DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
101	1	I would like you to take note of the fact that the public meetings on BDCP are mostly located in areas that are agriculture heavy, or are in Southern California, areas that would be friendly towards this project. In particular, I note that there is no public meeting in San Francisco or its immediate environs. I do not count San Jose which is 1 1/2 hours south.	Please refer to Master Response 40 regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP).
101	2	There are many of us in the San Francisco area who would be dramatically affected by further diversions of water beyond the already large amounts that are being sent south to the big farmers in the valley. I would prefer that the native fish and wildlife benefit from our limited water resources rather than wealthy corporate farmers.	The Proposed Project would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal.Wat. Code, § 85001[c]). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment eat the south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS. Impacts on Delta outflows (fresh water flowing to the Bay) are not significant. Model simulation results for the proposed project alternative (4A) indicate that long-term average and wet year peak outflows would increase in winter months with a corresponding decrease in spring months because of the shift in system inflows caused by climate change and increased Delta exports as compared to Existing Conditions. In other year types, Alternative 4A would result in higher or similar outflow because of the spring outflow requirements. In summer and fall months, Alternative 4A would result in similar or higher outflow because of changes in export patterns and OMR flow requirements and export reductions in fall months, and also because of the Fall X2 requirements in wet and above normal years. The incremental changes in Delta outflow between Alternative 4A and Existing Conditions would be a function of both the facility and operations assumptions (including north Delta intakes capacity of 9,000 cfs, less negative OMR flow requirements, enhanced spring outflow and/or Fall X2 requirements) and the reduction in water supply availability due to increased north of Delta urban demands, sea level rise and climate change. Results for the range of changes in Delta Outflow under Alternative 4A are presented in more detail in Appendix 5A, BDCP EIR/S Modeling Technical Appendix, of the Draft EIR/EIS. For a more detailed response regarding impacts beneficial uses of water, please see Master Response 34.
102	1	Thank you for going to this event. I know how completely fraudulent these things can feel. At the first Bureau of Reclamation meeting at the Holiday Inn last summer, Citizens For Clean Air forced the Bureau to hold a public comment period. When we arrived, Arnie Erickson noticed (from reading the agenda) that the Bureau planned to skip comment. Heidi went up to Brian Person and told him that everyone had read in the last Record Searchlight editorial that they were going to have an opportunity to speak. Mr. Person hemmed and hawed and finally, Heidi threatened him with the crowd if he would not give everyone at least a small opportunity to talk. "You have to," she said, jerking her thumb behind her, "or else ..." Brian Person heads up the Shasta Dam office. However, this was my friend Heidi Strand, and therefore, he caved in to our demands. What else could he do? Promote tyranny? If CCA had known that this BDCP meeting was going to be an example of more of the same, we would have sent representatives to help the audience. The notion of a comment period "with the only avenue for oral comment being approx. 25' - 30' away from the nearest	Please refer to Master Response 40 regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP) and Master Response 42 for information on comment response.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		display" is completely unacceptable.	
102	2	Eric Cassano, who runs our Anti-Knauf and 3M Quarry websites, explained that the government is using something called the Delphi Method to sell the audience on their pre-made decisions. The point is to make citizens feel small. The Delphi method is based on the assumption that group judgments are more valid than individual judgments. Here is a link to more on the Delphi Method, if you are interested: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Delphi_method Although I am sure that the Delphi Method has some valid applications, it has no place in meeting like the one you attended. Individual opinions and ideas need to be solicited with sincerity. Thank you for attending this meeting. Next time they come to town, it will be on.	Please refer to Master Response 40 regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP).
102	3	From ATT1: Email dated 1/25/2014 from Charles Alexander regarding favorable of BDCP requesting opportunity to comment.	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
102	4	From ATT2: Email dated 1/24/2014 from Virginia Phelps encouraging people to comment.	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
102	5	From ATT3: Email dated 1/22/2014 from Christine Mitchell speaking on behalf of an individual who would like to discuss water issues.	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
103	1	The Delta Tunnel is not a water solution and will cause environmental and financial disasters to Californians in a long run. Furthermore, it is not necessary at all. The tunnel design is politically pre-framed, one-sided, and short-sighted.	Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
103	2	I am against the Conservation Plan for these reasons: unrealistic high cost 60 billion dollars and rising; environmental ecosystem destruction; water right violation for up-steam residents; climate change may cause further water scarcities for Northern CA where no water solution in place for future and may cause no water to put into the tunnels by the time when the twin-tunnels are in operation; Southern CA and Central Valley local water companies already have water projects for their profitable industries; the so-called Conservation Plan does nothing for conversation but profit a few big water companies at the heavy cost of all Californians!	For more on the costs of the proposed BDCP, please see Master Response 5. The claim that the costs of the two tunnels will be $60 billion is not accurate. For information regarding BDCP funding, please see Master Response 5. The BDCP would not affect upstream water rights or entitlements. It aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented BDCP would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. The BDCP would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational scenarios (collectively Conservation Measure 1), measures focused on the protection, restoration, and enhancement of the Delta ecosystem (Conservation Measures 2-11), and measures to reduce other stressors (Conservation Measures 12-21). In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the BDCP would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. By improving and expanding available habitat, the BDCP would increase resilience and adaptability to climate change by making alternative habitat available during periods of high stress, such as very high or low freshwater inflow or very high salinity intrusion. By reducing other stressors on the Delta ecosystem, the BDCP alternatives would also improve the health of the ecosystem and of individual species population, making them stronger and more resilient to the potential variability and extreme conditions caused by climate change. The BDCP's proposed dual conveyance facilities would allow water to be moved through the Delta when conditions permit, and allow water to be diverted from the Sacramento River in the northern Delta when conditions in the south Delta do not permit diversions from the existing State Water Project and Central Valley Project facilities. The location of the north Delta diversion facility is less vulnerable to salinity intrusion, a potential impact of sea level rise in the future. If substantial sea level rise and critically dry upstream conditions were to occur, salinity could be repelled from this location for a much longer period of time than under current conditions. By establishing an alternative diversion point for exports, a great deal of water management flexibility is added. This added flexibility would provide more options for adaptively managing the Delta so that conditions can be optimized to provide the greatest benefits across all Delta water uses and habitat conditions. The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness, increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the state, with or without BDCP. The state is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the BDCP alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change. More information on ways in which the BDCP proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS.
103	3	Politically pre-framed evidence: whoever participated in the Delta Conservation Plan has to sign an agreement that allows the Tunnel Design fracking.	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water. As of the

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in "the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]" (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].) The state Department of Conservation is currently working on fracking regulations and rules passed by the Legislature have been sent to the governor. Through the rule-making process, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison's sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities. The State Water Resources Control Board could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the State Water Resources Control Board to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.
103	4	One-sided: the Conservation Plan is designed to destroy the Delta and Northern California in order to support Southern industries, or North against South.	The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The proposed project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish.
103	5	Short-sighted: environmental ecosystem protection should be our priority for years to come, not personal fame or big water companies' interests; agri-business is only about 7% of CA economy but consume more than half of our water; Southern and Central Valley profitable industries already have much better solutions to their water scarcities, such as sea water filtering and water recycling that cost much less money; local water companies will be driven to bankruptcy by the rocket high costs. I urge you to stop the Conservation Plan!	Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Refer to Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
104	1	The recent release of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and the associated Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) marks the first time the public can truly review the Plan. Prior to the release of the Public Review Draft EIR/EIS, residents of the greater Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay-Delta region and San Joaquin County have not been provided with a complete and detailed description of the Project, an accurate assessment and characterization of the potential impacts, and the specific elements of a comprehensive mitigation strategy to compensate for the impacts of this massive project. We would hope that this latest iteration of the BDCP will provided these necessary details, but an extensive and detailed analysis is required in order to make that determination. The spirit of both the California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental	Please note that the preferred alternative is now 2015, RDEIR/SDEIS, Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP or Conservation Measures. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. Please see Master Response 39 regarding public review. Please see Master Response 22 regarding Mitigation, Environmental Commitments, Avoidance and Minimization Measures and Alternative-Specific Environmental Commitments.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Policy Act is grounded in fully disclosing the impacts of project actions so that we as a society can make decisions knowing full well the consequences to our communities, our livelihoods, and our environment of those actions. The BDCP and the Public Review Draft EIR/EIS amount to an unprecedented amount of paper, nearly 40,000 pages. Given the size and complexity of the document, the 120-day public comment period is woefully inadequate. San Joaquin County is one of the communities most affected by the proposed actions of the BDCP, and we believe more time is needed to thoroughly review and comment on the BDCP documents. San Joaquin County respectfully requests that the public comment period for the BDCP EIR/EIS be extended by a minimum of 120 additional days beyond the current 120-day comment period.	
105	1	California statehood began in 1850, the beginning of man's efforts to change what Mother Nature had given this area. The Central Valley is drained by the Sacramento River flowing southerly and the San Joaquin River flowing northerly. The waters commingle forming the Delta, thence westerly to the Pacific Ocean at San Francisco. Google, Dept. of Water Resources provides some facts and numbers associated with the Delta: -Area; 1,153 square miles (sm), 737,920 acres. -Flow of water thru; 30 million +- acre feet per year, all fresh water. -Number of islands; 57. -Levees; 1,100 miles. -Agriculture; 841 sm (538,240 acres), 73% of the Delta. -Undeveloped; 117 sm (74,880 acres). -Urban development; 100 sm, (64,000 acres), 700 miles. I feel confident that earthquakes occurred in prior times. I am not aware of any evidence of sea water intrusion into the Delta. The islands were the accumulation of peat/detritus from tule, bulrush and other aquatic growth. The islands were not dry land. Farmers found a favorable growing environment to feed the new gold mining operations. The first step in farming is to prepare for planting by clearing the land. Clearing the land exposed the island's surface to drying. Oxidation of the peat material reduced its volume and strong winds carried away the detritus in large dark clouds. The result was a gradual lowering of the island's surface. To protect the farming operations, soil was deposited adjacent to the water's edge, forming levees. Today the surface of the islands have lowered as much as 25 feet below sea level. Example: Upper Jones Tract, 18.75 sm (12,000 acres), land use - agriculture operations. It is reported that the surface is 3 meters (10 feet) below sea level. This island is protected by soil levees. On June 3, 2004 the levee was breached. Over the next several days 150,000 acre feet (190 million cubic meters) of fresh water covered the property. Note: 150,000 acre feet of water will serve 300,000 homes/families for one year. It took 3 week to repair the	The Delta ecosystem is in a continuing decline, which impacts protected species and long-term water supplies. Over the last 150 years, the Delta has been altered by a system of manmade levees, reservoirs, and dredged waterways constructed to support farming and urban development and to provide flood protection for local towns and cities. Many other factors affect species health in the Delta, including water quality issues, nonnative species, illegal fishing, and local water diversions. The Delta is also threatened by continuing land subsidence, seismic risk, and effects of climate change. The proposed project (now identified as the California WaterFix Project) would make water deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not part of the project, they are important tools in managing California's water resources. The commenter's suggestion would not meet the co-equal goals of the Delta Reform Act by returning the Delta completely back to "Mother Nature's care."

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		breach and another 5 months to de-water. It is my understanding that on June 2, 2004, the day before the breach, Upper Jones Tract could be purchased for $1.2 million, i.e., $100 per acre. I do not know the financial burden to the tax payers for the repair and de-watering. I expect the cost was several million dollars. It is obvious that today's situation is man made. We should return the Delta to Mother Nature's care to sustain our human population. Consider: Delta islands of agriculture, 841 sm, and undeveloped, 117 sm, i.e., total 958 sm, 83% of the Delta. Suggestion: Public ownership of these 958 sm of Delta islands. It would be beneficial to breach the levees at multiple locations, not all at the same time. This action would remove the twin tunnels from consideration, and negate the threat of earth quake damage to levees along with salt water intrusion into the Delta. This would also expand ecosystem restoration by 958 sm. The tax payers would be on the win-win side this time.	
105	2	The goal of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan is ecosystem restoration, water supply reliability and storage and related projects. This includes construction of 30 miles long twin tunnels under the Delta. The initial cost estimate for the Delta Plan was $12 billion (B). The latest cost estimate is $25 B.	The costs of the project have evolved over the course of the Plan as the components of the Plan have changed and been refined. Early cost for the Plan were incomplete because cost estimates had not been developed for key Plan elements. Also, as new elements have been added to the Plan in response to stakeholder and regulatory agency requests, these new costs have been added. Costs have also increased due to inflation that has occurred during the planning process. The combination of these factors explains why Plan costs have appeared to increase over time.
105	3	Consider: The existing fish screens at the pumping facilities near Tracy. These fish screens are amazingly effective, not 100% efficient as Fish and Wildlife (F&W) would like. The demonstrated efficiency should exude gratitude and praise from F&W for the extremely small capture, (eye witness).	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
105	4	Consider: One of the invasive species introduced into Delta waters was the bass, a sporting fish. Bass should be fished out. This would allow the endangered delta smelt room to survive.	The prevalence of non-native species in the Delta is described in BDCP Section 2.3.4, where each natural community description contains a subsection describing the prevalence and ecological consequences of non-native species in that natural community. The BDCP contains several conservation measures intended to address the problem of non-native species: CM11 describes how they would be managed in conservation reserve lands, CM13 describes the control of aquatic weeds, CM15 describes the control of predatory non-native fish, and CM20 describes a plan to minimize the risk of new non-native species introductions.
106	1	Would you please represent the people of Northern California and stop all of the political movements that are going to rob us of our beautiful Delta water and fishing? All of us enjoy it for boating and water skiing. Southern California has it all, but they want more! We already gave up water with the Delta Mendota Canal, but they want more!	The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. The proposed project may impact recreational opportunities including impacts on hunting, fishing, swimming, and boating. Mitigation is proposed to reduce these impacts; however some impacts may remain significant due to the long-term nature of the temporary construction related impacts. Please see Chapter 15, Recreation, and Section 4.3.11 for more detail on the impacts of the proposed project on recreational opportunities and the proposed mitigation. To compensate for the loss of access as a result of constructing the river intakes, the proponents will work with the California Department of Parks and Recreation to help insure the elements of the proposed project would not conflict with the elements proposed in DPR's Recreation Proposal for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh (California Department of Parks and Recreation 2011d) that would enhance bicycle and foot access to the Delta. This would include the helping to fund or construct elements of the American Discovery Trail and the potential conversion of the abandoned Southern Pacific Railroad rail line that

