscape and aquatic life over my 28 years.

Currently water in the Sacramento and American rivers is at an all time low.

Simultaneously, farming and wetland around the Sacramento delta has made a stunning comeback through the efforts of truly sustainable farmers and pioneers in the area.

UC Davis has contributed significantly to these efforts.

I do not support any falsely named "conservation" plans that would divert yet more water from the Sacramento Delta.

I don't believe this will help our salmon populations any. I believe the proposed diversions and construction of the twin tunnels will only cause more damage to already sensitive salmon populations.

My friend did some of the research for NOAA and CA Fish & Game that helped to close the commercial salmon fishing down for a season in 2008. As I'm sure you are aware, Chinook numbers were lower than they had been in California's history. Please consider this report from University of the Pacific:

Recently, there has been much discussion in California about the relationship between water and jobs. Water deliveries from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta have been reduced due

to drought and environmental protections for fish including Salmon that are harmed by the powerful pumps which generate reverse flows on some rivers in the Delta. The decrease in water deliveries resulted in fallowed fields and reduced agricultural production in some areas of the San Joaquin Valley supplied by Delta water. California's salmon fishery was closed in 2008 and 2009 due to collapsing fish populations. The political battle over pumping restrictions has been characterized by some as fish versus farmers.

We estimate the salmon fishery closures resulted in the loss of 1,823 jobs and \$118.4 million in income compared to the level of the salmon fishery in 2004 and 2005.⁴

We don't need to supply Southern California with more water from the delta. What needs to happen, is smarter residential and industrial water practices down south, more efficiency, and more sustainable agricultural practices.

The water in the delta is a finite resource. This BDCP is essentially the same as not addressing our countries wasteful over reliance of oil, and before addressing efficiency and actual conservation, attempting to pump more of it by drilling in Alaska. The restoration of vernal pools and seasonal wetlands is unlikely to aid the salmon populations, especially no more considering the stressors created by diversions.

Please put this project on hold. The water crisis is already bad enough, this will only compound issues and provide a temporary relief.

I propose no modifications and no increase to delta outflow for the time being. This is too grave a project to carry out without the majority of Californians being aware of the issue and having a say in it.

Thank you,

Lauren Mills
4100 Mera Street
Oakland, CA
94601

From: murtagh665@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 6:15 AM
To: BDCP Comments
Subject: Delta Tunnels

Please do not build the Delta Tunnels. It is not the solution for a sound, long term plan for the health of the Delta.

Thank you,
Tim and Maggie Murtagh

From: Patrick Pickerell <Pat@Peridotcorp.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:13 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: STOP THE TUNNELS AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE DELTA

I emphatically object to the plan to build the two massive water diversion tunnels. You are about to strangle what is left of the delta permanently. The proposal to remove striped bass and largemouth bass from the system is ludicrous, the two species have coexisted with salmon and steelhead for 130 years.

Thanks,

Patrick Pickerell
President, Peridot Corporation
1072 Serpentine Lane
Pleasanton CA. 94566
925-461-8830 EXT11

From: Gene Hart <genehart23@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:29 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Save the Delta , this would be the biggest mistake that we could make. Stop trying to change Mother Nature !

Sent from my iPhone

From: Frank B. Jelinek <frank@classic-trophy.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 10:07 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan

Hello kind persons...

My name is Frank Jelinek and I enjoy the bay delta in various ways. I need to voice my concerns regarding the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

I will not go into the bullet point outline of all the diverse and urgent concerns because this list is extensive and you will have read many, if not all, of my concrete concerns about the entire water diversion plan.

Instead, because this list is important and lengthy, in this letter I would like to iterate and urge you to take the time--as much as is needed--before acting on any of this entire proposal. There are too many crucial decisions that have the real potential to ruin the delta or, at the very least, create certain obstacles that are part of a domino effect when you are referring to delicate ecosystems.

I can only ask that every single one of the issues brought before this governing committee is thoroughly researched, explained and, equally important, understand how the various parts of the plan and delta will be affected by this linking of the different parts of the delta ecosystem coupled with the tunnel project and conservation project.

What would be extremely sad and detrimental, is if the greed (and don't kid yourself here, where there is massive money spent, there is greed and personal agendas), is allowed to gloss over ANY area of these concerns and components, there is the real potential for disaster, possibly in a way or ways we can't even foretell.

Please, Please, Please!....

Take the time to do this right to protect not only the physical landscape of the delta but, more importantly, the ecosystem of the delta. AND see clearly the ramifications and try to gain the insight as to the insight of the participants involved.

Thank you for your consideration and implementation of this idea of cautious and fastidious discovery of all facts and mechanisms involved in these projects.

Frank Jelinek
916-969-2450

"Be Kind for Everyone You Meet is Fighting a Hard Battle"--Plato

PLEASE NOTE OUR NEW PHYSICAL, BILLING AND REMITTANCE ADDRESS
HAS CHANGED!

2111 Q ST
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816

New Phone: 916-444-8339; New Fax: 916-444-6150

From: dlantz@SoftHome.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:03 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Voter/Taxpayer Comment

In my experience as CFO of several corporations, the most vital aspect in evaluating any project is the cost. Something might be "good", but the only way to compare it to any other approach is by comparing the costs along w/the benefits. I have waited anxiously to the last minute, to see whether the backers of the BDCP would come up w/a cost figure. They have not, while opponents have detailed many objections.

The only logical conclusion is that (a) nobody really knows the cost, or
(b) it is a public funds give-away to those who sponsored it and stand to profit mightily from it. Or both. Until the public knows what they will pay, what the environmental and other costs are, and who will benefit how much, BDCP is a fraud.

From: Martin Heatlie <martin.heatlie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 10:17 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Public Comment, Huge Delta Tunnels

I am a 72 year old life-time resident of California. I liked the Delta better the way it was when I was a boy. There were many more fish then, and I don't believe any species were endangered. Today many huge trees lining channels have been replaced with rocks. Also, because too much water is being diverted to the south, special dams have been constructed specifically to reduce the amount of salt water intrusion into the Delta. I understand many farmers are concerned that the salinity of the water they pump to irrigate their crops.is increasing. Crops don't grow in soil that is too salty.

Now add huge tunnels to further degrade the Delta. Salmon, sturgeon, smelt, and many other animal species are not designed to deal with huge tunnels. Please image yourself a few miles into one of the tunnels. It would be dark beyond compression. I cannot imagine a more hopeless situation.

When Teddy Roosevelt set aside the Grand Canyon as a National Park he stated: "Let this great wonder of nature remain as it now is. Do nothing to mar its grandeur, sublimity and loveliness. You cannot improve on it. But what you can do is to keep it for your children, your children's children, and all who come after you, as the one great sight which every American should see."

I believe this statement applies equally to the beautiful Delta. The proposed tunnels put the Delta at risk for the sake of water just as the Hetch Hetchy Dam altered the wonders of Little Yosemite Valley.

If the tunnels are built the project will provide high paying jobs for a few years and the workers will no doubt generously thank the tunnel supporters. But when the project is completed, the effects of the tunnels will be around long after the workers have moved on.

