

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1000	1	<p>Farm Bureau's Agriculture Alert in 2004 quoted the U.S. Geological Survey, using tree ring reconstructions, writing, "Western drought is officially worse than Dust Bowl Years." "The drought could be the worst in 500 years, with the lowest flow in the Colorado River on record. The lowest five-year average of water flow was 8.84 million acre-feet in the years 1590-1594." "From 1999 through 2003, water flow has been 7.11 million acre-feet, comparable to or more severe than the largest-known drought in 500 years." "The water report did not surprise water managers."</p> <p>Farmers and water managers have known for more than a decade that we are in a drought, yet vineyards, almond and walnut orchardists continue to plant throughout north, south, east, and west San Joaquin Valley as recently as this past winter 2014. The orchardist put an ongoing drain on water supplies as opposed to planting crops that does not require such intensive water usage.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p> <p>It is important to note that the 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 agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
1000	2	No tunnels should be built to accommodate agriculture nor oil interests.	Since 2006, the proposed project 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 preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of oil corporations or large agribusinesses. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted upon by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the final environmental documentation for both CEQA and NEPA.
1001	1	<p>It has been proven that fracking by the oil industry can pollute our underground water resources and the process also uses huge amounts of water. What is the oil industry doing to save 20 - 25 % of our water and keep it clean?</p> <p>What compensation are they giving to the communities they are ripping off?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1001	2	This project is a bad idea. In my county, we are cutting back 35% and our rates keep going up. People need to change their habits and build more catchment systems and runoff retrieval at the local levels. Give tax credits to individuals and local municipalities instead of spending billions on a project that benefits a few.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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/.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
1002	1	<p>Maybe I [will] say yes if big agribusiness and big oil paid their share in taxes and stopped hiding money off shore!</p> <p>Thank you for doing the right thing in this matter.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but the lead agencies 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.</p>
1003	1	<p>Water is a precious commodity in this time of drought.</p> <p>Do not provide water for fracking and do not spend billions to support agribusiness.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project 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), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1004	1	We cannot afford this from a monetary point of view and we cannot afford it from a life -	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
		safety point of view as the public needs the water to live. We can live without oil. We cannot live without water.	<p>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.</p> <p>Information regarding BDCP costs and funding is provided in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP. State Water Project and Central Valley Project contractors would be responsible for funding construction and operation of new water conveyance facilities, as well as the costs for mitigating the impacts associated with facility construction. If an HCP alternative is chosen, the remaining costs for implementing the conservation plan would come from a variety of public sources, including federal appropriations, state and federal grants, and the water bond. Please see Master Response 5 for more information regarding costs of implementation and funding for the proposed project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 34. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the US Bureau of Reclamation do not regulate the beneficial uses to which State Water Project or Central Valley Project (CVP) water supplies are put, nor does the proposed project make determinations regarding what constitutes a beneficial use or modify stipulations in water service contracts between the DWR and the SWP contractors, Reclamation and their contractors, or between water transfer sellers and buyers. Beneficial uses are designated by the State Water Resources Control Board.</p>
1005	1	If big agribusiness needs these after exhausting all the cost-effective solutions, they should pay the full cost.	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but the lead agencies 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.</p>
1006	1	What would help is for big agribusiness and oil and other businesses ramping up their water conservation to fit the strong push in most of our California counties. We, the people are doing our part because we live here. Isn't it time the businesses have to conserve too? Need to write more policy and laws? How about some that target businesses for water waste in a State that relies on everyone and every business to do their part for water conservation.	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
1007	1	We need to keep California's water for its people, and wildlife, and never allow our precious water to be used or affected by fracking, or to be diverted for large corporate agribusiness	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
		interests.	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project 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), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1008	1	This proposal is an environmental disaster! As a north coast resident I am fed up with water projects which fuel overdevelopment in the South and drain our northern ecosystems.	<p>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.</p> <p>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 documentation.</p>
1009	1	I thought you were the peoples' governor. You need to get on the conservation bandwagon. How much water do you think you can take from the north before that becomes an issue? So much water gets wasted by big agribusiness and by the general public. Man up and do the right thing.	<p>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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 which addresses the purpose and need for the proposed project and Master Response 6 for information on demand management.</p>
1010	1	I live in Laguna Woods and we need the water. I have heard the Colorado River is very polluted and since we have to buy in all of our water it must be mixed with Colorado water to make it drinkable. We have 2 desalination plants being built, but that is not enough for all of us. We are not big agriculture, but Orange County needs water too. We have no groundwater or aquifers. I hope the tunnels do go through, we are counting on it.	<p>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.</p> <p>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. Regarding desalination, refer to Master Response 7.</p>