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			formerly connected Sacramento to Walnut Grove. The overall recreation experience for boaters or fishermen in the vicinity of intake construction areas would be reduced during construction activities because of the elevated noise levels as well as visual setting disruptions. These temporary construction-related effects would last for up to 5 years in the vicinity of intake and barge unloading facilities and could alter fish populations such that recreational fishing opportunities in the study area would be affected. Weekday construction would reduce the amount of fish and other wildlife in recreation areas in the vicinity of the intakes, resulting in decreased recreation opportunities related to wildlife and fish, causing recreationists to experience a changed recreation setting. Chapter 15 describes potential impacts on on-water recreation and fishing. Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts on marine navigation by developing and implementing site-specific construction traffic management plans; installing visual barriers between construction work areas and sensitive receptors; applying aesthetic design treatments to all structures; and employing noise-reducing construction practices. The potential impact on covered and non-covered sport fish species from construction activities would be considered less than significant because the proposed project would include environmental commitments (Appendix 3B). Mitigation Measures would also be available to reduce construction-related underwater noise and pile driving effects, to initiate a complaint/response program, and to provide alternative bank fishing access sites. Please see Chapter 16 Socioeconomics of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP for additional information regarding economic impacts to marinas.
106	2	Please, Mr. Wulff. Take a stand for the people. Stop the dirty politicians! I am 75 years old and want my children, grandchildren and greats to enjoy "our" Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS documentation.
108	1	Is there any info/reference contained in the BDCP EIR/EIS on the potential impact of proposed upstream diversion of water on the documented decline of pelagic organisms in the Bay/Delta? If so, where can I read it?	There are no new proposed upstream water diversions as part of the EIS/EIR alternatives. Some on-going projects that may divert upstream flows are considered with respect to cumulative impacts. These projects include the following: POTENTIAL PROJECTS FROM CUMULATIVE EFFECTS LIST (APPENDIX 3D) Davis Woodland Water Supply Project North Bay Aqueduct Alterative Intake Project Supplemental Water Rights Project – El Dorado Water & Power Authority Freeport Regional Water Project Sacramento River Water Reliability Study Delta Wetlands Project – Semitropic Delta Water Supply Project – Stockton The RDEIR/SDEIS provides and update analysis, including three new alternatives, on impacts to various aquatic species as a result of the proposed diversions in the North Delta.
109	1	Within the last two weeks, the governor introduced the strongest environmental budget proposal since he was elected in 2010. Among the highlights are about $8 million for groundwater data collection, assessment and management; $20 million for water efficiency, including reducing energy use for water pumping; $30 million for watershed and wetland restoration; and more than $472 million in	The BDCP/CWF is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The BDCP/CWF is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and improving ecological conditions in the Delta.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		regional water management. For years, and most recently in a white paper, Sierra Club California and our members and activists have been calling for greater focus on these areas of water policy. These are among the areas that can, if given the right attention, resolve the State's water supply problems and make it unnecessary to move growing amounts of water out of the sensitive San Francisco Bay Delta. Following on the budget proposal by about a week, the governor signed a drought emergency declaration. For the third year in a row, California's rainfall and snowfall were well below normal in 2013. Now, in this first month of 2014, the drought is getting downright frightening. Snowpack is less than 20 percent of normal in the Sierra. Mount Shasta, usually topped with a strong icing of snow this time of year, looks nearly naked. Sacramento-area rivers that are usually roiling in January look more like wide streams, and streams and creeks have dried up. Both the governor's budget proposal and the emergency declaration contain elements that will help Californians finally get a reasonable handle on how to manage water in this increasingly dry state. This could be a turning point in California's 164-year-old battle with itself about how to manage a precious resource. So, as an environmental advocate for an organization that has long pressed for better water policies, I should be encouraged. And I am. But I am also aware that not everyone is ready to ditch bad water policy. The ink was barely dry on the emergency declaration before some editorialists, columnists and Republican legislators, mostly from the San Joaquin Valley, started pushing for more above-ground storage. Some above-ground storage does not require a new dam. Some storage, for instance, involves increasing the use of above-ground percolation systems to replenish groundwater. But most of those who jumped onto the emergency declaration to call for more storage want more dams. We are living in an era when the earth's climate is changing because of human-caused pollution, particularly pollution from engines and factories and power plants fueled by oil, natural gas and coal. What used to be the norm for rainfall and snowfall is not likely to be the norm in the future. That is why the old ways of doing things will not work. Putting up a dam to collect water, when there simply is not rain or snow, will not work. Building giant tunnels, at a total cost of more than $50 billion, to carry water that may not be there is not a smart investment. We need to focus money and effort on using more carefully that water we do have. The solutions include conservation, recycling, improving efficiency, patching leaks, pricing water right, and abandoning bad ideas—such as fracking—that waste and pollute water. This year the governor's water budget appropriately emphasizes regional solutions and regional resilience. It is almost hard to believe this is coming from the same administration that has spent the last two years touting the giant Bay-Delta tunnels. Perhaps the drought	Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the BDCP/CWF. Please see Appendix 1C for more information on demand management measures. Fracking presumably would be an "industrial" use of water. The State Water Resources Control Board has the authority to modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the State Water Resources Control Board to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking. On June 13, 2014 the California Department of Conservation (DOC) released proposed regulations for the use of well stimulation in oil and gas production for a 45-day public comment period. The regulations are designed to protect health, safety, and the environment, and supplement existing strong well construction standards. They address a comprehensive list of issues, including testing, monitoring, public notice, and permitting. Through the rule-making process, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal compared to the average diversions from the Delta by the state and federal water projects for farms and cities.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		has provided a reality check.	
112	1	The Bay Delta Conservation Plan has nothing to do with conservation. It is a water grab by the Metropolitan Water District. If you look at what happened in the Owens Valley you can see what will happen to the Sacramento Valley. The Sacramento River will never quench the thirst of the Metropolitan Water District. The Metropolitan water district has already devastated our community here in the Delta with no concerns for our environment. It is against the law to devastate one community to benefit their community. What is worse is the fact they expect us here in northern CA to help pay for our own demise.	For more information regarding MWD Water Supply please see Master Response 35. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.
112	2	We want to desalinate the Metropolitan water district. We also will gladly help pay for desalination in L.A. They are building golf courses in the desert, and they are building in an area that cannot support itself. There are off-shore oil platforms that are slated to be torn down; these off-shore oil platforms can be easily converted to desalination plants. These desalination plants will deliver water even in drought years. This is a win-win for the Delta and L.A. The only loser here is the Metropolitan Water District because they will have to pay for their own water system. They would rather rape our Delta and get us to pay for it. Desalination is the future, and raping the CA Delta is costly and environmentally stupid.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the BDCP or California WaterFix. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, water recycling, etc. For more information regarding water demand management and desalination please see Master Response 6 and 7, respectively. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
112	3	The cost for the two tunnels project will cost more than 100 billion dollars, and leave an environmental mess and muck piles here in Northern CA. Why can't we transport the muck piles down to Southern CA where they belong?	The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding. Under Alternative 4 and 4a (the proposed project), the revised estimates of Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM) can be found in the recirculated documents in Table 3C-1 "Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities" starting on page 3C-40 of Appendix 3C in Appendix A, which details the revised estimates for RTM storage acreage, volume, and potential reuses. Mapbook figures M3-4 and M14-7 show potential RTM storage locations. Final locations for storage of RTM would be selected based on guidelines presented in Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, section 3B.2.18 "Disposal and Reuse of Spoils, Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM), and Dredged Material" starting on page 3B-50, also in Appendix A.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
112	4	The Metropolitan Water District has no regard for our fishing industry, salmon, striped bass, and all of the boating industry here in our beloved Delta. Their plan calls for dams that control waterways just for their benefit.	For more information regarding MWD Water Supply please see Master Response 35. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. Construction of water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the Draft BDCP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible and are described under each alternative in the RDEIR/SDEIS individual resource chapters and in the BDCP Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, EIR/EIS. An analysis of economic impacts of the proposed project, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are also evaluated and described in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx). Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the Draft EIR/EIS was revised based on the revised construction footprint for proposed water conveyance facilities, along with a refined set of construction cost and schedule assumptions developed for Alternative 4. Refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Section 16.3.3.9, in Appendix A for the revised analysis of Alternative 4. Additionally, one table from Draft EIR/EIS Appendix 16A has been incorporated into Appendix A. While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.
112	5	Here at the Clifton Court Forebay water pumps they kill 250,00 [sic] fish every week. They could have diverted the water around the intakes for the pumps, but this will cost them money. Salmon and striped bass fingerling all think they're migrating downstream but wind up in the pumps completely destroying our fish population. This is the Metropolitan Water District mindset. They simply don't care. Why should we trust the Metropolitan Water District? Just ask people that live in the Owens Valley.	A number of agencies, including fish and wildlife agencies (National Marine Fisheries Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife), DWR, public water agencies (e.g., Metropolitan Water District), and nongovernmental organizations, among others, are actively engaged in a Collaborative Science and Adaptive Management Program to develop a robust science and adaptive management program that will inform the development and implementation of the NMFS and USFWS biological opinions, the BDCP, and other programs. As part of this and other efforts, a number of issues including entrainment at Clifton Court Forebay are actively being examined.
113	1	Please stop raping the delta and desalinate the Metropolitan Water District. Stop the two	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		tunnels project.	For more information regarding MWD Water Supply please see Master Response 35.
114	1	You may recall that in a November 21letter, prior to the December 13 release of draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan and its EIR/EIS, the Environmental Water Caucus requested that the public review and comment period be extended beyond the planned 120 days, based on the anticipated 25,000 page estimate of the BDCP documents.	Please see Master Response 39 regarding public review.
114	2	The California Water Impact Network has now scanned the 40,214 actual pages of released documents. Based on the originally allotted 120-•day review time period, the public is being asked to review 473 pages per day during the 85 working days that are available during the comment period. As was pointed out in the previous EWC request, NEPA regulation 40 CFR 1502.7 states that the text of an EIS for "proposals of unusual scope or complexity shall normally be less than 300 pages." This regulation is flouted to the utmost by the BDCP release, and is compounded by the fact that the Bay Delta Conservation Plan documents on which the EIS is based run to about 10,000 pages. If BDCP cannot comply with the letter of national environmental regulations, it would be • reasonable to increase the time available for public review. It is impossible for organizations like the California Water Impact Network who are interested in responding to BDCP documents to provide useful, thorough, and thoughtful comments given the time presently allotted. Therefore, C-WIN respectfully requests that your agencies extend the public review period an additional120 days, until August 15, based on the size of the actual documents released on December 13, 2013. Thank you for considering this request.	For a more concise summary of the impact conclusions made in the documents, the BDCP Executive Summary and the EIR/EIS Executive Summary are available on the project website. Additionally, lay-friendly Highlight documents for both the BDCP and the EIR/EIS were published to provide summary information about the documents and to help readers get acquainted with the documents. The BDCP Highlights and the EIR/EIS Highlights are posted online at http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/AboutBDCP/InformationalMaterials.aspx. Short one-page factsheets on the BDCP and EIR/EIS are also provided online and by request. In addition, 17 narrated informational webinar episodes have been posted to the website for both the BDCP and EIR/EIS. These webinars were developed to provide short, easy to understand summaries of key elements of the BDCP and EIR/EIS. Background documents, additional factsheets, and FAQs continue to be available on-line. For more information, please see Master Response 6 regarding the length and complexity of the document. The public comment period for the BDCP, EIR/EIS, and IA was extended to July 29, 2014. Please see Master Response 57 for more information about the public review period.
115	1	On behalf of our organization - San Mateo County Democracy For America - I'm asking that you do what you can to extend the public comment period to August 15, 2014 for the BDCP (Bay Delta Conservation Plan). This plan - which was released in December 2013 - has over 40,000 pages and it is unrealistic to expect meaningful public debate on such a complicated document in 120 days. The 120 day guideline assumed the size of an unusually large document to be 300 pages. This situation is of a very different magnitude of size. The size of the document that needs to be reviewed is larger than the Encyclopedia Britannica. Please act in the public interest in moving to extend the public comment period.	For a more concise summary of the impact conclusions made in the documents, the BDCP Executive Summary and the EIR/EIS Executive Summary are available on the project website. Additionally, lay-friendly Highlight documents for both the BDCP and the EIR/EIS were published to provide summary information about the documents and to help readers get acquainted with the documents. The BDCP Highlights and the EIR/EIS Highlights are posted online at http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/AboutBDCP/InformationalMaterials.aspx. Short one-page factsheets on the BDCP and EIR/EIS are also provided online and by request. In addition, 17 narrated informational webinar episodes have been posted to the website for both the BDCP and EIR/EIS. These webinars were developed to provide short, easy to understand summaries of key elements of the BDCP and EIR/EIS. Background documents, additional factsheets, and FAQs continue to be available on-line. For more information, please see Master Response 38 regarding the length and complexity of the document. The public comment period for the BDCP, EIR/EIS, and IA was extended to July 29, 2014. Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period.
117	1	This [The Delta Tunnels] has got to stop. I am extremely concerned about how this is going to impact our fishery. You will effectively eliminate miles upon miles of waterways that have been used for hundreds of years.	The evaluation of specific waterways throughout the Delta and its tributaries shows that with the proposed operational criteria, the adverse effects of Alternative 4A would be minimal. No waterways will be eliminated.
117	2	Since water started getting pumped from the Delta, the ecosystem has been in a steady decline. Do you really think these tunnels are going to help that?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
117	3	Killing off of predatory fish? Are you joking!? Anglers practice catch and release for a reason. If the prey fish population declines, so do the bass. It comes and goes in waves. The Delta is a fragile ecosystem and we need all the help to keep it the way it is.	"Environmental Commitment 15 (Localized Reduction of Predatory Fishes) is not intended to entirely remove predators at any location or substantially alter the abundance of predators at the scale of the Delta system. Instead, EC15 proposes to reduce localized abundance of predatory fishes at locations of high predation risk (i.e., predation hotspots) associated with construction and operation of the proposed and