Because the Delta is a national, if not international, treasure, it would be wrong to construct the tunnels without addressing the variety of concerns that many people have expressed. If it is a good idea, and valid arguments can be made for why the tunnels should be built, is there a honest reason why the project should not be voted upon by the citizens of the counties in which the Delta exists. Ask San Franciscans if they like Hetch Hetchy dam and they probably would say they do, but ask the entire nation if it is right to build a dam in a nation park, and the answer would probably be no. The same issue and difference of opinion is true for the Delta.

Please add this letter to the public comments for the Delta Tunnels Project.

Sincerely.

Martin & Dawn Heatlie
PO Box 278
Wheatland, Ca. 95692
martin.heatlie@gmail.com

From: Paul Edgerton <paul.edgerton@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 10:22 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: BDCP is flawed

I attended one of the public information meetings and studied the DVD along with many editorial pieces about the proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

To my mind, the most important factor in resolving California's water problem is greater storage. Our water supply is variable, so we need to store water during the wet years to carry us through the dry ones. This plan makes no provision to increase storage, only to speed the transit of water from northern to southern California. This would be accomplished at great cost, fiscally and environmentally, at a time when California can afford neither.

In short, we can't guarantee delivery of water downstream unless it exits upstream. Even if this plan could achieve all of its projected benefits while simultaneously avoiding all destructive consequences it would fail to address the underlying reality of a variable water supply.

The benefits are not worth the cost and the risks are large. I oppose this plan.

Paul Edgerton,
Stockton CA

From: Russ Smith <rangiwai2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 11:45 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Please don't destroy the Delta

Any plan that recommends killing striped and black bass as part of a "recovery" is misguided. The problem is not the fish swimming around in the Delta it's the people taking all the water out of the Delta that are the problem. The tunnels are just the latest effort to destroy the Delta to get more water for farmers and Southern California and the BDCP seems to be content to just blame it on the fish so that once the fish are all gone, the fishermen will be too and nobody will complain about more water leaving the Delta.

Russ Smith
Sunnyvale, CA

From: Tim Eyster <vikings99969@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 2:22 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: regarding the tunnels proposal

Dear Sirs,

We are strenuous in our objection to the background engineering work and the socio/economic work that exists for the Delta Water Diversion. Little to no work has been researched and communicated regarding the displacement of the HUMANS living in the delta and the impact that tunnel building will have. We do not consider a 10 yr project as having short-term impact on the lives of those Californians directly impacted.

Sincerely,

Tim & Alison Eyster
1649 Grey Owl Circle
Roseville, CA, 95661

From: Miranda Yanko <mirandayanko1234@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 2:32 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Twin tunnels

Dear sir or madam,

I have serious concerns regarding the bay delta conservation plan. Taking fresh water out if the delta does not conserve the vital resource that is necessary for the ecology and economic stability of Stockton/sac area. We need the fresh water for farms that are here. The food/crops that are grown here are vital to our society and our world. This so called "conservation plan" doesn't give us any new fresh water it just takes it all away from us. This project is a big waste of money and time. We need to implement water conservation measures.

Please address these concerns at your earliest convenience, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely, Miranda J. Yanko
Sent from my iPhone

From: Jeffrey James <jeff@jsjamescpa.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 2:43 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan

I am writing to provide support for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and its coequal goals of protecting the environment and providing for human use. We must invest in our infrastructure to provide water reliability for 25 million people. The San Joaquin Valley has been devastated by drought and lack of water conveyance and storage to meet the needs of the environment and its people. As a young professional who travels the nation, I have considered moving to another part of the country not faced with so many economic, regulatory, and resource challenges. BDCP is a step in the right direction, but we must also invest in above-ground water storage, specifically Temperance Flat Dam, water banking, and robust conservation measures.

Jeffrey James

1242 E Champlain Dr
Fresno, CA 93720

--

Jeffrey S James

p | (559) 480-2433
e | jeff@jsjamescpa.com
w | www.jsjamescpa.com
f | [JS James CPA](#)
t | [Twitter](#)
l | [Linkedin](#)

From: Coralee & Mike <mikdowns@frontiernet.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 2:48 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: General Comment

I could write pages of specific comments on the Draft BDCP and EIR/EIS. You have already read them all. So I will just say as a 78 year old man, who spent over 50 years as a professional engineer, these documents do not make sense as a way to protect the Delta or provide any additional water to the Water Districts who want it. Less expensive alternatives were not seriously evaluated. Some of these would provide added earthquake protection to the Delta levies, and could provide better fish and habitat protection. Costs are not completely paid for by the water contractors, as advertised. Costs are not honestly presented, as the taxpayer will pick up much of the mitigation cost. The Delta farmers and residents will pay by loosing their livelihood and quality of life for many years.

*Thank you,
Michael Downs
Walnut Grove*

From: Will Corning <WillCorning@antioch.k12.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 5:40 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Comments on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan

Will Corning
1804 Mount Silliman Way
Antioch, CA 94531

July 28, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

The Bay Delta Conservation Plan appears to select winners and losers. The winners are the people who are supplied with water from the Central Valley Project, most particularly farmers in the southern half of the Central Valley who use most of the water diverted from the delta. The losers are the people who live around the delta whose water quality will decrease (particularly delta farmers), who will bear the hardships of construction, and who will never benefit from the water diversion of the tunnels. The people of the delta are already suffering from increased salinity due to the drought and current pumping into the Central Valley Project. The problem of salt in our water will only be exacerbated by pumping freshwater away from the delta.

The delta is a sensitive ecological zone that has been changed and disturbed by human habitation for decades. It is likely to be the site of a natural disaster in the upcoming century. There are hundreds of miles of levees that are keeping water off of what was once marshland. Due to subsidence, a majority of the delta islands are below sea level. There is abundant seismic activity near the delta. It would appear that the best reason for building the tunnels would be to prevent the loss of water to southern California when a natural disaster, such as sea level rise or severe earthquake, strikes the delta. However, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan does little to avert a disaster in the delta and does nothing to protect the people living in the delta from natural disaster.

Back in April 2000, the USGS publication "Delta Subsidence in California" proposed several strategies for how to combat subsidence, including shallow or deepwater flooding. Shallow water flooding and soil deposition could reverse the trend of subsidence, and flooding with freshwater would decrease the danger of large levee breaches. It seems possible to me that methods could be developed for sustainable agriculture in the delta that would not exacerbate the dangers of subsidence. The Bay Delta Conservation Plan does nothing to conserve the delta – rather it would protect the recipients of the Central Valley Project at the expense of the delta ecosystem and the people living there.

The Bay Delta Conservation Plan does not develop any new sources of water. It is generally recognized that there is a fixed supply of water in California, and the amount is likely to decrease in the years to come due to climate change. Rather than investing heavily in a plan that would deplete the delta, we should invest in strategies to recycle and use desalinated water. Both of these strategies would increase the water available to the people of California. Recycling has been shown to be the least expensive source for water, but desalination has proved to be a successful strategy for a number of countries in the Middle East. The way of the future for California should be to develop sources of water that are sustainable and capable of increasing with our population. Draining and destroying the delta ecosystem is not our only choice.

Sincerely,

Will Corning

From: R Silver <pacifictbird@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 3:59 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: BDCP Comments

The BDCP rises as one of the most important California has undertaken yet this century and yet most Californians don't know a lot about it despite the very high total cost of the project. Yet not enough Californians are informed of the benefits versus the costs of the Twin Tunnels taxpayer-funded part of project, the delayed introduction to conservation measures in the plan, and the missing treatment of connected Bays, surely the BDCP deserves to be rejected in its current version.