1011	1	This is not rocket science, Gov. Brown ... Hello, our state, California, is in the worst drought ever! You have done good things for the educational system and other things. But apparently, you do not, will not, or cannot get it ... water shortage, water drought. No rain, no snow, no melting waters from the mountains, underground water supplies low, very	<p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		low.	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1011	2	Enough is enough ... fracking is the wrong way to go. I do believe you know that as you use to be an environmentalist at one time. Please be that again!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1012	1	When big agriculture can comply with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards and use biodegradable-friendly by-products instead of cancer causing chemicals that kill humans and bees. Not a drop of water to big agriculture.	<p>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.</p> <p>The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry.</p> <p>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 BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1013	1	Water needs to be sent to individuals, small-scale farmers and communities, not the agricultural giants who do not know about water conservation!	<p>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.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p>
1014	1	The tunnel is another example of corporate welfare, where tax money is used to subsidize, in this case, oil and agricultural interests. The projects are ultimately unsustainable and should be allowed to falter and die if they cannot provide for their futures without bailouts from taxpayers.	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but the lead agencies 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.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1015	1	<p>We do not need fracking. Are you crazy?</p> <p>If big agribusinesses needs more water, have them build and pay for desalination plants.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project 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), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1016	1	<p>Water from Northern California has already gone to Southern California. They have more of our water than is reasonable, especially considering the extensive agricultural production in the counties around the Sacramento valley. The [Highway] 99 corridor and the I-5 corridor should be fed by reservoir and desalination plus careful control of irrigation systems. Israel does both very well.</p> <p>Finally, canals to Southern California in a long-term drought do not make sense unless they are transferring desalinated water. For that, regional canals are a better option. Agriculture is essential in both Northern and Central California. Moving water out of stressed river supplies instead of making fresh water from rising oceans is not a good plan.</p> <p>Develop desalination instead! It is infrastructure and also generates jobs. Do not steal water. I do not agree that rainwater collection is sufficient (we are in a drought). We need a long term robust solution ... desalinate! It is well proven elsewhere.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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.</p>
1017	1	<p>This is unconscionable.</p> <p>Why continue to loot nature and public resources, in an ongoing series of environmental fiscally driven disasters for the benefit of profit and a few privateers.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The EIR/EIS indicates that additional water contractors may become project proponents in the future (see</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Chapter 1, Introduction). Please refer to Master Response 5.
1018	1	If this money is to be used to benefit big industry, I say no. As retirees we find our water bills are constantly getting higher - streets around us are showing the lack of watering our yards resulting in yellowing and dying front lawns. It certainly is not a good thing to drive through and see so many homes in a previously lovely neighborhood falling into disrepair because of the high costs of watering. We are all trying to conserve water to help with this problem, but for big industry to benefit in any way while we are not is just not right.	<p>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.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Rates charged to water users, such those mentioned by the commenter, by individual water agencies receiving SWP or CVP supplies are based on the independent rate-setting policies of those agencies. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect how agencies distribute water supply costs among their water customers. 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 part of the proposed action, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of large corporations.</p>
1019	1	<p>Farmers, who use 80% of water resources, should be mandated to construct water harvesting (collection) ponds (sand, clay or vinyl lined, with sun reflection methods) and proper terracing for topsoil conservation.</p> <p>The use of organic fertilizers also conserves water, due to its porous structure. They need to be informed of sustainable crops (like hemp, flax and drought tolerant crops), or alternative regions which would provide more water (for almonds, pistachios, etc.). They can also draw upon treated water from water treatment plants for tertiary applications.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural practices.</p> <p>Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. 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, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>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 BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1019	2	Shale fracturing ("fracking") is well documented to have many detrimental effects on the existing water resources, due to chemical contamination by water, soil and air--during and after their process of blasting and extraction and storage of waste. We cannot afford, financially nor environmentally, a risk to our already limited water supplies and habitats. Renewables are at hand and tax incentives should be extended for this industry. If it were not for our subsidies to oil and gas companies, they would not be able to compete in a fair market. We do not need to placate them any further with public money for private businesses!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1020	1	<p>It is up to the ordinary citizens to help clean up this earth. Not the fossil fuel industries. That also means, we have to address our addictions to those fuels, oil, gas and coal and the damage both extracting and using affects our health and the earth's health.</p> <p>It affects all.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1021	1	<p>Conservation and appropriate water use for the location and rainfall amount received should be pursued.</p> <p>We do not always need more, less people, less water needed. How about some population reduction suggestions for the masses.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed project 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 proposed project 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 the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>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 proposed project. 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, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 proposed project. 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, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p>