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			existing water conveyance facilities, through active capture methods (boat electrofishing, hook-and-line fishing, predator lottery fishing tournaments, and other means of passive and active capture). A number of studies, cited in the BDCP Effects Analysis, provide evidence that predation at such hotspots is of concern to covered fish species. For a more detailed discussion of the existing predation issues in the South Delta, please see BDCP Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy, Section 3.4.1.2, BDCP Appendix 5.F, Biological Stressors on Covered Fish, and Chapter 11 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. EC15 would remove predator refuge habitat and reduce predator abundance in the construction areas. At a minimum, EC15 will target the removal of an amount of predator refuge commensurate with the amount that may be created by construction of water conveyance facilities. These measures are expected to fully mitigate any indirect effect on predation rates associated with construction. Because of uncertainties regarding treatment methods and efficacy, implementation of EC15 will involve discrete study pilot projects and research actions coupled with an adaptive management and monitoring program to evaluate effectiveness. Please see Section 4.1, RDEIR/SDEIS for a full description of EC15."
117	4	If these tunnels were to open up, you will affect everything: birds, fish, any mammals that live in or around the water. Why do Northern Californians have no say in this? You will turn this freshwater fishery into a salt water marsh, making everything around it unusable.	Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project, Master Response 14 for information on salinity.
119	1	No to Governor Brown's tunnel system proposal. We need the Delta left as is, just maintained in a more responsible manner.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
120	1	Zeroing out pollution in the Delta by buying carbon credits is a fraud! My complaint deals with Chapter 22 -- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases -- of the latest Bay Delta Conservation Plan's EIR/EIS. Under paragraph 22.3.1.1-Construction of the Water Conveyance Facility- it reads, "Construction of the water conveyance facility (CM1) would generate emissions of criteria pollutants (ROG, NOX, CO, PM10, PM2.5), and CHG's (CO2, CH4, N2O and SF6) that would result in short-term effects on ambient air quality in the air quality study area. Emissions would originate from mobile and stationary construction equipment, exhaust, employee vehicle exhaust, dust from land clearing and earthmoving, electrical transmission, and concrete batching from onsite plants." The paragraph ends with hilarity by allowing that "these emissions would be temporary, i.e., "limited to the construction period" -- which is 10 years or more! Paragraph 22.2 - Regulatory Setting - states that "The study area is subject to air quality	The comment quotes information from Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases. With respect to the statement regarding the "short term" nature of construction activities; construction would require approximately 14 years. This is considered short-term relative to the operational timeframe of typical large scale development projects, which often exceed 30 to 40 years. Characterizing construction emissions as short term is consistent with CEQA guidance provided by all four Plan Area air districts. Applicable rules and regulations are summarized in Section 22.2 in Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 22. Consistent with federal requirements, project emissions are evaluated against de minimis levels outlined in the General Conformity regulation (40 CFR Parts 5, 51, and 93). Pursuant to the General Conformity Regulation, a General Conformity Determination for the applicant preferred alternative (Alternative 4A) was prepared and is presented in Appendix 22E, General Conformity Determination. Project emissions are also evaluated relative to local air district thresholds, which were adopted to assist lead agencies in determining the significance of environmental effects with regards to local attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards. The project will implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b to offset construction-related nitrogen oxides (NOX) and reactive organic gases (ROG) to net zero. These offsets would be purchased through local air district offset programs or through a DWR-sponsored program (not the California

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		regulations developed and implemented at the federal, state, and local levels," i.e the federal and state Environmental Protection Agencies. Paragraph 22.1.2 - Background Information on Criteria Air Pollutants - states that "the federal and state governments have established national ambient air quality standards and California ambient air quality standards, respectively, for six criteria pollutants." They are "ozone, Carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and particulate matter (PM) which consists of PM 10 microns in diameter or less and PM 2.5 microns in 32 diameter or less." Paragraph 22.1.1.1 - Sacramento Valley Air Basin - states that "The highest frequency of air stagnation occurs in the autumn and early winter when large high-pressure cells collect over the Sacramento Valley. The lack of surface wind during these periods and the reduced vertical flow caused by less surface heating reduce the influx of outside air and allow air pollutants to become concentrated in a stable volume or air. The surface concentrations of pollutants are highest when these conditions are combined with temperature inversions (warm air over cool air) which trap pollutants near the ground." Paragraph 22.2 - Regulatory Setting - sub-paragraph General Conformity Regulation - states that "If the conformity evaluation indicates that emissions are in excess of any of the General Conformity de minimis thresholds, the applicant must perform a conformity determination. A conformity determination is made by satisfying any of the following requirements:" 1. Showing that the emission increases caused by the federal action are included in the State Implementation Plan. 2. Demonstrating that the state agrees to include the emission increases in the SIP 3. Offsetting the action's emissions in the same or nearby area. 4. Mitigating to reduce the emission increase. Paragraph 22.2.1.2 - Environmental Protection Agency Endangerment and Cause and Contribute findings - states"…the current and projected concentrations of the six key well-mixed GHG's-CO@,CH4, N20, PFC's, SF6 and HFC's in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations. Sub-paragraph - State CEQA Guidelines - states "…measures in an existing plan or mitigation program for the reduction of emissions that are required as part of the lead agency's decision [are] "…implementation of project features, project design, or other measures which are incorporated into the project to substantially reduce energy consumption of AGHG emissions, offsite measure, including offsets that are not otherwise required, to mitigate a project's emissions and measures that sequester carbon or carbon-equivalent emissions.	Cap-and-Trade Regulation). All offsets purchased through Mitigation Measures AQ-1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b must achieve a 1:1 reduction with construction emissions to ensure claimed offsets meet the required performance standard. All offsite reductions must also be quantifiable, verifiable, enforceable, and satisfy the basic criterion of additionality (i.e., the reductions would not happen without the financial support of purchased offset credits). Please note that Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 remains a potentially viable alternative and is being carried forward in this RDEIR/SDEIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If the Lead Agencies ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. Please see also Chapter 22 of the Final EIR/EIS and associated appendices for analysis of GHG for alternative 4A. Please refer to Master Response 19 for additional discussion of climate change GHG.
120	2	Testimony of Steve Centerwall, ICF International At Delta Stewardship Council Meeting, Dec. 19, 2013 Speaking for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, Mr. Centerwall related that the effect of construction on air quality can increase criteria pollutants such as carbon monoxide, reactive organic gases and dust and that project on-site measures will be implemented such as electrifying equipment, making sure equipment runs well and other standard measures	As described in Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, the project will implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b to offset construction-related nitrogen oxides (NOX) and reactive organic gases (ROG) to net zero. These offsets would be purchased through local air district offset programs or through a DWR-sponsored program (not the California Cap-and-Trade Regulation). Air district offset programs have operated in California for several decades and have achieved considerable emissions reductions. For example, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management Districts (SMAQMD) Heavy-Duty Low-Emission Vehicle Incentive Programs (HDLEVIP) awards more than $7 million annually to

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		that are taken to reduce air quality emissions. (He did not elaborate or say what equipment would be electrified or how that would come about.) Mr. Centerwall: "In addition, there was off-site mitigation to basically off-set any additional emissions that we couldn't reduce to net zero, and that's really the bottom line for air quality. We're going to reduce it to net zero." (He did not elaborate) My complaint: It is evident all through the BDCP's Air Quality Chapter of their EIR/EIS that to zero out over pollution in the Delta workplace will depend upon off-sets. This is a benign word until it is explained and the EIR/EIS carefully avoids any explanation. There are good reasons why. Off-setting over-pollution of the workplace is based upon buying carbon credits under the Cap & Trade law from an Air Quality Management District that has significantly lower pollution. In the case of Delta operations, that means the SFAQMD-which is exactly what they have in mind. However, buying carbon credits only zeros-out over-pollution on paper! The fact of over-pollution remains. This does not leave the Delta zeroed out at all. Workmen who have jobs in construction with the BDCP will still have to work in an over-polluted atmosphere at the construction site, subjecting themselves to all the horrific contaminants found there, To use this tactic in order to zero-out pollution during construction of the BDCP's tunnels in the Delta is a fraud! It is clear from the BDCP's own documents that the only way they can zero-out harmful pollution at the workplace is through off-setting by purchasing carbon credits. Without this ability, the BDCP cannot even begin to fulfill its mission in the Delta. Therefore, the EIR/EIS of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan should be denied and the whole plan scrapped. We are looking to the CA/EPA to make good on its promise of protection of workers and Delta residents from harmful pollutants as it is evident the BDCP can only think about fraudulent ways to make it appear that protection is there while it really isn't.	emissions reduction projects in the Sacramento Valley. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement (VERA) program has operated since 1992 and has a proven track record of reducing ozone precursors in the Central Valley. All offsets purchased through Mitigation Measures AQ-1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b must achieve a 1:1 reduction with construction emissions to ensure claimed offsets meet the required performance standard. All offsite reductions must also be quantifiable, verifiable, enforceable, and satisfy the basic criterion of additionality (i.e., the reductions would not happen without the financial support of purchased offset credits). These requirements will be outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring Report Protocol (MMRP) and considered a condition of project approval. With respect to the achieved reductions, all offsets must come from projects located within the same air basin as the generated emissions. Reductions must also be achieved (contracted and delivered) by the applicable year in question (i.e., emissions generated in year 2016 would need to be reduced offsite in 2016).). As noted by the commenter, the project may purchase carbon offsets to reduce construction-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to net zero. As noted in Mitigation Measure AQ-21, carbon offsets purchased by the project must also achieve a 1:1 reduction with construction emissions and satisfy the basic criterion of additionality. Please also see Finally, with respect to the project commitments that will reduce onsite criteria pollutant emissions, refer to Appendix 22A, Section 22A.1.11. The air quality environmental commitments go above and beyond state and local requirements and will reduce onsite emissions to the greatest extent feasible (Please see also Chapter 22 of the Final EIR/EIS and associated appendices for analysis of GHG for alternative 4A. Please refer to Master Response 19 for additional discussion of climate change GHG.
121	1	I note that much of the errata released Dec 20 is devoted to the geology of the planning area. Appendix 3E discusses potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to State Water Project / Central Valley Project Water Supplies.	The comment does not raise issue with the adequacy of the environmental document.
121	2	The EIR/EIS do not appear to adequately address two issues. First, the construction and cost risks of the tunnel project over a 15 year period during which the U.S. Geological Survey has indicated a relatively high probability of large magnitude earthquakes in Northern California. Second, the likelihood and cost of changes in Central Valley Project and Southern California use or demand for water due to a large earthquake in Southern California. Failure to consider either of these eventualities is a glaring deficiency in planning for a project with a construction period of 15, or possibly 20 years.	As described in Master Response 16 and Section 3E.2.6.2 of Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, major seismic events that resulted in failure of Delta levees could require from 2 to more than 6 years to repair. During the repairs and for some time after the repairs, SWP and CVP water may not be available or partially available. These conditions could occur with equal frequency under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, or any of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS. However, climate change could lead to a higher probability of levee failure in the future than under Existing Conditions. As described in Section 3D.3.2.3.3 of Appendix 3D, Define Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, it is assumed that levee repairs would continue as under historical and Existing Conditions as under ongoing programs. This assumption is also included for all alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS, and is not considered to be part of the EIR/EIS alternatives. Methods for water users to respond to loss of SWP and CVP water supplies also would be similar under the