California needs a plan that's uses our precious taxes, fees, and benefits more wisely in our warming World. Indeed, the World is looking to Us for the smart and efficient ways to provide water and food for All. The BDCP would be a great setback compared to what we can do with \$50,000,000,000 dollars. As for conservation and water management, farming should shift just as the species your not doing enough to maintain are doing.

So please don't let your opinions be swindled by the big Money interests in this debate. We, the Informed People, know they want "their water" even with such a wasteful and unhelpful plan. And why not, they don't have to pay their fare share under the BDCP! Instead, they probably figure they can buy public servants for a lot cheaper!

Well, please don't let that happen!

Thank you and good day!

Rodger Silvers
San Jose, CA

From: Gjestson David <davegjestson@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 5:55 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: BDCP and IIR/EIS Comments

Dear Ryan Wulff:

I am a retired wildlife biologist having worked for the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources for 30 years extending from 1967 to my retirement in January 1999. In my capacity as a natural resources manager, I am experienced in both land management strategies as well as statewide planning and environmental assessment of hundreds of project ranging in size from a few acres to those in the 80,000-acre range. I appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on one of this magnitude.

I am a new arrival in California (2011), and only recently discovered this huge proposal, so my review is quite limited. However, I am an Oakley resident and strongly endorse the recommendation the city has submitted to you, in particular, the lack of formal and long-term community representation in this process. Along with my friends and neighbors, I am opposed to the project's obvious negative environmental impacts on this huge ecological area. Even a cursory screening of the list of biological species concerned demonstrates the very cursory view of species impacts. Simply avoiding an evaluation of migratory waterfowl, let alone the numerous species of migratory birds that pass through the area because they are currently not endangered or threatened expresses shortsightedness on the part of the reviewers.

I was also rather stunned at the clandestine way the project was introduced to the reader as a "Conservation Plan" when the clear goal of the project is to send water south to large, wealthy agricultural interests without so much as a mention in the introduction. That to me reflects disdain for the taxpayer who has already been burdened with huge bills over the past 100 years primarily to benefit a relative few large landowners and lined the pockets of benefitted legislators. This project represents a sham of the highest order. Perhaps a reference to the book, "Cadillac Desert" by Marc Reisner should be referenced in the plan and EIS?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely, David L. Gjestson
18 Clare Court
Oakley, CA 94561

cc: Randy Pope, Oakley Mayor

From: mary mctaggart <cavelanding@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 9:05 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: BDCP EIR/EIS Comments

July 28, 2014

BDCP Comments
Ryan Wulff, NMFS
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Wulff:

I am a resident of Lisbon District (RD 307) north of Clarksburg in the Primary Zone of the Legal Delta. I grew up there, my father and grandfather having farmed in both Lisbon and Pearson Districts. My parents aged 102 and 96 still live on their Lisbon District farm. A good friend died of Valley Fever contracted in the Kettleman City area after disturbing soil chasing a septic system problem.

With reference to EIR/EIS chapters 22 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases), 24 (Hazards and hazardous Materials), 25 (Public Health), and 29 (Climate Change), I ask that the BDCP staff examine the potential for BDCP-related construction and maintenance activities over the 50 year Plan period to add to the risk of increased incidence of Valley Fever (coccidioidomycosis) among both construction workers and Delta residents and visitors. Valley Fever, a soil-borne fungal infection, can cause life-long debilitation and death. According to information available from the California Department of Public Health, Division of Communicable Disease Control, Valley Fever is already present in the counties of the BDCP Plan Area. (See "Valley Fever Fact Sheet" September 2013 and "What you need to know about Valley Fever in California" May 2014.) Although the area of highest incidence in California now begins just south of the Delta and extends south to Kern and San Luis Obispo counties, the EIR/EIS should examine whether with the higher temperatures brought by climate change this highest incidence area could move north into the BDCP Plan Area. Any activities which disturb soil, such as construction of and/or management of habitat areas and construction and use of unpaved roads can heighten the risk of infection of "anyone who lives, works, or visits" a Valley Fever area. ("Valley Fever Fact Sheet" - see also "Prison disease price tag may rise" The Sacramento Bee, July 28, 2014). Possible mitigations might include monitoring of soil, air, disease incidence, use of N95 masks or respirators, dust suppression actions, and public education for Delta visitors, residents, and those engaged in BDCP construction activities.

Please refer to the following websites:

<http://www.cdph.ca.gov/healthinfo/discond/Pages/Coccidioidomycosis.aspx>

<http://www.cdc.gov/fungal/diseases/coccidioidomycosis/index.html>

<http://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/ohb/pages/cocci.aspx>

Sincerely,

Mary McTaggart
34840 S. River Road
Clarksburg, CA 95612

From: Bill Jacobson Consulting <bill@billjacobson.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 1:30 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan DEIR/DEIS

25 July 2014

National Marine Fisheries Service
Attn: Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, California 95814

Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan DEIR/DEIS

Dear Mr. Wulff:

Overview

The Bay Delta Conservation Project (BDCP), also known as the “Twin Tunnel Project”, is in its basic function, a plan developed and supported by numerous private, corporate, State, Federal and NGO organizations to move and divert Northern California water. The BDCP states that this is a “long-term strategy to secure California’s water supplies and improve the ecosystem of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta.” [1] They reason that there are Co-Equal goals for the project, to improve water supply and to restore San Francisco Bay Delta ecosystems.

Our position is that 30 miles of water tunnels will negatively impact the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and Northern California aquatic wildlife ecology now, and for generations to come. Killing and destroying fish and aquatic life, wildlife, and infiltrating 30 miles plus of land mass as a means to divert water to large scale agribusiness and Southern California water districts is short sighted and is an unsustainable method of caring for our water, watershed ecology and natural resources living far beyond the Sacramento delta.

The Bay Delta Conservation Project claims that the following benefits will improve water supply and Bay Delta ecosystems: [2]

- Secure water supplies for a “vast” part of California economy from the Bay Area to San Diego and more than 3 million acres of farmland
- Create and protect jobs: Boost the economy by \$84 billion dollars
- Ecosystem Restoration for Delta fish and wildlife

These claims deserve our utmost attention and concern.

In securing water supplies for a “vast” part of California economy, what is the actual cost? The foundational economic goods and services of a healthy Bay Delta ecosystem include clean water, exclusion of salt water infiltration, rich land mass, food, beauty, recreation, tourism and many other benefits that sustain healthy Bay Delta communities.

The study that states that creating and protecting jobs will boost the “economy” by \$84 billion dollars. Nature

provides a wide array of market and non-market benefits to society, ranging from recreational and scenic qualities, to extractive uses such as fishing, farming, production of oxygen for the air we breathe. All Northern and Central California Tribes, planners, watershed managers, forest owners, natural resource agencies, scholars and businesses must be included in the research and communication process to adequately determine the value of nature's capital assets.

In stating that ecosystem restoration for Delta fish and wildlife will be enhanced, do the majority the aforementioned voices Tribes, planners, watershed managers, flood rush managers, forest owners, natural resources agencies, etcetera, agree?