1022	1	<p>Please end attempts to remove vitally needed water from its normal watersheds in Northern California.</p> <p>Due to excessive exploitation, salmonids and other anadromous fish are becoming seriously in danger of extinction. Water tables fall, and streams dry, making the forested areas of California far more likely to be burnt down. Entire ecosystems are at risk due to this benighted water transport, and living becomes difficult for indigenous species, indigenous peoples, rural people, and even urban communities formed where water is normally to be found.</p> <p>Stealing water from the areas dependent upon it for thousands to millions of years is a</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Master Responses that address the commenter's issues include: 3 (Purpose and Need), 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM, Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities, Compliance with ESA), 21 (Tribal Issues), 27 (Environmental Justice), 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), 14 (Water Quality), 17 (Impacts on Smelt), and 20 (Cultural Resources Assessment). Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general biological resource areas are discussed in</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>grave mistake.</p> <p>Do not attempt to create artificially large urban human communities or grow intense water-dependent crops in areas where these cannot exist as local ecosystems, but instead, allow local climates to determine what arises.</p>	Sections 4 and 5 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Refer also to Appendix A (Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources; Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources), and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments
1023	1	<p>My ancestors were among the earliest from the East into California. They were farmers and ranchers as well as founders of Firebaugh's Ferry, helpers in saving redwood forests, and truly caring about the State.</p> <p>If you let big companies and the wealthy run the State government, it will be a disgrace to your father's memory and a tragedy for democracy.</p> <p>If government is now in control of the wealthy corporations and individuals in America, you should be the first to tell us that situation outright. And then lead the people in successful debate of that issue which is more important than all else. But continuing to exploit the State for speed, power, and more profit to the already wealthy, is wrong and not what we elected you for.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of corporations. 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. 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.</p>
1024	1	<p>What we actually need in California is a new source of fresh water, not more ways to use the water we do not have and are not getting.</p> <p>I urge you to be foresighted, and build desalination plants now, it is the only new source of fresh water for the state.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time.</p>
1025	1	<p>It is time to see leaders, governors, and senators who are acting for the betterment of everybody, not just for the wealthy.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1026	1	<p>Do not frack with scarce California water - go solar and wind!</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1027	1	<p>How is this any different than the plans that you opposed back in the 70's? If the State had started reclaiming water back then, then we would not be in a crisis.</p>	<p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please also refer to Master Response 36 regarding the difference between the project and the peripheral canal.</p>
1028	1	<p>There are other less damaging efforts to the environment that can be made. We need to find ways to live within our means and save water upstream. If we are in the midst of a major long term drought, there may not be the water to run through the tunnels!</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft 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 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, each individual resource area chapters with its associated mitigation measures, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the FEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and water conservation.</p>
1029	1	<p>Water is for everybody not for the benefit of corporation farms and the wealthy Plutocrats.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The issue raised by the commenter on large agricultural corporations is beyond the project scope. Refer to Appendix 1C and 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. The commenter is also referred to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). Additionally, the proposed project 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 since 2006 having more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts, and meeting materials have been posted online since 2010 in an unprecedented commitment to public access and government transparency (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]). See Chapter 32, Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination, EIR/EIS, for additional details regarding public participation.</p>
1030	1	<p>Profits before people. Seems like a sad sad song that keeps getting played over and over again. Please do not let campaign contributors be the "speech" that drowns out the needs</p>	<p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		of citizens who do not have millions to contribute.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
1031	1	If anything our money should be invested in clean energy, not worsening the California drought to help the oil industry.	<p>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.</p> <p>The commenter does not raise any issues related to the environmental analysis in the EIR/EIS or related documents.</p>
1032	1	It is time to expect Central Valley agriculture to implement low water use irrigation systems. No more excuses.	<p>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.</p> <p>The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural or irrigation practices.</p> <p>Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. 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, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
1033	1	The priority should be on restoring the health and quality of the Delta environment, not on building the tunnels. First, let us do what is necessary to restore the Delta to environmental health. At that point there will be more clarity on whether redirection of water flow to the south is in our collective interest.	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed project would meet the co-equal goals of the Delta Reform Act (refer to Master Response 31), which involves both improvements to the Delta ecosystem and the state's water supply reliability. The commenter is also referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. The project would stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. 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. 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.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1033	2	The only way the tunnels make economic sense is if the flow of water to the South is actually increased. At the present time, it is not clear whether the Delta can withstand those increased draw-downs.	The DEIR/EIS, RDEIR/EIS, and Final EIR/EIS provides an assessment of a wide range of impacts on resources located within the Delta as a result of construction and operation of each action alternative, including the preferred Alternative (preferred alternative). Many of the resource evaluation were dependent, on part, on the hydrologic and water quality modeling conducted for each alternative. The resources that could be affected as a result of changed hydrologic or water quality conditions within the Delta include water supply, surface water, aquatics, and recreation. The DEIR/EIS, RDEIR/EIS, and Final EIR/EIS disclose the impacts on those resources and propose mitigation to reduce the impacts.