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			No Action Alternative and all of the other alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS. However, those methods are not considered under the Purpose and Need of this document; and therefore are not evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
121	3	What happens if an earthquake occurs in Northern California during 15 year construction of the tunnels? What would be the cost impacts on construction? What would be the consequences of any tunnel failure during partial construction? What would be the costs of delay?	Excavation activities are not expected to trigger an earthquake. Section 9.3 Environmental Consequences, Chapter 9 of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS describes the potential effects that could result from project construction, operation and maintenance, and restoration due to geologic and seismic-related conditions and hazards. As described in Section 9.3, all the proposed facilities would be designed and managed during and after construction to meet the safety and collapse-prevention requirements of the relevant state codes and standards listed in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, of the RDEIR/SDEIS for the anticipated seismic loads. An earthquake is what happens when two blocks of the earth suddenly slip past one another. The surface where they slip is called the fault or fault plane. Based on the proposed tunnel alignments, depths, tunneling method, and the energy involved in boring, the construction of proposed project tunnels is not expected to increase the chance of an earthquake. Chapter 9 of the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the geology and seismicity of the study area. Based on a review of the last 20 years of precast tunnel lining seismic performance histories, it can be concluded that little or no damage to precast tunnel lining was observed for major earthquakes around the world. Based on preliminary data, it is anticipated that the Delta tunnels can be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. Impact GEO- 1 and GEO-7 discusses the possibility of loss or damage resulting from strong seismic activity during construction and operation of water conveyance features. For more information regarding tunnel design please see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report. Please see Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS for discussion of potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action scenario. The Department of Water Resources released in 2013 the Conceptual Engineering Report that describes design details of the modified pipeline/tunnel option (MPTO). For more information regarding tunnel research and design please see http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Conceptual_Engineering_Report-Modified_Pipeline_Tunnel_Option.sflb.ashx.'
121	4	What would be the impacts on the Central Valley Project and Southern California water demand or use of a large magnitude earthquake in Southern/Central California, as for example, a recurrence of the Fort Tejon earthquake of 1857 or its reverse, a South to North rupture of the San Andreas fault from the vicinity of the Salton Sea to Parkfield?	Seismic risk to the SWP and CVP facilities located to the south of the Delta would be similar under Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS. The EIR/EIS also assumed that repairs to the SWP and CVP facilities would continue to be completed under ongoing programs, including repairs due to seismic events. Water supply interruption could occur during repair activities; however, methods for water users to respond to loss of SWP and CVP water supplies also would be similar under the No Action Alternative and all of the other alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS. However, those methods are not considered under the Purpose and Need of this document; and therefore are not evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
121	5	As a general comment, the California Seismic Safety Commission, www.seismic.ca.gov in its discussion of Fire Following Earthquake (FFE) responses Water Supply in Regards to Fire Following Earthquakes Charles Scawthorn SPA Risk LLC	The commenter does not raise an issue on the adequacy of the EIR/EIS or related analyses.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		www.seismic.ca.gov/pub/CSSC_2011-02_WaterSupply_PEER.pdf has recommended development of a high pressure sea-water system for fighting seismically-induced fires in the Los Angeles area. State of California expenditure for a high pressure seawater fire fighting system for Los Angeles should have a higher priority and be built before any spending for Delta tunnels.	
121	6	If you are going to discuss centuries long issues like climate change and sea level rise, you should more than cursorily address issues such as seismic construction risk and statewide water demand under a major earthquake scenario.	The effects of an earthquake on the water conveyance features specific to each alternative during construction are described in Chapter 9, Impact GEO-1. As described in Master Response 16 and Section 3E.2.6.2 of Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, major seismic events could result in reduced or total cessation of SWP and CVP water deliveries to areas located to the south of the Delta for 2 to more than 6 years for repairs; and for some time after the repairs. These conditions could occur with equal frequency under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, or any of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS. However, climate change could lead to a higher probability of levee failure in the future than under Existing Conditions. Methods for water users to respond to loss of SWP and CVP water supplies also would be similar under the No Action Alternative and all of the other alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS. However, those methods are not considered under the Purpose and Need of this document; and therefore are not evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
121	7	Chapter 9 discusses seismic hazards, but these appear mostly to be how to design the project so that it would survive and be operable after a seismic event, not the issues I raise above about effects of an earthquake during construction or on Southern California demand. However, chapter 9 does raise an additional issue: in view of the soils and seismic risks indicate that, the approach of the EIR is this-assume engineering, yet unspecified, is able to manage site conditions: P. 9-43 "The emphasis in the impact analysis has been to identify where the existing data suggest that geologic or seismic conditions pose a potentially serious threat to structural integrity. The analysis determines whether these conditions and associated risk can be reduced to less than significant by conformance with existing codes standards, and the application of accepted, proven construction engineering practices. a range of specific design and construction approaches are normally available to address a specific circumstance. For example, the potential for liquefaction to affect structural integrity could be controlled by a range of engineering approaches, such as by removal and replacement of the liquefiable soil with engineered file and construction of the structure on pilings founded on non-liquefiable material. Specific control measures have not been developed for all site conditions at this point in the BDCP planning process." Sec. 9.3.1 P. 9-43, Lines 13-14	The effects of an earthquake on the water conveyance features specific to each alternative during construction are described in Chapter 9, Impact GEO-1. The conceptual-level or preliminary engineering analysis conducted for the proposed project to date has been appropriate for determining the types of seismic and geotechnical conditions and constraints that exist in the Plan Area, and for serving as basis for determining the types of design approaches and construction techniques that are available to reduce geologic and seismic hazards to acceptable levels. Such a level of analysis and design is acceptable for the preparation of a CEQA/NEPA document. After CEQA/NEPA document certification, the final design of structures would be developed; this will require additional subsurface geotechnical investigations to identify site-specific conditions that would be reflected in the final engineering design. As described in responses to Comments 2, 4, and 6; and in Master Response 16 and Section 3E.2.6.2 of Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, major seismic events that resulted in failure of Delta levees could require from 2 to more than 6 years to repair. During the repairs and for some time after the repairs, SWP and CVP water may not be available or partially available. These conditions could occur with equal frequency under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, or any of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS. It is assumed that levee repairs would continue in the future as under ongoing programs, and is not considered to be part of the EIR/EIS alternatives. Methods for water users to respond to loss of SWP and CVP water supplies also would be similar under the No Action Alternative and all of the other alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS. However, those methods are not considered under the Purpose and Need of this document; and therefore are not evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
121	8	The EIR is based on assumptions about environmental impacts from a conceptual approach that assumes the availability of different engineering and site management approaches but has not defined the specific measures to be used. Thus we do not know whether further soil	As part of the planning work completed to-date, site specific geotechnical data was collected along the proposed conveyance alternatives and used to optimize the engineering. Because of lack of site access, the geotechnical exploration was limited to public lands, waterways, and some private properties that DWR was

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		removal from below any tunnel locations, or pile driving, or depths of soil removal of pile length to bed rock have been determined yet. This assumption that site conditions can be managed by alternative available engineering approaches affects among others the feasibility, environmental impacts, and cost and cost uncertainty and contingency of this project and any preferred alternative. More information should be collected and provided on the issues of soil condition and site control and whether removal of soil or piles will be required for any conditions encountered. As an example of the effect of site conditions and contingencies we need only look at the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Water System Improvement Project (WSIP) where the cost has escalated from about $3.5 billion to $4.5 billion, a $1 billion or 30% increase, all contingencies have been used up, and a 3 year delay has had to be added because of previously unknown site conditions associated with retrofit of the Crystal Springs dam and reservoir. See. Sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=690 for changes adopted by the SF PUC April 23, 2013 and reported June 28 2013. http://sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?document=3953 Among the comments resulting from these delays to a project similar in concept, but much smaller than the BDCP, were those of the California Department of Public Health, p. 9 "Completion of the WSIP is significantly delayed relative to the 2002 and 2005 program schedules. These delays adversely affect public health and safety, since customers in the Regional Water System continue to be exposed to the risk of a major disruption in service should there be a catastrophic event before the WSIP improvements are completed" June 28, 2013, p. 9 June 28, 2013 report, p. 13 "The program budget increase is due to unexpected geologic conditions discovered at the site of the Calaveras Dam Replacement project." June 28, 2013 report, p. 19 In mid-June 2012, the construction contractor encountered unexpected geologic conditions during excavation of the slope on the left side of the valley (when looking downstream from the existing dam) that could potentially contribute to instability of the slope above the left abutment and spillway area of the new dam as designed…..[new design] will result in the need to dispose of approximately 3 million cubic yards of additional soil and rock materials, and to double handle some of the materials needed for construction of the new dam. ..The changes described above will result in significant schedule and cost impacts to the project. The assumption in Chapter 9 that large bore tunnels under the Delta can be engineered, built, and managed during construction using normal available engineering approaches is open to serious question without further delineation of site conditions and engineering design.	allowed to enter. As the project development progresses, additional site specific geotechnical data will be collected and used for design and construction of the conveyance facilities. Based on the engineering completed, soil removal below the proposed tunnel depths is not anticipated except at the tunnel shaft locations. Deep foundations are proposed for intakes, pumping plants, and appurtenant facilities. However, soil removal below the pile tip elevations is not anticipated for the above mentioned facilities. The lead agencies have completed soil boreholes up to 500-feet deep in the Delta and bedrock was not encountered in these boreholes. The program construction cost estimate and schedule include contingencies to address unanticipated ground conditions during construction. We are addressing the potential risk of changes in site conditions by including a 36% contingency in the cost of tunnel construction.
121	9	Failure to consider construction risks, lack of discussion of `Southern California demand under all contingencies, other priorities for state expenditures, and lack of fully described engineering for site conditions which may have25-30% cost escalation and materials removal consequences, suggest that the current EIS/EIR may not have addressed all	The estimated cost for the proposed project includes a 35 percent contingency which is above the industry standard of 25-30%. Numerous studies have been conducted, some by state agencies and others by outside entities, which have concluded that the proposed project is affordable for ratepayers and agricultural users. More information about the estimated costs of the proposed project is provided in master response 5.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		significant environmental issues and no decision to proceed should be made until these are addressed.	The Draft EIR/EIS contains a wealth of information and analyses. The document reflects seven years of collaboration, response to requests for additional information, careful thought, accumulation of the latest scientific information, and the thorough analyses needed to develop and conduct an environmental review of a project as massively critical as the proposed project. The EIR/EIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project according to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).
123	1	As a resident of the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta I find the twin tunnels to be the most expensive Band-Aid approach to solve California's water problem in history; it only transfers water from one area to another without adding one drop of water to the system. It actually destroys an entire environment, economy and life style in the Delta to pour water into the desert so that corporate farmers can grow crops in an unsustainable environment. I understand that the Central Valley water project was started during the depths of the Great Depression, paid into by farmers in the Central Valley; however, not without taxpayers money which paid the bulk of the cost. The water rights for those farmers have passed through generations have spun into agricultural corporations which have the right to sell water to muni water districts and developers at a huge profit. I understand that California has a very successful agricultural business. Growing up in this state I understand what farmers do for us; they put food on our tables.	As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage. Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species is provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant,