Our Viewpoint

The Social Alliance Network encourages all People and communities to urgently become informed on this attempt to disrupt our land, our native aquatic life, wildlife, waterways and way of life.

We also ask that NMFS not support this proposal to disrupt the long term sustainability of this watershed and associated ecosystems.

Sincerely,

Bill Jacobson
Founder
Social Alliance Network

Bibliography:

[1] see: Fast Facts of the BDCP <http://goo.gl/ioY2Nx>

[2] California Department of Water Resources: <http://www.water.ca.gov/tribal/bdcp.cfm>

Bill Jacobson, mpa

530.268.7367 p

415.454.4167 c

bill@socialalliancenenetwork.org

www.socialalliancenenetwork.org

www.salmonjourneys.com

From: janet lovell <janetlovell@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:35 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed

Begin forwarded message:

From: postmaster@mac.com
Subject: **Delivery Notification: Delivery has failed**
Date: July 29, 2014 8:29:50 AM PDT
To: janetlovell@me.com

This report relates to a message you sent with the following header fields:

Message-id: <454D40B2-72EF-48B4-80A7-DACD010488E2@me.com>
Date: Tue, 29 Jul 2014 08:29:42 -0700
From: janet lovell <janetlovell@me.com>
To: BDCP.comments2@noaa.gov
Subject: BDCP plans

Your message cannot be delivered to the following recipients:

Recipient address: BDCP.comments2@noaa.gov
Reason: Remote SMTP server has rejected address
Diagnostic code: smtp;550 No such user - psmt
Remote system: dns;noaa.gov.s9a1.psmt.com (TCP|17.158.232.237|60033|74.125.148.10|25)

Original-envelope-id: 0N9H00G2VCDFF040@nk11p03mm-asmt002.mac.com
Reporting-MTA: dns;nk11p03mm-asmt002.mac.com (tcp-daemon)
Arrival-date: Tue, 29 Jul 2014 15:29:40 +0000 (GMT)

Original-recipient: rfc822;BDCP.comments2@noaa.gov
Final-recipient: rfc822;BDCP.comments2@noaa.gov
Action: failed
Status: 5.0.0 (Remote SMTP server has rejected address)
Remote-MTA: dns;noaa.gov.s9a1.psmt.com
(TCP|17.158.232.237|60033|74.125.148.10|25)
Diagnostic-code: smtp;550 No such user - psmt

From: janet lovell <janetlovell@me.com>
Subject: **BDCP plans**
Date: July 29, 2014 8:29:42 AM PDT
To: BDCP.comments2@noaa.gov

I am adding my comments to the many I am sure you have received regarding the BDCP plans. Since the

management of those who wrote the plan made it so difficult to read what is exactly in the plan it has taken a great deal of effort for the public to be aware of what is included in the plan. This is both devious and undemocratic. The public deserves to have full disclosure on both the actual plan and the unintended consequences. At that point, public meetings and public comment periods should be opened.

I am a resident of El Cerrito and have lived in San Francisco, Berkeley, or El Cerrito for 70 years. I have spent 65 years on the Sacramento River during the summer and have watched and experienced the changes in the Northern Delta. There have been a number of them, all as result of previous water engineering projects. The BDCP plan at this time is one more of these. The previous changes in water movements that were engineered to send water to The South are basically the cause of the negative changes in the Delta. Now you want to reengineer the water by adding tunnels that will drain the water out just below Sacramento that will cause the unintended consequences of loss of water to North Delta farmers, fishermen, recreational boaters . As well Northern California water users will be losing their fresh water supply in order to supply water to other parts of the State. Why do plan another source of water for other parts of the state. This plan and the tunnels will be very costly... I notice that water districts that receive this water plan to pay a large part of the cost.does this not tell us that these groups will benefit and others will lose greatly. Or does this not tell us that these groups control the political power that is pushing this plan through . Conservation and environmental protection should not be controlled by money and politics. Think about spending the same amount of money on desalination plants before you ruin the Northern Delta.

Sincerely,

Janet Lovell

From: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM
To: bdcg comments - NOAA Service Account
Subject: Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
Attachments: 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM
Subject: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
To: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
Anita deGuzman  
*Administrative Assistant*  
NOAA Fisheries \* West Coast Region  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
916-930-3600 - main  
916-930-3629 - fax  
Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2014

May 15th 2014

Dear BDCP,

Nat'l Marine Fisheries Svs.  
Sacramento, CA

My name is Catalina LLanos, I am a student at CSU Chico majoring in physical geography. Being born and raised in a highly urbanized area of Los Angeles never made me appreciate any of the natural resources I had access to, water in particular. After moving to Butte County almost four years ago, I gained a high appreciation and concern for the availability and quality of our freshwater in the state of California. I have been enrolled in some classes over the last few semesters that have taught me many things about water policies and water management, and have also volunteered and interned at water quality assessment teams for my local watershed, so I have some type of knowledge about the ongoing water issues we face and expect to see over the next years. The Bay Delta Conservation Plan is a ridiculously long document that addresses 50-year "solutions" to some of the major issues of concern such as management for endangered species within the California Delta, fulfillment of agricultural river diversions, and fulfillment of water supply for the southern delta's 'consumption. I don't believe the implementation of waterways and large tunnels will be beneficial to the latter issues on the long term basis. Based on some of my knowledge and experiences at the delta reservoirs that were created, I can say that these type of projects only harm our landscapes and affect the natural regimes of the planet.

The California Delta has been managed as a tidal/freshwater system for over 70 years. This has declined the ecological productivity of the delta, altered water flows, and affected the fish and habitat availability due to levee construction and channelization. I don't believe that continuing to alter out freshwater by routing and timing the water flows

will improve these conditions, since it leads to the need for many other efforts. After reading some of the proposed activities of the BDCP, I can see why the plan wants to be put into effect. The debate between the needs to improve the water supply reliability or protecting the endangered fish and habitats is controversial. I think this debate is redundant because we wouldn't have to be in this situation if there would have been appropriate water regulations and maintenance based on traditional knowledge of our waterways. Water is a sacred source to all species, the fact that anthropogenic modifications are consuming the landscape only brings more issues to the availability of it, and increases our dependence and demand for it even more.

If we look back on our history, we can see that a similar situation took place with the creation of the Los Angeles Aqueduct and the draining of Owens Lake. The applications and description of alternatives only sound to me like another recipe for degradation of the landscapes and water transfer to millions of users. From some of the proposed activities, one that highly concerns me is the excerpt about activities to reduce methylmercury contamination. It is upsetting to see how the contamination of the water is becoming a problem in some areas, I don't think this is fair to native fish species. I have read many articles, some of which include analyses on Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley (Merz and Moyle 2006) and management for ecotoxicological considerations due to municipal discharges into streams (Brooks et al. 2006), and can only see the continued decline of other populations.