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.
123	2	We need to develop better ways of irrigation, develop de-salinization which is very expensive, developing solar energy and hydrogen generation to power these systems. This will actually add water to the system. In the long run it will provide water to the more arid areas of our state. Global warming has become more than a theory. As one of the most developed countries in the world, we need to join the 21st century by not using the Band-Aid approach, but working on long term solutions to our shared water problem.	The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
126	1	Full disclosure -- I'm a fisherman. I think this plan is terribly misguided and a poorly disguised attempt by Southern California farmers to grab more water to grow their water intensive crops.	The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
126	2	There is zero science that says predatory non native fish are the cause of the decline in smelt and salmon populations, so why do most of the proposals include plans to intentionally reduce the populations of those fish? It's a classic red herring, everyone knows water diversion is the problem but if we blame fish, then we can kill them, then the fishermen won't care and will stop fighting, and then the farmers get all the water they want. It's criminal, they are the ones killing all the salmon and smelt, not the fishermen.	Environmental Commitment 15 (Localized Reduction of Predatory Fishes) is not intended to entirely remove predators at any location or substantially alter the abundance of predators at the scale of the Delta system. Instead, EC15 proposes to reduce localized abundance of predatory fishes at locations of high predation risk (i.e., predation hotspots) associated with construction and operation of the proposed and existing water conveyance facilities, through active catpure methods (boat electrofishing, hook-and-line fishing, predator lottery fishing tournaments, and other means of passive and active capture). A number of studies, cited in the BDCP Effects Analysis, provide evidence that predation at such hotspots is of concern to covered fish species. For a more detailed discussion of the existing predation issues in the South Delta, please see BDCP Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy, Section 3.4.1.2, BDCP Appendix 5.F, Biological Stressors on Covered Fish, and Chapter 11 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. EC15 would remove predator refuge habitat and reduce predator abundance in the construction areas. At a minimum, EC15 will target the removal of an amount of predator refuge commensurate with the amount that may be created by construction of water conveyance facilities. These measures are expected to fully mitigate any indirect effect on predation rates associated with construction. Because of uncertainties regarding treatment methods and efficacy, implementation of EC15 will involve discrete study pilot projects and research actions coupled with an adaptive management and monitoring program to evaluate effectiveness. Please see Section 4.1, RDEIR/SDEIS for a full description of EC15.
126	3	Spend the money to fix the screens at the pumping station so they do a better job of not killing fish, and make the farmers grow crops that are less water intensive.	"DWR and Reclamation are required to improve fish collection efficiency at the existing south Delta salvage facilities, as part of facility improvements required by the National Marine Fisheries Service 2009 biological opinion on the SWP/CVP. For example, in 2014 Reclamation replaced the secondary louver system with a traveling screen system. These screens provide protection by guiding fish into the holding tanks while catching debris on pegs and transporting debris to a collection system at the work surface. The technology required at the proposed north Delta intakes and the existing south Delta export facilities differ fundamentally. The north Delta intakes would be located on the side of the river channel and so would be designed to comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish screening criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3). The south Delta export facilities are located on dead-end channels and requires active collection and salvage of fishes. Screening the intakes at Clifton Court Forebay was analyzed during the water conveyance alternative development process and is described in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A. This alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because initial results of recent studies, including information included in the recent NMFS biological opinions, supported a phased approach that would emphasize improvements to operations of fish handling facilities and reduced predator potential within Clifton Court Forebay prior to further analysis of installation of fish screens. Nevertheless, DWR and Reclamation will continue investigating strategies to increase fish salvage efficiency, reduce pre-screen losses, and improve screening efficiencies, consistent with the 2009 biological opinion of the SWP/CVP." The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.
127	1	This Demand and Comment Letter is submitted to you by the following public interest organizations in an effort to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta and California rivers: Friends of the River; Restore the Delta; and the Environmental Water Caucus, a coalition of more than 30 public interest organizations. This letter pertains to the California Resources Agency, California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Bureau of Reclamation's recent decision to stop posting public comment letters and other vital information on their jointly hosted Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) website (baydeltaconservationplan.com) just after issuance of the public drafts of the BDCP Plan and Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) on about December 13, 2013. When our country was formed, people peaceably assembled in order to hear each other's views on matters of public importance. Informed public debate is the hallmark of our democracy. The modern equivalent of the venerable town hall/public park assembly is the public comment process via the Internet on proposed major government actions. Americans have fought wars to retain these freedoms. The BDCP proponent agencies, however, seem intent upon wresting these hard-earned freedoms from the public. These freedoms have been suppressed by these agencies' decision to stop posting critical comment letters on the established project website. If we lived in Communist China, we might expect thoughtful or critical public comment to be suppressed. We do not expect this in the United States of America. The water tunnels BDCP is another effort by the same Governor and others to develop the old peripheral canal project that was defeated by a referendum vote by a margin of about 2 to 1 in June 1982. The water tunnels are identified as Alternative 4, DWR's Preferred Alternative. (BDCP Draft EIR/EIS, 3-3). The water tunnels are one of, if not the most, controversial proposed public works projects in California history.	Since 2006, DWR has sought to include as many voices into the planning process as possible and has demonstrated that commitment with an unprecedented level of public involvement. More information about the public outreach conducted during the comment review periods for the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS is provided in Master Response 40. During the interim planning years (2009-2013) and although there is no specific requirement or guidance under state and federal environmental laws or policies to do so, meeting materials, meeting notes, meeting presentations, audio recordings of meetings, draft documents, and comment letters were made available to the public on the BDCP website. Many of the comments posted are critical of the BDCP. The opinion that the viewpoints were restricted by not providing comments and information for public and agency review is unfounded. More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41. All formal comments received on the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS have been catalogued, evaluated, and responses incorporated into the Final EIR/EIS. All of the comments on the RDEIR/SDEIS were also made available on the project website. Comments received during the public review and other forms of public engagement resulted in changes to the preferred project (Alternative 4A is now the preferred alternative). The Final EIR/EIS has incorporated all public review comments and responses. See Master Response 42 for additional details on response to public comments.
127	2	Recent Website Change Regarding Posting of Comments The initial Friends of the River comment letter was submitted to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as instructed by the BDCP website on January 14, 2014. Receipt was confirmed by reply email from NMFS that same date also advising that "Additional information can be found at www.baydeltaconservationplan.com." What can be found on the BDCP website are the 40,000 pages of the consultant prepared Plan and EIR/EIS documents which the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, NMFS and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), have previously called "advocacy" and/or "biased" documents for the BDCP water tunnels project. (Federal Agency Release, Bureau of Reclamation Comments p.1; NMFS Comments p.2): USFWS Comments p.1, July 18, 2013). What cannot be found on the BDCP website is the January 14, 2014 Friends of the River initial comment letter explaining among other things that the water tunnels project "is not a permissible project under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) because it would adversely modify designated critical habitat for at least five Endangered and Threatened fish species." (p.1). What also cannot be found on the BDCP website is the December 19, 2013 Environmental Water Caucus (EWC) (a coalition of more than 30 public interest	See Response 127-1 for more information regarding the public outreach process. In light of such factors as the statewide significance of the proposed project, the length and complexity of the Plan 5 and Draft EIR/EIS, and the requests from the public for more time to review the documents, the state and federal lead agencies recognized that the proposed project represents an "unusual situation" and released the Draft BDCP and associated Draft EIR/EIS for a total review period of 226 days. The 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS was noticed and circulated for public review for a total of 113 days. Please see Master Response 39 for information regarding the length of the public review period. The operation of new conveyance facilities with existing facilities would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta. Please see Master Response 17 for additional information regarding evaluation of impacts to biological resources.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		organizations) letter requesting that the public review and comment period be extended from April 14, 2014 to August 15, 2014. The EWC letter explains that "there are 40,214 actual pages of the released documents" and that "these documents represent 20% more pages than the 32 volumes of the last printed edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica." To explain the change in policy regarding posting of correspondence on the BDCP website, the following language now appears under "Correspondence": "In order to maintain the integrity of the formal public review period, incoming correspondence will not be available via the website beginning December 13, 2013 to the close of the public comment period April 14, 2014." (See http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/library/Correspondence.aspx , emphasis added.) The obvious purpose of refusing to post comment letters is to hide critical comments from the public. It limits the information available to the public to the pro-BDCP water tunnels documents posted in December 2013. This restriction is an unconstitutional and unlawful exercise of viewpoint discrimination by the State agencies, the Resources Agency and DWR, aided and abetted by the participating federal agencies, NMFS which is receiving the comments but not posting them on a website, and USFWS and Reclamation. The First Amendment prohibits viewpoint discrimination. This restriction is also an unlawful denial of public access to the comments prohibited by the California Constitution. Furthermore, the decision to withhold posting of comments is a direct violation of the environmental full disclosure purposes of both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).	
127	3	The Closing of the Forum to Critical Comment Is Contrary to the Promise of Encouraging Public Participation The State claims that "The BDCP encourages public participation." (BDCP website under "Correspondence".) Secretary Laird of the California Resources Agency and numerous other state officials have claimed that the BDCP process is open and transparent. Those claims of encouraging public participation and openness are false. By refusing to post critical comment letters, the speech of the commenters is being silenced. The public does not see the other side of the water tunnels story. Meanwhile, the proponent agencies continue to tout the water tunnels on the website. (Spanish language posting, January 3, 2014 entitled Breve Informativo; English language Overview Presentation posting, January 20, 2014). The project proponents have been free to misrepresent, advocate, speculate and omit unpalatable facts from the web site while silencing responsive correction. Instead of encouraging public participation, the agencies are doing everything in their power to discriminate against and exclude views opposing the water tunnels from the public website forum they have created. This is part of a pattern of suppression of free speech that was displayed in the summer of 2013 when Caltrans employees trespassed on private property in the Delta to remove signs carrying the message "Save the Delta! Stop the Tunnels!" That thuggery by the State only stopped after it was brought to widespread public attention by media coverage and rallies protesting the sign removals; no legal basis for the sign removals was ever provided by Caltrans.	Please see response to Comment 127-1 and 127-2 for information regarding transparency and public participation in the planning process, including posting of public comments in a manner consistent with both NEPA and CEQA. In regards to the removal of signs on Highway 160, the DWR is a water purveyor and is not involved in the rulemaking or enforcement of the rules and regulations of other state agencies such as Caltrans.
127	4	The Viewpoint Discrimination on the BDCP Website Violates the First Amendment	See response 127-1 and 127-2 for issues related to public outreach.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		The First Amendment of the United States Constitution provides in pertinent part that there shall be no law "abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." Similarly, the California Constitution commands that "A law may not restrain or abridge liberty of speech or press" and the people have the right to "assemble freely to consult for the common good." Cal. Const., Art. 1, section 2(a); section 3(a). "In a public forum, by definition, all parties have a constitutional right of access and the state must demonstrate compelling reasons for restricting access to a single class of speaker, a single viewpoint, or a single subject. When speaker and subject are similarly situated, the state may not pick and choose." Perry Educ. Assn. v. Perry Local Education Assn, 460 U.S. 37, 55 (1983). "Any access barrier must be reasonable and viewpoint neutral [citations]." Christian Legal Soc. Chapter of the University of California, Hastings College of the Law v. Martinez, 130 S.Ct. 2971, 2984 (2010). "When the government targets not subject matter, but particular views taken by speakers on a subject, the violation of the First Amendment is all the more blatant. [Citation.] Viewpoint discrimination is thus an egregious form of content discrimination. The government must abstain from regulating speech when the specific motivating ideology or the opinion or perspective of the speaker is the rationality for the restriction." Rosenberger v Rector and Visitors of University of Virginia, 515 U.S. 819, 829 (1995). Under the current regime, only those viewpoints that the government chooses will be posted on the BDCP website. For example, the website continues to include blogs purporting to debunk alleged "Myths" about the BDCP, and other materials written to promote BDCP and discount public concerns. (See, e.g., http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/news/blog/14-01-10/Correcting_Stubborn_Myths_Part_II.aspx.) This blog suggests that a comment on the blog may be provided by clicking on a link. ("Click here to contact us with your questions or comments about the BDCP Blog.") Yet that link is the same link to the email address for submitting formal public comments on the Plan and EIR/EIS (BDCP.comments@noaa.gov). As explained clearly on the BDCP website, such comments will not be posted. The exclusion of critical comments from the BDCP website at the same time as the government agency proponents continue to post materials that promote their viewpoint that BDCP is a worthwhile project violates the First Amendment prohibition of viewpoint discrimination in forums created by the government.	
127	5	The Denial of the Right of Access to Critical Comments Violates the California Constitution The California Constitution provides in pertinent part that "The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny." Cal. Const. Art. 1, section 3(b)(1). Moreover, any authority "shall be broadly construed if it furthers the people's right of access, and narrowly construed if it limits the right of access." Cal. Const. Art. 1, section 3(b)(2). "Given the strong public policy of the people's right to information concerning the people's business (Gov.Code, section 6250), and the constitutional mandate to construe statutes limiting the right of access narrowly (Cal. Const., art. 1, section 3, subd. (b)(2), all public records are subject to disclosure unless the Legislature has expressly provided to the contrary." Sierra Club v. Superior Court, 57 Cal.4th 157, 166 (2013) (internal quotation marks deleted).	Please see response to Comment 127-1 and 127-2 for information regarding transparency and public participation in the planning process, including posting of public comments in a manner consistent with both NEPA and CEQA. For comments pertaining to the size and complexity of the document, please refer to Master Response 38.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		The complexity of the BDCP and the volume of documents being circulated for public review to explain that complexity make review challenging even for professionals. For an average member of the public, the job is almost impossible. The public's ability to be informed regarding this project is facilitated by having access to comments being made by others during the review process, including non-profit environmental groups and other public agencies. The refusal to publish comment letters on the website as they come in denies the public the right of access to the comments in violation of the California Constitution.	
127	6	The Exclusion of Environmental Information Contrary to the Opinions of the Project Proponents Violates NEPA and CEQA NEPA and CEQA are both "environmental full disclosure laws." Silva v. Lynn, 482 F2d 1282, 1284 (1st Cir. 1973)(NEPA); Communities for a Better Environment v. City of Richmond, 184 Cal.App.4th 70, 88 (2010)(CEQA). Both laws require that an agency "use its best efforts to find out all that it reasonably can" about the subject project and its environmental impacts. Barnes v. U.S. Dept. of Transp. 655 F.3d 1124, 1136 (9th Cir. 2011)(NEPA); Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova, 40 Cal. 412, 428 (2007)(CEQA). Interfering with review by members of the public of comments made by other members of the public is environmental concealment, not disclosure, and is calculated to prevent the public from finding out all that it reasonably can about the subject project and its impacts. CEQA provides that "notwithstanding any other provision of law" the record of proceedings "shall include, but is not limited to," written documents submitted by any person relevant to findings and all written correspondence submitted to the respondent public agency with respect to compliance with CEQA or the project. Public Resources Code section 21167.6€(3), (7). The NEPA Regulations require that federal agencies make comments received under NEPA available to the public pursuant to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act and that they shall be provided without charge to the extent practicable. 40 C.F.R. section 1506.6(f). The CEQA Regulations provide that: Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities. Such procedures should include, whenever possible, making environmental information available in electronic format on the Internet, on a web site maintained or utilized by the public agency. 14 Code Cal. Regs section 15201(emphasis added). Instead, the BDCP proponent agencies have selectively published environmental information favorable to the project on their website while concealing what they consider to be unfavorable information that they would rather not share with the public. Making the comments available only after the comment period has closed makes a mockery of the promise of a fair, transparent and open process. Members of the public will have no opportunity to learn information provided by those with concerns about the BDCP in time to help them develop their own timely comments, including suggested alternatives to the	Please see response to Comment 127-1 and 127-2 for information regarding transparency and public participation in the planning process, including posting of public comments in a manner consistent with both NEPA and CEQA. All formal comments received on the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS have been catalogued, evaluated, and responses incorporated into the Final EIR/EIS. All of the comments on the RDEIR/SDEIS were also made available on the project website. Comments received during the public review and other forms of public engagement resulted in changes to the preferred project (Alternative 4A is now the preferred alternative). See Master Response 42 for additional details on response to public comments.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		project. The exclusion of comments from the website violates the environmental full disclosure purposes of both NEPA and CEQA, and the CEQA regulation requiring the posting of environmental information on the agency's website.	
127	7	The exclusion of public comments from the BDCP website makes the claim that the BDCP encourages public participation a lie, and violates the First Amendment, California Constitution, NEPA and CEQA. This blatant viewpoint discrimination will not be tolerated. We demand that your agencies immediately commence posting all comment letters received on the BDCP website as soon as they are received, and confirm in writing that you are now doing so.	Please see response to Comment 127-1 and 127-2 for information regarding transparency and public participation in the planning process including posting of public comments in a manner consistent with both NEPA and CEQA.
127	8	Claiming that taking more water away from the fish will be good for the fish, that taking more freshwater away from the Delta would be good for the Delta and that a water grab for the benefit of the exporters is really a conservation plan is false propaganda intended to deceive and confuse the public. This pattern and practice of viewpoint discrimination by the BDCP proponent agencies is the strongest self-indictment that could be made of the folly, environmental destruction and economic waste threatened by the water tunnels project. The government would not be trying to suppress the speech of project opponents if it actually believed its own claims about the asserted benefits of the project.	The proposed project was developed to meet the standards of the Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such, it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 17 for additional information regarding evaluation of impacts to biological resources. Please see response to Comment 127-1 and 127-2 for information regarding transparency and public participation in the planning process. Since 2006, More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.
128	1	I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because: It is too costly (up to $54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).	Please see Master Response 5 for an explanation of BDCP costs and funding. Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.
128	2	I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because: Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in Northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 26 (Area of Origin). The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Please see Master Response 25 for more information regarding upstream reservoir effects.
128	3	I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential	Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta. With regards to agricultural impact mitigation, please see

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		conservation lands.	Master Response 18.
128	4	I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because you cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.	As described in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS, comments and suggestions received from the State Water Board were influential in defining the range and content of alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS, including the State Water Board's Delta Flow Criteria Report, prepared pursuant to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009. Informed by State Water Board comments, DWR met with State Water Board staff to identify a general approach to model an increased spring Delta outflow alternative. This alternative was designed to increase spring Delta outflow by approximately 1.5 million acre-feet, on average, above the NEPA baseline assumptions. This became Alternative 8 as analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Consideration of the specific determination contained in the Delta Flow Criteria Report, which identified 75% of unimpaired net Delta outflow for January through June, would not have been feasible to include as an alternative in the EIR/EIS. A letter from the Executive Director of the State Water Board to the deputy secretary of the Natural Resources Agency on April 19, 2011 recognized that the determination did not consider the competing needs for water or other public trust resource needs, such as the need to manage cold-water resources in tributaries to the Delta. Further, implementation of these flows would also likely affect water users beyond those receiving CVP and SWP deliveries south of the Delta. As described in Section 3A.3.5, alternatives requiring impairment of senior water rights held by entities not participating in the BDCP were eliminated from full consideration in the EIR/EIS, as such rights could not be infringed by CDFW, USFWS, or NMFS through those agencies' actions or through "ESA Section 7 consultation" with Reclamation. For additional supplemental modeling requested by the SWRCB related to increased Delta outflows please see Appendix C of the RDEIR/SDIES.
128	5	I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because. The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.	The proposed project operations do not require the reoperation of Shasta, Trinity, or Folsom Reservoirs or any San Joaquin River and tributaries water storage facilities, or the construction or reconstruction of dams. All of the existing reservoir operation criteria will be met with the same frequency as conditions without the proposed project. However, some changes in the seasonal release patterns at Oroville would occur under the proposed project, primarily related to increased spring releases and reduced summer releases. However, this change in reservoir storage release patterns does not affect long-term storage and as with the other reservoirs, does not conflict with existing applicable operational criteria. RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 6 (Surface Water) describes waters of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River basins, including the Delta and Suisun Marsh, that could be directly or indirectly affected by SWP and CVP operations and environmental commitments identified in the project Alternatives. Appendix A Chapter 8, Water Quality, describes effects on surface water quality in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins.
128	6	I believe that the BDCP should include, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We do not need to build more dams or tunnels.	Please see response to comment 4 within this comment letter, above. The proposed project is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns while securing reliable water deliveries. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, Final EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
130	1	Think of the legacy we will leave our children and grandchildren. What will we leave them if we build these tunnels and destroy this beautiful State?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
131	1	It is very clear that we must begin to live within our resources, so that future generations will have the means to solve the problems they are being handed by our over-use of water and energy.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
132	1	Let's get our priorities straight and protect the environment and future life on this planet.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
133	1	Hey! When it's damaged it's damaged; and when it's gone it's gone. Nature was here first. She knows what she's doing. To work contrary to her has never brought mankind anything but trouble in the end.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
134	1	There are just too many factors endangering the livelihood of people and the fishery of the Sacramento Delta to continue this travesty!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
135	1	Selling our water as a conservation plan is ludicrous. The Sacramento Delta is already showing significant ecological problems from lack of water. I expected more of Governor Brown.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.
136	1	Our water is a valuable resource that must be shared with all aspects of California. Dams will have to be removed at some point. It is time to look not only to the present, but also the future needs.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
137	1	Building these tunnels would just be a continuation of the destruction and stupid decisions that have caused the problems in the past.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
138	1	In my opinion, this issue is of such great importance that it would definitely, in future elections, swing my vote away from supporters of the tunnels, and any other projects selling water down south to unsustainable farming areas in the southern Central Valley.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
139	1	I understand how valuable water is for our great state of California. But we don't need to sacrifice what makes our state great -- our natural resources -- and the Delta is one of them.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
140	1	This is a very ill-conceived project. We need more dams, not tunnels. Why do we continue to supply the L.A. area at the expense of the Delta farmers and	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Northern Californians?	to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental impact analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
141	1	Not that it makes any difference to you Mr. Brown but I think these places should be left for our next generations like they were there for us. Killing these places off would create many more problems than you think you would be solving, unless the problem is people like you and Feinstein who think your wallets are not fat enough!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation. The planning, designing, and environmental processes have been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole.
142	1	This project is pure folly. It is too expensive and should not be an expense borne by the tax-payers. It will further degrade the Delta ecosystem and will transfer yet more of Northern California water to the south, damaging and harming the rivers and wildlife that depend on them.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3. It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.
143	1	Conservation is, I believe, one of the key solutions to the water issues in California; one that has not been fully explored. A truly sustainable water plan for the state would focus on	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		increased water conservation and efficiency, treating and recycling waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, capturing and treating storm water, and reducing irrigation of drainage-impaired lands in the southern Central Valley. Until conservation has been fully supported by the state, there is no way I am going to consider supporting the chancy, expensive, and potentially ruinous tunnel project.	Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
144	1	This project should be called the Underground Peripheral Canal. It will be death to the Delta. Consider that Delta waters will have more saltwater intrusion as climate change inevitably is forecast to cause seawater rise and intrusion. Northern California needs to keep all of the freshwater it can. If nature had meant for this water to be in Southern California it would be there naturally. It is meant to be where it is to sustain flyway and ecosystem habitat. No on the tunnels!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity. Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride). In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.
145	1	My family has lived in this Central Valley since the mid-1800's, and I since 1952. I watched its decline begin when my grandfather took me to see Oroville Dam being built. I'd like to leave a place for my grandchildren that is a little better than another Owens Valley, but the Owens Valley is what the BDCP have in mind for the Delta. I am not aware of a single estuary in the world that has been recovered by diverting water for export around the estuary, nor am I aware of an effort to recover any estuary or similar environment that so purposefully excluded the participation of the local community. Let's face it, plain and simple, the BDCP is just a 50 year get-out-of-jail free card on the ESA for the export water contractors. If you truly represent me, and the community I live in, you will stand up against the BDCP and reject it out of hand. The ball is in your court. I will wait to see what kind of integrity you have.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. For more information regarding public trust please see Master Response 13
146	1	Would it not cost less and do more than the big tunnels to simply buy all the land in the Westlands Water District?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
147	1	Please note: I live in the south. Though water is important, I've seen how we destroyed the Owens Valley and messed up the Salton Sea.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Don't do more damage to the Delta too!	index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
148	1	This project is too focused on water for human uses, and not focused enough on water for fish and wildlife, as well as the Delta as place. More Delta outflow is needed to restore the aquifer and the species that live and migrate through it. Additionally, the damage that will be done in put in the system is not worth it. There are less costly, more balanced ways to achieve the co-equal goals. California does not need this costly project.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding. The Proposed Project would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal.Wat. Code, § 85001[c]). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment eat the south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS. For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4. For more on the co-equal goals and Delta as a Place, please see Master Response 24.
149	1	Besides the prohibitive costs, including unforeseen, this project would be an ecological disaster and result in the loss of some of the most valuable trout stream sections in the world. A good example is the McCloud River and its wild rainbow trout. This species of trout has been transplanted to rivers in several other countries and is one of the most prized in the world. Raising the water level in Shasta Lake would remove valuable river habitat.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. BDCP/Cal WaterFix is unlikely to affect Rainbow Trout. Operations of the new conveyance facilities would not result in any major changes above Shasta reservoir (BDCP Ch. 5 Effects Analysis). CALSIM modeling predicts that changes in Shasta Reservoir storage capacity due to Alternative 4 scenarios will be minimal (<10%) relative to the NEPA baseline (BDCP EIR/EIS Chapter 6, Surface Water, Alternative 4, Impact SW-1). The proposed project does not intend to alter the structure of the Shasta Dam or to flood the McCloud River. Programs that are included in EcoRestore are aimed to increase habitat availability and suitability within the Bay-Delta system for various species. Raising Shasta Dam is a viable option that has been considered by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. More information about the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation can be found at http://www.usbr.gov/mp/slwri/documents.html. For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.
150	1	Emergency H2O declaration doesn't mean CEQA is suspended when needed the most, nor as cover to sneak through twin tunnels and wasteful, toxic fracking.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or “hydraulic fracturing” -- presumably could be an “industrial” use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in “the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]” (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].) The CEQA process for the BDCP/CWF has not been suspended due to emergency drought operations. The CVP and SWP Drought Operations Plan is independent of the BDCP/CWF permitting process. For information on droughts and the BDCP/CWF, please see Master Response 47.
151	1	Northern California communities will lose millions of dollars of tourist revenues as free flowing rivers attract visitors. This was proven when the Stanislaus was drowned by the New Melones dam. Sonora has never recovered the tourist dollars that the rafters and kayakers	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		spent in the community. Much of the mitigation projects were never completed. The lake is only useful to energy intensive noisy motor boats and personal watercraft. There are fewer and fewer places where people can be free of intrusive noisy motors and the accompanying stench of gas or diesel fuel. Why do we need to repeat this same exercise?	index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. DWR acknowledges your opposition to the BDCP. An analysis on recreation-related socioeconomic impacts can be found in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Section 16.1.1.6, Economic Character of Recreation in the Delta. Additionally, the BDCP has released a draft statewide economic impact analysis study that analyzes the project as an investment for the state as a whole. It can be found at http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/News/News/13-08-05/BDCP_Draft_Statewide_Economic_Analysis_Released.aspx
151	2	We have kayaked many of California's rivers over the last three decades, and do not want to see any more dams or water projects. The historic projects have destroyed 98% of the former wetlands in the Central Valley. It seems we should be working on restoring wetlands and estuaries not destroying the last 2%. It is time to just say "no" to people growing cotton and not food in the desert. It is time to put southern California on notice that there will be no more transfer of fresh water resources from Northern California resources to people who have continued to waste water in a myriad of ways.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
152	1	We need a sustainable future. I oppose the tunnel project. We need to update our farming practices. As far as I can tell, farmers are receiving an unreasonable benefit in the amount of water they use. We need better stewardship of our resources.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.
153	1	Educate people about using less water, recycling it, and realizing that all life needs water to live. Watering landscapes, (especially lawn sprinklers which waste an enormous amount of water), washing clothes and washing cars, dishes, and all the other myriad cleaning of things that people do, are trivial compared to death by dehydration. Where is the education?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
153	2	The Delta tunnels would be a terrible mistake. I trust it never happens.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
154	1	I do not believe that the large corporate farms south of the delta will not ask for more and more water once the tunnels are built. Why build a four lane highway but use only one lane? Each year there is more encroachment of salt water into the Delta. I have tasted it as I am an old board sailor/sail boater. There is no more water coming down the river now than 20 years ago, there is only more being sent to the big farms (more pumping). With the big new tunnels, more water will not enter San Francisco Bay and support the fish that use the delta.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. Impacts on Delta outflows (fresh water flowing to the Bay) are not significant. Model simulation results for the proposed project alternative (4A) indicate that long-term average and wet year peak outflows would increase in winter months with a corresponding decrease in spring months because of the shift in system inflows caused by climate change and increased Delta exports as compared to Existing Conditions. In other year types, Alternative 4A would result in higher or similar outflow because of the spring outflow requirements. In summer and fall months, Alternative 4A would result in similar or higher outflow because of changes in export patterns and OMR flow requirements and export reductions in fall months, and also because of the Fall X2 requirements in wet and above normal years. The incremental changes in Delta outflow between Alternative 4A and Existing Conditions would be a function of both the facility and operations assumptions (including north Delta intakes capacity of 9,000 cfs, less negative OMR flow requirements, enhanced spring outflow and/or Fall X2 requirements) and the reduction in water supply availability due to increased north of Delta urban demands, sea level rise and climate change. Results for the range of changes in Delta Outflow under Alternative 4A are presented in more detail in Appendix 5A, BDCP EIR/S Modeling Technical Appendix, of the Draft EIR/EIS. For a more detailed response regarding impacts beneficial uses of water, please see Master Response 34. Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity. Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride). In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.
155	1	Diverting water to an overpopulated desert is not a sustainable, efficient or effective solution. Local resources are best put to use or conserved locally. The destruction of one ecosystem in the name of overpopulation does not justify the destruction of a second one to save face or win an election. Two wrongs don't make a right, and in this case, two tunnels don't either.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding. Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
156	1	This is quite frankly the worst possible idea for water management in this state. We need to protect the wildlife resources we have. We cannot waste financial resources on a project of this scale. We cannot shift the environment to the wayside for the benefit of corporations already subsidized by the state.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. For more on the costs and funding, please see Master Response 5. Water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed BDCP. As a habitat conservation plan and natural community conservation plan prepared under the federal Endangered Species Act and the state Natural Community Conservation Planning Act, the BDCP would actually improve habitat for fish, other species and terrestrial plants and wildlife, rather than cause harm to them. Though the BDCP as proposed would involve the construction of new conveyance infrastructure, the EIR/EIS contains environmental commitments and mitigation measures to reduce significant and adverse effects to the extent feasible. For additional discussion on the habitat restoration and enhancement activities included in the proposed BDCP, please see Master Response 5.
156	2	The correct path forward here is to migrate against growing export low value and high water consumption crops. State subsidizing of water based on prior agreements needs to end or at least be renegotiated to a reasonable level.	The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. The Lead Agencies acknowledge the comment regarding farm size and subsidized water; however, the proposed project does not prioritize these. The proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water conveyed through the proposed project, California Aqueduct, Delta Mendota Canal, or other water conveyance facilities is put to a beneficial use. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.
156	3	An independent panel with scientists not associated with corporate interests really needs to be formed to generate an objective path forward. To my knowledge, none of this has been done by our current government and this needs to change.	See BDCP Chapter 10 regarding the role of independent science in BDCP development. Briefly, not one, but several independent panels have been formed during BDCP development, and their input has been very important in shaping the form and content of the current document. Independent scientific review is also anticipated to be a regular and ongoing process during BDCP implementation. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			longer includes an HCP or NCCP.
156	4	Govern the resource in a responsible manner. The next generations deserve to be handed something back that is in a better shape than we received it. We can turn this around and this plan is not the way to do it.	The statements made by the commenter address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
157	1	Nice Earth is contradictory to capitalism. If our owners were about taking care of Earth, if we were about us all taking care of us all, it'd be socialism communism.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issue was raised with the environmental adequacy of the EIR/EIS.
158	1	There was a little part of the University of the Project study a few years back that mentioned that the dollar loss from decreased salmon fishing related to the Delta was greater than the dollar loss when farmers had severe cutbacks to water coming from the Delta.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The proposed BDCP aims to provide a more reliable water supply in a way more protective of fish. The plan proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which ecological goals and objectives would be fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented BDCP would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. A more detailed analysis of effects on salmon fisheries was completed as part of the Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report, which found that the overall impacts of the BDCP on Delta commercial fisheries are expected to be positive to both the population and commercial landings for fishery species (including salmon).
158	2	The Twin Tunnel rip off (somewhat related to the incredible rip off of AB 134--- selling Sacramento waste water to Westlands, et al, which actually was selling Sacramento votes for the Twin Tunnels) is to get cleaner water to ship to farmers, fracking interests, and further south after those interests have caused the water further down the Delta to get terribly brackish. Those water interests do not want the yucky water they have created.	The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34. Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity. Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride). In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.
158	3	There was an alternative plan, the Western Delta Intakes Concept (WDIC) ---tunnels from Sherman Island which would address the flow and smelt issues. Garamendi had supported Assemblyman Berryhill's proposal. That got shot down I suppose because the water wouldn't be clean enough----although the Westlands, et al, were the ones who created the brackish situation in the Delta.	For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4. For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.
159	1	We agree that the tunnels would not only be a disaster for the Delta, but also for Folsom Lake, the Sacramento area, and beyond. Keep Northern California water in Northern California.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. The proposed project operations do not require the reoperation of Shasta, Trinity, or Folsom Reservoirs or any San Joaquin River and tributaries water storage facilities. All of the existing reservoir operation criteria will be met with the same frequency as conditions without the proposed project. However, some changes in the seasonal release patterns at Oroville would occur under the proposed project, primarily related to increased spring releases and reduced summer releases. However, this change in reservoir storage release patterns does not affect long-term storage and as with the other reservoirs, does not conflict with existing applicable operational criteria. RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 6 (Surface Water) describes waters of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River basins, including the Delta and Suisun Marsh, that could be directly or indirectly affected by SWP and CVP operations and environmental commitments identified in the project Alternatives. Appendix A Chapter 8, Water Quality, describes effects on surface water quality in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins.
160	1	I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in Northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding. The proposed project operations do not require the reoperation of Shasta, Trinity, or Folsom Reservoirs or any San Joaquin River and tributaries water storage facilities. All of the existing reservoir operation criteria will be met with the same frequency as conditions without the proposed project. However, some changes in the seasonal release patterns at Oroville would occur under the proposed project, primarily related to increased spring releases and reduced summer releases. However, this change in reservoir storage release patterns does not affect long-term storage and as with the other reservoirs, does not conflict with existing applicable operational criteria. RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 6 (Surface Water) describes waters of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River basins, including the Delta and Suisun Marsh, that could be directly or indirectly affected by SWP and CVP operations and environmental commitments identified in the project Alternatives. Appendix A Chapter 8, Water Quality, describes effects on surface water quality in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
160	2	Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.	For more information regarding agricultural mitigation please see Master Response 18. Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
160	3	You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the South Delta is particularly important.	As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The San Joaquin River is being restored independent of the BDCP, so that its historic fisheries can be revived. Although the flows will not equal those that occurred prior to the construction of Friant Dam north of Fresno, the new flows under the San Joaquin River Restoration Program will represent a huge ecological improvement over conditions that have persisted over the last several decades As discussed in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy, the San Joaquin River Restoration Program monitors the physical and biological effects of flows along the San Joaquin River from