Another proposed BDCP Activity that I have concerns about is the habitat restoration, creation, enhancement and management activities proposal. I think that there is only so much you can try to manage in restore compared to the magnitude of the facility sites. There are many places that, if become endangered, wont have as high of a

**From:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM  
**To:** bdcpc comments - NOAA Service Account  
**Subject:** Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**Attachments:** 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM  
**Subject:** BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**To:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
Anita deGuzman
Administrative Assistant
NOAA Fisheries * West Coast Region
U.S. Department of Commerce
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-930-3600 - main
916-930-3629 - fax
Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov

RECEIVED

BDCP1884

JUL 29 2014

To whom it may concern,

Natl Marine Fisheries Sys.
Sacramento, CA

The current state of the BDCP is a document designed to dissuade and fool concerned citizens of the central valley in regard to the health of the delta. In its current form the BDCP is a behemoth document of impractical size, a physical copy would be an eleven-foot tall document. The size of the documents is only the surface of the actually shortcomings of the BDCP, the content is a mixed bag of political jargon and political persuasion. The BDCP identifies urban advancement over wild habitat in the delta as an increase of spatial diversity and complexity, which is just about as close to a lie as possible. Urban development of riparian wetlands creates a disturbance that introduces invasive species, species that are quick to dominate an area, which develops into a monoculture (Park, 2004). As if demolition of the little remaining wetlands in the Central Valley was not enough damage, the BDCP is seeking out to receive incidental take permits, which allow the destruction of threatened and endangered species due to "incidental" damage from covered construction. What the BDCP also fails to reveal about incidental take permits is that the issuing agencies often provide incidental take permits without major scientific input in almost ninety percent of take permits issued.

The BDCP is convoluted plan between the water agencies and water contractors to continue to profit on the destruction of wetlands in the central valley. The delta smelt is a critical species to riparian wildlife and removing water in no way benefits this species, additionally current river capacity in the Central Valley barely reaches capacity to support a salmon run. I fail to see how any EIR or EIS can

claim how less water will protect the ecology of wetlands. The BDCP uses a lot of literature to run around and avoid any actual input on the topics they bring up, a sign to the fact that the EIR and EIS is to have little to no actual scientific input. Mitigation efforts seem impractical due to the fact that the lack of water available will make any type of mitigation an effort in futility.

The BDCP is a cleverly developed document prepared for the profit of water contractors with no scientific input and complete disregard of the ecology of the delta and Central Valley wetlands. To meet the dire needs for water for southern California farmers other alternatives should be considered. Desalination, fog harvesting, crop conversions, and improved water efficiency are all environmentally friendlier alternative to the installation of more tunnels in the delta. Too long has southern California relied on crops that require large amounts of irrigation. If the BDCP really had the best intentions of the delta and wishes to see the ecology preserved the best possible plan of action would to leave it alone and remain with the status quo.

With regards,

Paul Nevarez

prev24@yahoo.com

Park, K. (2004). Assessment and management of invasive alien predators. *Ecology and Society*, 9(2), 2060-2068.

From: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM
To: bdcpc comments - NOAA Service Account
Subject: Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
Attachments: 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM
Subject: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
To: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
Anita deGuzman

*Administrative Assistant*

NOAA Fisheries \* West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100

Sacramento, CA 95814

916-930-3600 - main

916-930-3629 - fax

[Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov](mailto:Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov)

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2014

Nat'l Marine Fisheries Svs.  
Sacramento, CA

Dear DEIR/DEIS, after careful reading of the BDCP plan, I question the environmental protection, timing, and mitigation measures that will be provided to ecological wildlife and native plant species that live in the Delta region. The direct processes of protecting the native vegetation, soils, and ecological wildlife have not been clearly identified. In multiple sections of the of the BDCP plan, environmental protection has been mentioned, but the direct actions have not been taken. For example in section 3.2.3, Development of DWR "Proposed project" in 2012, nothing was mentioned regarding the specific government agencies that are going to take the responsibility of protecting the ecological wildlife. In section 3.4.1 it is mentioned that the implementation of fish screens would take into effect once the tunnels were built, but during spawning season, fish, particularly salmon, travel upstream for spawning, and this would interfere with that process. The removal of sediment is also an issue because, in section 3.6.1.1 it states that the sediments are going to be removed, but in reality, this affects the plants and animals that feed on this sediment, because it helps water quality. In section 3.5.2.2- Conservation components, would the soils that surround parts of the Delta be completely ignored? Or are they going to be taken into account when implanting the plan?

Another issue that I would like to address is the project description. The project objectives have been clearly identified, but the description does not mention the effects on native peoples who live in these areas. Is there going to be enough water left for them so they go on with their daily life? Also, this description does not mention the water delivery to Southern California. How much of this water is going to be diverted to that part of the state? I also think that more of the potential take permits and other regulatory authorizations need to be clearly identified, and how carefully will these be enforced? Additionally, does this mean that people can fish all of the non- threatened and non-endangered fish that they want to?

The mitigation measures that were mentioned were well thought out. Great detail was provided with the proposed plan of the twin tunnels project. The materials that are needed for the project are well presented. The impacts that this project has on the environment, and the timing of the water delivery could be thought out more.

The timing of this project was something that was hard to understand. Is this project going to take years to build, or will it be built within a couple of months? Also, when is project going into effect? Also, will the fish be moved to fisheries? Or will they remain where they are and slowly die off?

Other concerned must also be addressed. In this plan, there is no mention of how the fish and other wildlife will be dealt with. Are there going to be specific conservations actions taken to protect the habitat for the wildlife that live in this region? Are these aquatic species going to be moved to a different place so they be protected? Thank you for taking time to read my concerns for this project.

Sincerely, Christine Black

Christine Black  
cblack@mail.ccsuchico.edu

**From:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM  
**To:** bdcpc comments - NOAA Service Account  
**Subject:** Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**Attachments:** 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <[anita.deguzman@noaa.gov](mailto:anita.deguzman@noaa.gov)>  
**Date:** Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM  
**Subject:** BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**To:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <[ryan.wulff@noaa.gov](mailto:ryan.wulff@noaa.gov)>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
 Anita deGuzman
Administrative Assistant
 NOAA Fisheries * West Coast Region
 U.S. Department of Commerce
 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
 Sacramento, CA 95814
916-930-3600 - main
916-930-3629 - fax
Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov

RECEIVED

BDCP1886

JUL 29 2014

Jose Torres
GEOG 426

Natl Marine Fisheries Svs.
Sacramento, CA

BDCP Review

First let me begin by saying that I am not a subject matter expert, so perhaps my knowledge before reading this was not sufficient. So Don I ask to not submit this to any official institution. As the name states it is suppose to be a plan, I am assuming that it is a plan to take action. It is a very complex plan with many moving parts. Site maps for projects should be included, and the entire document as hole should be condensed. A suggestion in doing so would to perhaps take out some of the redundant definitions. After reading it the plan gives the idea that tis an educational encyclopedia rather than a plan.

I had questions regarding the overall authority on standards in particular the Permits by the US Fish and Wildlife. Why include defined outline of the agency, and not simply state that such agency equals such standards or compliance. Also had a problem with the length of the permits being 50yrs. Droughts can have significant impact and can happen in 1-2 years.

I wont lie I did not even come close to reading all of this plan, I skimmed to areas I thought I might find interest in or areas I thought would explain a subject I had a question on. Instead I just found definitions and descriptions of what an office or position represents or is in charge of, but nothing regarding what they are actually doing or planning to do. So basically my initial perception that this was a plan to improve solve or mitigate the water issues of the state, I feel like it is an outline and description of all the involved agencies and their roles.