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Friant Dam to the confluence of the Merced River to provide sufficient fish habitat in that area. The release of water from Friant Dam for the SJRRP depends upon the amount of runoff. Using water supply forecasts for the Friant Division of the Central Valley Project, the SJRRP uses the estimated total unimpaired inflow below Friant Dam to determine an allocation. The Restoration Administrator makes recommendations on the timing of releases based on river conditions and the specific goals and objectives at that time. Prior to an increase in flow rates, the SJRRP analyzes the likely effects on the river and surrounding lands and documents the results with a Flow Bench Evaluation. Following an affirmative evaluation, the SJRRP issues a notification and changes the releases. For more information on the SJRRP please visit http://www.restoresjr.net/ Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species ia provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
161	1	I oppose these massive tunnels because they would be diverting water to the desert to grow unsustainable crops to ship overseas. This will profit giant agribusinesses at the expense of our environment and the people of California.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for. One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board. The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.
162	1	How much is it to do a desalinization plant? Are there better options?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level. Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands. Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand. The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
163	1	California is trending towards drier, warmer climate change. We can't afford to sacrifice our Delta and Northern California farming communities to provide water to other parts of California. Instead, use the monies to convert large grass areas and other large water consumption environments in Southern California to a terrain that is more adaptable to the dry climate of Southern California. Stop growth and keep us an agricultural state!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The proposed project does not include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors. Please see Master Response 26 regarding northern California water resources. The proposed project is designed to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to impose land use controls on municipalities. Many water agencies in California have embraced water conservation on numerous fronts. Many of these efforts are highlighted in Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, which describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 6 regarding water demand management and Master Response 35 regarding water use in southern California.
164	1	I oppose new dam construction and am in favor of a new construction moratorium. The current drought conditions show that continuing on the dam building and new home development path is not sustainable.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management. For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.
165	1	Don't destroy our ecosystem over money. Do the proper research to prove what the actual effects will be. Don't construe and manipulate the data to fit the agenda of only the special interest groups who will pay millions upon billions to break the balance of nature even further.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
166	1	Start mandatory conservation and enforcing AB-1881, and stop stealing water from other counties and states! How is it that Southern California, for the most part, has no mandatory water conservation policies in place but continues to reap the benefits of unchecked water supplies from other regions at their expense and that of the environment, habitat, and other human needs? It's ridiculous! And I live in Southern California! How far would have 20% conservation gone all these years to help the northern half of the state not deplete all reserves in the drought we're now in by our continued practice of flushing all our available rain water out to the ocean?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Please see Master Response 6 regarding water demand management as well as Master Response 35 on water use in Southern California.
166	2	Where is the investment in reclaimed water and desalination plants instead of projects like this? Santa Barbara is now in a crisis mode because Lake Cachuma is going dry, but last time I checked, they decommissioned their desalination plant? Why would you do that? Where is the sane big picture planning from our elected government officials that start to deal with and accept that this state is in a constant state of drought and start living responsibly?	The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
167	1	Do not let the inevitable damage to the Delta's farmland, recreation areas, and unique habitats go forward. The planned tunnels will not only cause damage, but will lead steadily and incrementally to more and more damage. The tunnels need to be prevented, not promoted.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
168	1	I am a biologist that has worked for fisheries agencies on the Feather, Sacramento, Yuba, and several of their tributaries. Currently, I am mapping all of the natural vegetation in the Great Valley of California, and I do not agree with this project. There is too much room for misuse and abuse of our crucial water supply for the Delta and Northern CA.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The amount of water DWR can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process as described in the 2008 and 2009 BiOps (RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary ES.2.2). In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3). The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.
169	1	The health of the Delta and San Francisco Bay depend on strong, cleansing flows of fresh water. No more water diversion!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Flow criteria would be applied month by month and according to water year type. More information on the ranges of water project diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in BDCP, Chapter 3 (Conservation Strategy). By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The plan does not increase the amount of water to

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Responses related to other issues raised by the commenter: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Water Quality), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 26 (Area of Origin).
170	1	This is a ridiculous proposal, the southern California agri-businesses are trying to make a desert of parched arid land into a moist, lush farming paradise, land that has no right being farmed. This is nuts, there are better uses of our tax dollars than making rich agri-donors to the politicians, richer.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.This issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 regarding funding and cost of implementation.
171	1	Before such costly and destructive measures can be considered, there must be a full analysis of water saving methods for both Central Valley agriculture and Southern California homeowners. Does every farm in the Central Valley use water efficient irrigation systems? Do Southern California homeowners conserve this vital resource (water) by washing their cars and irrigating their lawns appropriately? Are grey water storage takes available to householders so that they can recycle rain water and use water appropriately? Californians do not want to see their watersheds further damaged by inappropriate and wasteful water use. It's time for appropriate irrigation, watering and the technology that goes with it, not two tunnels that divert water from the delta and place northern California river systems at risk. These rivers are our natural heritage and need to be protected.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage. More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for. One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board. The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.
172	1	Water is limited. We all need to live with what we have. We cannot keep squeezing the eco-system without negative consequences. The more water users we create the worse it will get when our supply is low.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
173	1	I am a concerned angler who seeks protection of our native fisheries, including salmon and steelhead, which have been experiencing historically low population levels. This project will negatively affect them and just benefit agricultural water users who already control the bulk of the water use in this state.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Proposed Project would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal.Wat. Code, § 85001[c]). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, EIR/EIS. The proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Flow criteria will be applied month by month and according to water year type. More information on the ranges of water project diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in BDCP, Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy. Monitoring for compliance with D-1641 requirements or any future requirements for SWP/CVP water supply operations would be conducted year-round in the future under the proposed project.
174	1	There's a basic issue of fairness and inclusiveness that has not been followed in the BDCP process. The process should start over with all affected parties involved from the beginning. The process should encourage all parties to fund and manage scientific studies by unbiased parties - preferably government scientists - to determine the necessary flows to preserve the Delta. The science should drive the process, not the parties who fund it.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Proposed Project and its alternatives were developed from sound science based on extensive modeling and ongoing peer review by Lead Agency scientists and independent science panels. Input was received from regulating governmental agencies, topic experts, stakeholders, private organizations like the Sierra Club, and the general public during the developmental phase of this document since 2006. The feedback was used to guide the development and subsequent revisions of the Proposed Project and its associated EIR/EIS to reflect concerns addressed from the various groups. All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts, and meeting materials have been posted online since 2010 in an unprecedented commitment to provide public access and government transparency. Although the RDEIR/SDEIS, EIR/EIS and much of the proposed project has been drafted by scientists working for a private consulting firm (ICF) working for the Lead Agencies, the Agencies' scientists have been intimately Ainvolved, and their judgments are reflected throughout the EIR/EIS and the proposed project itself.
175	1	Please do not proceed with the construction of new water diversions and tunnels under the Delta. The Sacramento River is one of the last true treasures in the State of California and on the west coast of the Americas. I would find it hard to believe anybody could argue this fact if they spent a day on the river enjoying the natural habitat and recreation provided. The Sacramento River is a Northern California icon that has survived a tragic history since the Gold Rush. We have inflicted enough pain and damage on the fisheries and wildlife associated with the river throughout our history. I cannot imagine letting a tragedy of this magnitude happen to the river in my lifetime without voicing my opinion. Building the tunnels and diverting more water from the Sacramento River is the most depressing solution imaginable. Please don't let this mistake happen and make us all sad to call ourselves Californian's.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The Proposed Project would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal.Wat. Code, § 85001[c]). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment eat the south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3
176	1	As a native California (the 5th generation in my family), I feel strongly about protecting our waterways and natural environment. Protecting wetlands and stream habitat will also help our communities survive rising water levels due to climate change.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The commenter does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS or the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS. For further clarification on issues related to climate change and the proposed project, please refer to Master Response 19, along with Chapter 29 in the Final EIR/EIS pertaining to climate change and sea level rise.
177	1	It is high time that the people of Northern California stop diverting their water for unnecessary usage in Southern California! This new plan would effectively destroy what remains of the salmon fishery in Northern California and ruin what little is left of the delta smelt!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS (Aquatic Resources).
177	2	We do not need bigger dams; instead we need all Californians to conserve water like they have never conserved before! People in Southern California waste a tremendous amount of water on their lawns, golf courses, and in their swimming pools, which we can ill afford in this time of drought! I personally know many people here in the Bay Area who refuse to conserve because they feel that the water they save will just be diverted to L.A. and their rates will go up due to less usage. Water is a precious resource and we cannot afford to waste it! However, this solution of bigger dams, more dams, and diversion tunnels in not the answer!	Since 2006, the BDCP and subsequently the California WaterFix Project have been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not part of the project, they are important tools in managing California's water resources. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. The BDCP, as well as the California WaterFix Project, is one component, among

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Conservation, education, and a new awareness of our earth are!	many, of the California Water Action Plan. That Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species.
178	1	Why not buy water from British Columbia where they consistently have an over abundance?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
179	1	There must be a time when we realize that water is limited and our activities must be tailored to the supply.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.
180	1	Please stop H.R. 3964 from passing. Bleeding more water from the northern rivers will not solve the water problems until water conservation is fully instituted, especially with increasing population. If we are to have so many people in this state, much of which is a desert climate, we must reduce water usage first, even if this means not allowing water for the green lawns and imported non-drought-tolerant flora that never grew here naturally.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. H.R. 3964 better known as the Sacramento San Joaquin Valley Emergency Water Delivery Act was passed by the House in February 2014. This bill was aimed to amend the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) to include the Act's purposes to: (1) ensure that water dedicated to fish and wildlife purposes is replaced and provided to Central Valley Project (CVP) water contractors by December 31, 2018, at the lowest cost reasonably achievable, and (2) facilitate and expedite water transfers in accordance with that Act. The proposed project is its own separate entity. For more information on H.R. 3964 please visit https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/3964. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.
180	2	With the current habits of water usage we will end up with a ruined natural environment after which severe water rationing will still be necessary. This seems like a terrible long term outcome.	As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
181	1	The Delta water tunnels will not make it rain. The projects are too large and costly, and will create demand for nonexistent waters that should simply be better conserved.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project and Master Response 6 for information on demand management measures.
181	2	For Coho Salmon, for northern California watersheds, for Southern California watersheds, for the McCloud River and countless rivers and streams.. for our existent microclimates.. do not implement these two huge tunnels. Boondoggle. Governor Brown must know better than this.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
181	3	Look to creating living, carbon-sequestering, climate-enhancing topsoil!	The creation of top soil is not within the scope of the proposed project. Although the project does not propose to create topsoil for the purpose of increasing carbon sequestration, impacts on existing topsoil resources nevertheless would be minimized. This would be accomplished through implementation of the environmental commitment entitled, "Disposal and Reuse of Spoils, Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM), and Dredged Material," and through implementation of Mitigation Measures SOILS-2a and SOILS 2b, which would protect topsoil and soil quality, including organic matter content, to the maximum extent practicable.
182	1	I oppose all alternatives to the Delta Restoration Plan that call for diversion tunnels routing Sacramento River water to exporters south of the Delta. Salt water intrusion will occur in the Central Valley if the fresh water is depleted in the Delta.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries,

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Many species of fish will face extinction.	tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity. Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride). In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.
182	2	It is the Delta Restoration Plan a costly boondoggle that will only benefit large corporate landowners like the Westlands Water District and in Kern County, not the public.	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via California WaterFix proposed conveyance facilities.
182	3	The diversion of so much water will be an inducement for fracking in the southern San Joaquin Valley and elsewhere which will forever ruin groundwater resources for us all.	The proposed project would not significantly impact local water supplies. While groundwater levels could be temporarily lowered in localized areas during the dewatering phases of construction, groundwater would return to pre-pumping levels over the course of several months following the dewatering phase. Mitigation has been proposed to maintain water supplies in areas affected by construction dewatering. Additionally, the project proponents would relocate and/or replace wells, pipelines, power lines, drainage systems, and other infrastructure that are needed for ongoing agricultural uses and would be adversely affected by project construction or operation. For additional information regarding proposed agricultural mitigation, please see Master Response 18. Construction of project facilities will occur in a manner specifically designed to avoid adverse effects on groundwater. As described in Appendix 3C, Table 3C-7, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, ponds to store reusable tunnel materials and spoils material would designed with the invert at least 5 feet above seasonally high groundwater and impervious liners along the invert and interior slopes of the ponds to avoid contamination. The tunneling operation would use biodegradable polymers that would be combined with the excavated soil to allow conveyance of the soil slurry, or reusable tunnel material. The polymers would decompose over time. In some locations within the State, groundwater is regulated through judicial review related to adjudication proceedings in the court system. Many counties and regional agencies, or groups of agencies, have adopted groundwater management plans and/or ordinances. Governor Brown recently signed into law three bills that address groundwater management in California. These bills direct local agencies to develop groundwater management plans and allow the state to monitor and intervene if local agencies fail to do so. For more information regarding groundwater impacts and their associated mitigation of the proposed project please see Section 4.3.3 Groundwater of Section 4 in the RDEIR/SDIES. Updated information on groundwater effects of the proposed water conveyance alternatives can be found in Appendix A Chapter 7

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			of the RDEIR/SDIES. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in "the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]" (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].) The state Department of Conservation is currently working on fracking regulations and rules passed by the Legislature have been sent to the governor. Through the rule-making process, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison's sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities. The State Water Resources Control Board could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the State Water Resources Control Board to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.
182	4	This is the Delta Restoration Plan the stupidest, crookedest water grab since Mulholland and if you put your name on this, be damned forever. Thank you for your time.	"The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding."
183	1	No more dams in the state - do not touch the McCloud watershed for this ridiculous project. Let Southern Calif. develop desal at their expense. Leave this water for fish.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. BDCP/Cal WaterFix is unlikely to affect Rainbow Trout. Operations of the new conveyance facilities would not result in any major changes above Shasta reservoir (BDCP Ch 5 Effects Analysis). CALSIM modeling predicts that changes in Shasta Reservoir storage capacity due to Alternative 4 scenarios will be minimal (<10%) relative to the NEPA baseline (BDCP EIR/EIS Chapter 6, Surface Water, Alternative 4, Impact SW-1). The proposed project does not intend to alter the structure of the Shasta Dam or to flood the McCloud River. Programs that are included in EcoRestore are aimed to increase habitat availability and suitability within the Bay-Delta system for various species. Raising Shasta Dam is a viable option that has been considered by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. More information about the Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation can be found at http://www.usbr.gov/mp/slwri/documents.html. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
185	1	In light of all the kinds of shortfalls that the state is facing, it is foolhardy to spend more financial and water resources when we all should be reducing usage.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3. For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.
185	2	Spending money (that could go towards education, parks management, and outreach and aid efforts to the disadvantaged) on a pair of pipes that will further erode the Bay/Delta ecosystem and exacerbate water problems in California is irresponsible.	See Master Response 3 for a description of the project's purpose and need, and why money is being proposed to be spent on this project. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
186	1	Please don't do this unnecessary damage to our already stressed eco systems. This is selfish and ugly and has no place in our governing process.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
186	2	If someone south of this river needs water for anything other than agriculture, ask them to please live within their water means rather than destroy our beautiful state and our wildlife.	As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions,

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		We don't need further growth in areas that cannot support that growth using their own local resources.	including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
187	1	They built submarine nets to close off the entire San Francisco Bay entrance during WW2. They can build nets (minuscule and cheap compared to the WW2 submarine nets) to allow the fresh water to flow southward and yet keep the Smelt from going through the Tracy Pumps. This could all be figured out and implemented for very little money by a first year freshman industrial tech class at any California State University. Quit wasting my tax money for a few rich contractors to line their pockets at the Delta's expense and my expense.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. DWR and Reclamation are required to improve fish collection efficiency at the existing south Delta salvage facilities, as part of facility improvements required by the National Marine Fisheries Service 2009 biological opinion on the SWP/CVP. For example, in 2014 Reclamation replaced the secondary louver system with a traveling screen system. These screens provide protection by guiding fish into the holding tanks while catching debris on pegs and transporting debris to a collection system at the work surface. The technology required at the proposed north Delta intakes and the existing south Delta export facilities differ fundamentally. The north Delta intakes would be located on the side of the river channel and so would be designed to comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish screening criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3). The south Delta export facilities are located on dead-end channels and require active collection and salvage of fishes. Screening the intakes at Clifton Court Forebay was analyzed during the water conveyance alternative development process and is described in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A. This alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because initial results of recent studies, including information included in the recent NMFS biological opinions, supported a phased approach that would emphasize improvements to operations of fish handling facilities and reduced predator potential within Clifton Court Forebay prior to further analysis of installation of fish screens. Nevertheless, DWR and Reclamation will continue investigating strategies to increase fish salvage efficiency, reduce pre-screen losses, and improve screening efficiencies, consistent with the 2009 biological opinion of the SWP/CVP. The positive-barrier fish screens for the proposed north Delta intakes would be designed to established protection standards for salmonids and delta smelt, and would comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			screening criteria. Appendix 3F of the PD EIR/S provides details on the development of intakes and fish screening technology, as well as the Conceptual Engineering Reports (CERs). It is proposed that monitoring and research would be conducted to inform the fish screen design, construction, and operation in order to maximize their effectiveness. Dual operations provides for flexibility that will better protect the fish based on real time data. The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.
188	1	I am a 4th generation Californian deeply distressed by the already existing environmental degradations in our beautiful state. In a time of extreme draught, the duration of which is unknowable, it seems crazy to further disrupt natural water flows in Northern California in the dramatic ways proposed by the BDCP. I do not think we have enough solid scientific knowledge to predict the outcomes. Please do not do this.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
189	1	At some point, the question needs to be answered as to when enough is enough. It's already a proven fact that the entire north state ecosystem not just the Delta, has been savagely damaged by pumping so much water south; so how is pumping more going to fix anything? If it's a matter of money (which it always is), then what would a healthy salmon fishery and beyond that ecosystem be worth to the State's revenue? States like Alaska, Washington and Oregon put much importance on management of natural resources to a huge financial benefit to all the people of the State, rather than just a selected few who will reap massive earnings from a public funded project to sell what rightfully belongs to every person who pays their taxes. This has gotten to the point of a moral decision. At some point we will cross the threshold where we can't go back and fix the damage that has been inflicted. Don't let that this project get us there and be on your shoulders for who knows how many generations to come!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species is provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The Proposed Project would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal.Wat. Code, § 85001[c]). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment eat the south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.
190	1	As a former resident of California (1958-1968) and a river runner since 1957, I oppose any project that endangers natural systems, free-flowing rivers, wildlife habitat, federal and state environmental protection laws.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The amount of water DWR can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process as described in the 2008 and 2009 BiOps (RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary ES.2.2). In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3). Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
191	1	Please do not use California's precious water supply for fracking. Fracking for oil and gas is an inherently water-intensive process. A couple of quick facts on fracking and water in California. Water usage estimates range from 2 to 10 million gallons of water for every fracked well. Each fracking well starts with some 2 million gallons of water for an initial injection. Taking an average nearly 5 million gallons of water would mean that if all the potential wells identified by the U.S. Energy Information Administration in California were to be fracked, it would require some 200 billion gallons of water.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in "the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]" (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].) The state Department of Conservation is currently working on fracking regulations and rules passed by the Legislature have been sent to the governor. Through the rule-making process, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison's sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities. The State Water Resources Control Board could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the State Water Resources Control Board to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.
192	1	It will cost more to pump this water down south then to build desalinization plants. Why help the Westlands Water District and the Kern County oil and gas fracking business? They just sell the water at a high price when water is priceless to us!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34. For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
193	1	This is simply a rerun of the disastrous environmental and financial policies of the late and unlamented Peripheral Canal of the 1970s.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act. Refer to Master Response 36 for more information on the differences between the proposed project and the Peripheral Canal. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding. The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website.
194	1	There are many ways we can meet the water demands of our state. I am strongly opposed to the BDCP. I hope money is funneled into strategies for improved water management and by encouraging water conservation by residents, farmers and businesses.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
195	1	Regardless of whether we are in a drought emergency or not, the answer is not to pump water out of the Delta and send it elsewhere. The answer is to allow development in areas that have the resources and infrastructure to support it, and to limit development in areas that do not have the resources or infrastructure to support it. No matter how many people want to live in any given area, the number that are allowed to live there must be governed by what the area can support. To allow anything else is illogical.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. For more information on potential growth effects due to project implementation please see Chapter 30 Growth Inducement and Other Indirect Effects of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A.
196	1	I am deeply disturbed by the plan to divert water from Northern California rivers to Southern California through a pair of giant cement tunnels. This plan would be a disaster to	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the river environments and all the plants and animals that depend on it.	index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding. Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
196	2	I feel that the research and planning to create these tunnels is incredibly flawed and short-sighted. It is not the answer to the water problems facing the southern portion of our state!	The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage. The Department of Water Resources released in 2013 the Conceptual Engineering Report that describes design details of the modified pipeline/tunnel option (MPTO). This document is located on the project website.
196	3	As a master gardener and environmentalist, I work hard to educate the public about the proper management of soil, water and plant species and the correct way to incorporate mindful and harmonious use of our states resources. These tunnels are not the answer, and the long-term repercussions need to be examined further. Putting that much cement into an already fragile soil/water relationship would be disastrous, causing the soil to heat up, and further water loss and temperature increases to occur around the tunnels. This is not the answer. I am writing to implore all involved to scrap this terrible plan, and look at creating a plan working with the earth, not against it!	Please see response to Comment 196-2. Effects on soil resources are discussed in Chapter 10 of the Final EIR/EIS. For discussion of effects on mineral resources, please see Chapter 26 of the Final EIR/EIS.
198	1	I find it very disheartening that up north, our reservoirs are at record lows, our rivers are at record low flows, and yet if I go down south their reservoirs are all full. Why do they need more of what water we do not have? My taxes already go to a lot of things I do not agree with, please do not make this another thing that I am paying for without my permission.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.
199	1	While I believe the aim of the BDCP at one time may have been to help revive the Delta, this plan does the opposite. The BDCP needs to investigate other alternatives, such as buying out land that does not drain well, such as those within the Westlands Water District, at fair market price.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species -- all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
199	2	The health of the Delta should not be held hostage by huge corporate agricultural interests.	The amount of water DWR can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process as described in the 2008 and 2009 BiOps (RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary ES.2.2). In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP,

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			DWR must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3).
199	3	Ultimately, the magnitude of funds being discussed for the implementation of the twin tunnels would do so much more good if they were directed at major conservation efforts. For example, all homes in California under renovation or upon sale/transfer could be required to have low-flush toilets and water-saving showerheads installed, as is required in Berkeley, CA. Such a law could save millions of acre-feet of potable drinking water alone.	The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.