Chapter 4 was a chapter that gave me some satisfaction, because it actually went into details of the project. The pipeline project, unfortunately I felt it is an extreme project. It is 40ft in diameter and built along the Sacramento Rv. I don't know if they have been to the river lately but there isn't much water there. So that takes us back to the habitat restoration/preservation. If we take the little water that is left than what is the point of all the water reroutes?

All of these circular problems bring be to conclude that this plan is silly, not because it is to long, an encyclopedia, or that it is unclear, but because it does not address the actual problem depletion of our water resource. I just read an article on Texas, they are already putting recycled black water back in to the tap water supply. When push comes to shove I am sure that we will resort to this as well. By that time however it will be to late, for the environment and the 56 species outlined in the BDCP. I suggest less mitigation on were to get more water and more focus on regulating our current use of the water we do have.

From: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM
To: bdcg comments - NOAA Service Account
Subject: Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
Attachments: 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM
Subject: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
To: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
 Anita deGuzman  
*Administrative Assistant*  
 NOAA Fisheries \* West Coast Region  
 U.S. Department of Commerce  
 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100  
 Sacramento, CA 95814  
916-930-3600 - main  
916-930-3629 - fax  
[Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov](mailto:Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov)



RECEIVED

May 8, 2014

BDCP Comments  
Ryan Wulff, NMFS  
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100  
Sacramento, CA 95814

JUL 29 2014

Natl Marine Fisheries Svs.  
Sacramento, CA

Dear Mr. Wulff:

After close review of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan I have concerns regarding water transfers and other voluntary water market transactions. In chapter 4, section 2.7 of the plan it states that under the BDCP there is no quantifiable maximum amount of water that could be delivered through State Water Project and Central Valley Project Facilities; this includes SWP and CVP water as well as water from voluntary water market transactions (pg. 4-90, 26-29). I believe that the amount of water being moved and transferred throughout the Delta should be regulated and monitored regardless of stakeholder or transaction. Maintaining water flows in the Delta is fundamental to the survival of valuable aquatic ecosystems. It also states in chapter 4, section 2.7 that, "separate environmental review and possibly take permits may need to be obtained that cover impacts to listed species or critical habitat that may result from the effects of such transactions on the source area" (35-37). It is the buyer or seller's responsibility to acquire such permits before the water transaction. I wonder how the BDCP can be completely effective if it isn't regulating all water movement throughout the Plan area. Regardless of source area, the water is still entering and/or exiting the Delta, therefore affecting the natural communities and covered species.

Some of the covered activities proposed by the BDCP aim to change water flows within the Delta in order to improve water quality and benefit covered fish species. By reducing exports in the south Delta, and shifting them to the north it will increase outflow in to the Bay, resulting in reduced salt water intrusion and improved water quality (23-35 5.3.1.1). The BDCP has plans to alter the Fremont Weir to allow for more Sacramento River flood waters to enter the Yolo Bypass. This will restore habitat for many of the covered species. The BDCP also plans to implement intake pump facilities in the north Delta, with a combined capacity of 9000cfs. The combination of these plans will drastically decrease Delta inflow from the Sacramento River (5.3.1.2). Consequently, with lower flows from the Sacramento River, there will be less deposition of sediment into the Delta. The Sacramento River historically deposits more than 80% of its sediment into the delta, which makes up 85% of Delta sediments (pg. 5.3-24 5-6). This reduction in sediment will lead to less turbidity and higher productivity. The BDCP has plans to implement changes in the Delta that could have a very positive impact on aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. The BDCP acknowledges the potential for incidental takes due to the covered activities planned in the Delta; however it is taking actions to mitigate such losses by enhancing habitats through restoration and conservation efforts.

Thank you,

Hayley Ascherin  
hascherin@live.com

**From:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM  
**To:** bdcf comments - NOAA Service Account  
**Subject:** Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**Attachments:** 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM  
**Subject:** BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**To:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
 Anita deGuzman
Administrative Assistant
 NOAA Fisheries * West Coast Region
 U.S. Department of Commerce
 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
 Sacramento, CA 95814
 916-930-3600 - main
 916-930-3629 - fax
Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2014

Shayla Ramos

530-518-7670

Nat'l Marine Fisheries Svs.
Sacramento, CA

Dear DEIR/DEIS,

I am commenting on the BDCP proposal. To begin I am aware with no actual facts or evidence my comments will be 'noted'. I appreciate that my letter be 'noted' and not casted to the side for another commenter whom provides evidence by elaborating with facts, articles etc. There comment has more basis and credibility but I do believe our comments both hold the same merit.

The objective are not clear on what the project but are supported by references that are on record in the proposal, although the references are not easily attainable since one reference may lead to another reference that has included other references throughout the proposal. The phases of project are not adequately described and the people who live in a 500 mile radius of the facility are not represented. The specific permits that apply and acquire authorization are not clearly identified and are only referenced without clear indication on where the exact name and detail of permit and authority is in the proposal.

Not all environmental resources that are potentially affected are not clearly described. There is no sufficient information to understand physical and cultural environmental factors at the time of the notice of preparation. There needs to be more information in decision making and analysis as baseline for the physical and cultural environment such as the Indians that use to resign where the facility will be and the wetland reserves. Appropriate protocol was used to perform surveys but I am unaware of the surveys of proponents that the agencies have analyzed by the obscure details for reference.

The minimal impacts have been poorly determined for all environmental resources including the threshold of significance and is substantially underrepresented with little analysis with support of direct and indirect impacts of project. The proposal had poor organization that it was difficult to find appropriate presentation of potential significance of comparing all resources impacts. The lack of organization also gave way to no presentation of cumulative impacts of past and foreseeable future when there is indeed a vast array of articles, survey and data on the cumulative potential effects on the physical and cultural impacts of altering the environment for the improvement of civilization such as deforestation and minimization of wetlands.

Mitigation was presented of potential impacts except no alternatives were. There was little to no detail on mitigation measures to agencies to defer information and decision making which gives little faith to DEIS/DIER on the topic and potential outcome of the project and objectives. The economic infeasible mitigation measures are presented but is not clear on supporting evidence. The majority of agencies connected to the project have performed analysis that have been clearly stated but does not seem adequate to support conclusion of all measures.

There are a miniscule array of alternatives presented with no detailed evaluation on why alternative were not analyzed besides the insufficiency to objectives with little supporting evidence in the references. There is no adequate range of alternative in DEIR that are potentially feasible that would meet objectives or minimize impacts. Alternatives are not sufficiently supported as why they are not economically feasible with the information and references given and it is unclear if this has been analyzed.

From: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM
To: bdcpc comments - NOAA Service Account
Subject: Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
Attachments: 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM
Subject: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
To: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
 Anita deGuzman  
*Administrative Assistant*  
 NOAA Fisheries \* West Coast Region  
 U.S. Department of Commerce  
 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100  
 Sacramento, CA 95814  
 916-930-3600 - main  
 916-930-3629 - fax  
Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov

JUL 29 2014

To whom it may concern,

Natl Marine Fisheries Svs  
Sacramento, CA

After reading through some of the BDCP DEIR/DEIS, biodiversity and natural system health are mentioned on multiple occasions. However much of the restoration is intended to focus on primarily one species. The current environmental conditions have essentially performed that function already by restricting the environment and only allowing well adapted species to thrive. By restoring large areas in the thousands of acres targeting the success of one species such as the nontidal marsh is aimed at the giant garter snake will likely only be moderately successful (CM10 3.6.2.9). Instead of the attitude was changed from targeted species health to increase overall system health, a better way could potentially come from establishing overall system health and diversity to increase the strength of all populations thereby increasing the strength of the targeted species. By creating more niche opportunities these targeted species will have better odds of survival and establishment. This applies to all restoration efforts throughout the delta.

Another area of concern comes from the project objectives section ES.2.1 where it states that new operations or configurations of the water conveyance system are to be installed in the North delta, and particularly how this may relate to mercury restoration. The Sacramento river and its tributaries feed a large portion of the water to the delta, which at the current time is contaminated with mercury from mining (8.2.3.9). Mercury will naturally make its way through the system over time, and with higher disturbance rates there would likely initially be more contamination do to sediment movement. However over time the mercury would go the way of the cliched solution to pollution being dilution. A possible problem with pumping groundwater from the North delta is that any sort of cone of depression that was created could easily reach the river and use that as a recharge point. A few wells is not a problem but if many wells or long pumping times present themselves the flow of the river will likely be diminished. The mercury section only states that local entities will likely be responsible for mercury reduction, this is inadequate as mercury has been shown to be very toxic. The restoration of natural

flow regimes would contribute to mercury restoration based on movement out of the system into the ocean or be buried as the streams meander, so reducing the amount of water coming from the North delta is only going to hinder the mercury restoration further.

Stefan Kirk  
1521 Nord ave #90  
Chico, CA 95926

**From:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM  
**To:** bdcpc comments - NOAA Service Account  
**Subject:** Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**Attachments:** 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM  
**Subject:** BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**To:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
 Anita deGuzman
Administrative Assistant
 NOAA Fisheries * West Coast Region
 U.S. Department of Commerce
 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
 Sacramento, CA 95814
 916-930-3600 - main
 916-930-3629 - fax
Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov

Victoria Birdseye

GEOG 426

5-8-14

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2014

BDCP Response Letter

Nat'l Marine Fisheries Svs.
Sacramento, CA

After reading through the BDCP EIR draft and taking into consideration its proposed project I am concerned that there are some problems with the EIR and the BDCP that should be addressed.

Firstly, The BDCP did not address any cultural or historic valuable places that would be or could be impacted. The lead agency should contact the appropriate trust agency. Trust agencies could include the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), California State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO), and the California Coastal Commission. Native tribes would also be valuable to contact. The Department of Fish and Wildlife website <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/ceqa/intnlproced/eir.html> states that an EIR must be produced "When a project has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory." This is an EIR draft so that requirement is met but there is no cultural study addressed in this EIR therefore this EIR is incomplete. Even if there is no impact to cultural or historic assets a section must explain that. I understand that many of these cultural and historic sites are kept confidential to avoid vandalism and defacement, however, if the public is not made aware of the chance that culturally significant artifacts and places, perhaps places significant to knowledge of the prehistory of California, then the public is unable to make an informed decision about building the BDCP if they are not aware of all the impacts. It is the EIR's responsibility to provide full disclosure of a project to the public, therefore they EIR is incomplete and inadequate.

Secondly, there is not an adequate project description. The BDCP EIR draft does not specifically explain what the project will entail. Project clarification needs to be included in the Final EIR. The draft has a lot of environmental settings, which is appropriate because that is the baseline for a reader's decision but not even that is complete, as I have previously stated. The BDCP EIR draft fails to explain the actions the proposed project will include. The EIR draft for the BDCP is not specific enough in regards to what actions will take place.

From: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM
To: bdcf comments - NOAA Service Account
Subject: Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
Attachments: 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM
Subject: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
To: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
Anita deGuzman

*Administrative Assistant*

NOAA Fisheries \* West Coast Region

U.S. Department of Commerce

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100

Sacramento, CA 95814

916-930-3600 - main

916-930-3629 - fax

[Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov](mailto:Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov)

BDCP Draft Comments

NMFS

To Whom It May Concern:

After reviewing the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, I have to argue that it fails reach its intended goal of securing water security for the future of Californians. Although this process of implementation has included over 300 public meetings as advertised, the true voice of the general public is held back due to the lack of insight and information that can be gained from a 20,000 plus page paper. The general public has been excluded in the process of what could be one of the most socially important projects in the history of California. For example, California has a very diverse population, yet the state fails to meet the needs of those people who cannot read a few pages, let alone a 20,000 page report that is very unorganized in structure and compositions.

Aside from the unorganized nature of the document, the BDCP fails to address the qualifications and criteria required to deem "Successful" in the conservation of species covered under the Federal Endangered Species Act and how the monitoring of these species will be covered. There is no guarantee and no logical way of thinking that by diverting water from the north delta to the south delta by means of large (3,000cfs-15,000cfs) underwater tunnels will ensure the conservation of critical aquatic species found in the delta and the areas north of the BDCP plan. Therefore I withdrawal any support for any of the implementations of construction including any sort of underwater tunnels. The smaller the tunnel, the less cost effective for the taxpayers, and the larger the tunnel, the worse the environmental repercussions will be for species in the delta and the areas north of the plan.

I suggest a conservation plan should start with a plan on reducing water use in the future, which is not covered whatsoever anywhere in the BDCP. Conservation is not achieved when over-consumption of a natural resource is assisted by large infrastructure. In fact, we can assume over consumptive agricultural practices will continue at the same pace they occur today, especially with a "guaranteed" supply of water coming from massive tunnel system in the middle of the delta.

Overall, I suggest a revision of the BDCP that is supported by current science and not "studies in the future." A crucial part of the BDCP that is lacking is the analysis of the BDCP's plan for habitat restoration and the true explanation of "How and to what degree" the proposed effect of species restoration will be achieved if the BDCP were to be placed into action. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

David Zarate Jr.

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2014

**From:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM  
**To:** bdcpc comments - NOAA Service Account  
**Subject:** Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**Attachments:** 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM  
**Subject:** BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**To:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
 Anita deGuzman
Administrative Assistant
 NOAA Fisheries * West Coast Region
 U.S. Department of Commerce
 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
 Sacramento, CA 95814
916-930-3600 - main
916-930-3629 - fax
Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this letter to make it very clear that I do not support the plan to build giant tunnels under the Sacramento Delta in order to move water to the south.

The BDCP is designed to protect 56 covered species. This is something that most people would agree is a good thing yet the BDCP does not explain specifically how it will protect these species. And I fail to understand how removing millions of acre feet of water from the delta will help any native species. The BDCP claims conservation measures will restore up to 83,200 acres of natural communities, including tidal wetland and associated estuarine and upland natural communities distributed across the Delta. Yet the BDCP never explains how removing such vast amounts of water from the delta will restore this land.

This BDCP is nothing more than a 20 billion dollar project that will only benefit a very few Californians. Furthermore while my grandchildren will still be paying for this project there is no clear evidence that the BDCP will be able to provide the water that is promised.

The problem is not a lack of water; the problem is that water is used incredibly inefficiently in this state. We produce more agriculture in California than any other place on earth, which I believe is a good thing. And we should continue to strive to be the worlds leader in agriculture yet it is foolish to continue to subsidize water. Let all Californians pay fare wages for the water they use. Let them pass on that cost to the consumers. Only then will Californians learn that water is a limited resource and it is infeasible to grow highly water dependent crops in arid regions.

Any person with any common sense can see that this state's financial health is in dire straits. And any one with common sense can also see that the BDCP is going to cost the state billions of dollars in order to make a few people millions. This project is going to cost all of us in order to benefit a very few and even more devastating to this state this project is going to destroy a diverse ecosystem in irreversible ways all in the name of financial gain.

As a fifth generation Californian, a registered voter, a tax payer and a veteran I urge you to not build these tunnels. There is plenty that can be done at a far lesser cost to the state both financially and environmentally.



Christopher Stoll
1132 Hobart St Unit A
Chico Ca. 95926

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2014

Natl Marine Fisheries Svs.
Sacramento, CA

From: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM
To: bdcpc comments - NOAA Service Account
Subject: Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
Attachments: 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM
Subject: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
To: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~

Anita deGuzman  
*Administrative Assistant*  
NOAA Fisheries \* West Coast Region  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
916-930-3600 - main  
916-930-3629 - fax  
[Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov](mailto:Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov)

Shea Arceo

California State University, Chico

400 W 1st St.

Chico, CA 95929

BDCP Comments

Ryan Wulff, NMFS

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100

Sacramento, CA 95814

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2014

Nat'l Marine Fisheries Svs.  
Sacramento, CA

Dear Ryan Wulff,

While reading through the Bay Delta Conservation Plan my main thoughts were that it was awfully confusing. It was repetitive with the plan's goal. I didn't think it was very helpful that throughout the whole draft it would refer to different acts or different parts of the draft. I wanted to understand what it was talking about so I often had to mark my spot and jump to the section it was referring to. Which ended up taking too much time and really broke up the flow of reading the draft. Although I understand it is necessary to list all acts that it supports and such, it felt like it interrupted paragraphs. I appreciated the use of bullet points of ideas or goals. It made it easier to approach rather than a lengthy paragraph.

Specifically in section 9 about alternative options, it was easier for me to comprehend the details of each alternative through the tables given on pages 9-14 through 9-20. I thought it was much easier to get a quick overview of each alternative in a table rather than reading each specific section. Also with section 9.1.1 on page 9-1, line 37-39 mentioned the typically

considered alternatives for habitat conservation plans. I thought it would be helpful to include examples of each scenario. If we want to be able to avoid incidental take permits we need to know examples of ways that would result in such incidental take.

Overall I thought the parts of the draft that I read were written so complex it made it difficult to read. Some things were repetitive and plainly not necessary to be mentioned again. However it was very thorough.

Sincerely,

Shea Arceo

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Shea Arceo".

shea\_arceo@yahoo.com

**From:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM  
**To:** bdcpr comments - NOAA Service Account  
**Subject:** Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**Attachments:** 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM  
**Subject:** BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014  
**To:** Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
 Anita deGuzman
Administrative Assistant
 NOAA Fisheries * West Coast Region
 U.S. Department of Commerce
 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
 Sacramento, CA 95814
 916-930-3600 - main
 916-930-3629 - fax
Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov

Jonas Chanh, Student
Geography and Planning Department
California State University, Chico
Butte Hall Room 507

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2014

Nat'l Marine Fisheries Svs.
Sacramento, CA

Dear To Whom It May Concern:

I have reviewed some of the sections of the BDCP in correlation to my Water Policy class in the Geography department at California State University, Chico as part of my assignment. Our goal was to review and evaluate the BDCP and apply our thoughts, concerns and what we have learned over the course semester. My primary review of the BDCP was the BDCP Draft Highlights in chapter nine – BDCP Alternatives to Take.

As a result of my review and evaluation of the BDCP's chapter nine, the BDCP did not mention any ware about water transfer in tunnels. Except from the available table provide in page 100 Alternatives BDCP Approaches. By looking at the table it would seem that category H: More Restoration seems to have more of a better take alternative benefit.

However, it may appear that the benefiteres of the BDCP project would be the agricultural and urban water agencies. In addition with the construction lasting 10 year, it would have a dramatic impact that would affect the health and wellbeing of the citizens and species who lives and depends on the stream and rivers. Although, the "Annual Water Delivers" table may present a reasonable and visible diagram of what might the BDCP would help improve the ecosystem, but it does not account for the number of families who may be affected.

Even though the BDCP would prove a beneficial out on papers, documents, and charts, in ten years a lot could happen. Some mitigation or suggestion may be to encourage and implement southern California to conserve and recycle and reuse sewage water. Build rain catchment system and create awareness of their water problems. Furthermore, make a law or program that would enforce low flow equipment. Also, shape a idea that California as whole depends on each other to thrive and if northern California's aquifer gets dry out like the Owen's Lake, it would only create more problems in the future.

Sincerely,



Jonas Chanh, Student
Geography 426 – Water Policy
Geography Department

From: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 7:12 AM
To: bdcg comments - NOAA Service Account
Subject: Fwd: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
Attachments: 20140729 - Catalina Llanos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Paul Nevarez - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christine Black - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jose Torres - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Hayley Ascherin - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shayla Ramos - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Stefan Kirk - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Victoria Birdseye - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - David Zarate - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Christopher Stoll - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Shea Arceo - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Jonas Chanh - Student - California State University - Chico.pdf; 20140729 - Cathy Hankins - Chico.pdf

received 7/29

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Anita Deguzman - NOAA Affiliate <anita.deguzman@noaa.gov>
Date: Fri, Aug 1, 2014 at 3:56 PM
Subject: BDCP COMMENTS | Received 07.29.2014
To: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal <ryan.wulff@noaa.gov>

I have attached the following comments for your files.

Copies have been made and are in your mailbox - original letters are up front at the reception desk.

--

~~~~~  
Anita deGuzman  
*Administrative Assistant*  
NOAA Fisheries \* West Coast Region  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[916-930-3600](tel:916-930-3600) - main  
[916-930-3629](tel:916-930-3629) - fax  
[Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov](mailto:Anita.deGuzman@noaa.gov)

July 28, 2014

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2014

Natl Marine Fisheries Svs  
Sacramento, CA

National Marine Fisheries Service

650 Capitol Mall, Suit 5-100

Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Bay Delta Conservation Plan DEIR/DEIS

Dear Mr. Wulff:

I am writing this letter with concerns from a Native California, a Miwko Native from this region and also a 22 year resident from Kings Island by the Clifton court Forebay on the Delta out of Byron, CA. I raised my children to understand the value of land management and water resources for our Bay Area, and I would hate to think that all that beautiful resource would be tunneled to other areas.

If the state learned to manage its water resources we would not be destroying the precious land and habitat of the delta areas. This becomes a tax burden that we will passed down for many generations and I do not think that there is substantial research to proceed with this plan.

I would love for my grand children, great grand children, and many generations after, to be able to see this area through the Native history of the land and, not destroyed to the States decision to proceed with this plan.

Listen to the taxpayers who will be the ones supporting this project if it is approved, I'm sure there are other alternative options and I think that they should be researched to all means before concluding that this is the only option.

Regards,

Cathy Hankins

cahankins@aol.com