1033	3	Once the tunnels exist, they will create their own mandate for being kept full. This puts the priorities entirely backwards. The tunnel project appears to be a way for water users to trump any claims to the environmental integrity of the Delta.	The commenter is referred to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). Future water deliveries from the federal and state water projects are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation.
1033	4	There are many measures that should be taken in the south to manage water resources better. That will maintain urban demand stable even in the face of population growth. That in turn will clarify that the beneficiaries of the increased water draw from the Delta will be agriculture and gas production. Cost recovery should be so structured that the beneficiaries largely pay the cost. This means that the tunnel project should be combined with a tax on extraction of petroleum products and natural gas.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding the alternatives development process and why alternatives that did not include the water conveyance facility were not included. Please also see Master Response 6 regarding the effectiveness of water demand management and its ability to meet the purpose and need of the proposed project. The 2013 public draft BDCP highlights the principle of "beneficiary pays" in the cost and funding chapter (Chapter 8). As described in this chapter, all costs of the construction and operation of the proposed water conveyance facility, plus all mitigation costs, will be paid by the participating state and federal water contractors. All remaining costs of BDCP have benefits that largely accrue to the residents of the state as a whole and are therefore paid for by broader state and federal funding sources. Please see Master Response 5 for further details on the adequacy of the funding strategy. Please note that the BDCP and large-scale habitat restoration is no longer included in the preferred alternative, Alternative 4A. 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.
1034	1	Respectfully, you are way off base sir. Due to unrelenting climate change we are in a severe drought, which is not likely to change in the near future. Stop giving water to any big oil business. It is time for solar and wind 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. Contrary to the commenter's assumption, the water supply and Delta hydrodynamic modeling conducted for the Draft EIR/EIS specifically considered and included potential future climate change to hydrologic and water quality variables. Refer to Master Response 19 (Climate Change and GHG); Chapter 29, Climate Change, Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A RDEIR/SDEIS; and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS (in Appendix A). As noted in Chapter 21, Energy, of the Draft EIR/EIS the project would not result in the construction of new power plants, including hydroelectric dams or solar or wind facilities. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of oil corporations.
1034	2	Do not think by pleading water for big agriculture is going to let you off the hook for supporting fracking. No special water allotments to big oil, ever. Under any circumstances. None.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project 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), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).
1035	1	<p>Resist the power of corporate money at the expense of people.</p> <p>Corporations are not people. I thought you were better than that -- do not fall to the level of a Scalia or a Roberts.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding of the project.</p>
1036	1	<p>Escalating wars and ever decreasing water supplies should be enough to stop fracking and really focus on wind and solar power. Not to speak of the health horrors of industrial farming. All of the money in the world will not do a thing if we all as a society cannot eat healthy food and drink clean water. The extreme short sightedness of this proposal is appalling.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project 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), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1037	1	<p>The Sacramento River needs to stay exactly like it is. It, too, is already stressed from dams further upstream and this long-established drought we are experiencing. Do not divert its flow with these erroneously conceived tunnels, the expense and the building of which would be disastrous to the lives of the people and animals that live in their path of construction. I do not believe the concept would work, and there are far better ways to manage the Delta water area. We do not want our precious water going to more fracking fields or big agriculture to use in the arid desert that is the western San Joaquin.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The 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 the effects on surface water quality in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins. The project'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 SWP and CVP facilities. The location of the north Delta diversion facility is less vulnerable to salinity intrusion, a potential impact of sea level rise, or levee failure, in the future. By establishing an alternative diversion point for</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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. 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. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general biological 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 done to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. 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 including: agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses such as fish protection flows. Fracking 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. (California Public Resources Code, § 3106[b].) The issue of "big agriculture" is beyond the scope of the proposed project. Refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Action 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.</p>
1038	1	<p>My question always is: Who really benefits from this proposal and who are those that will suffer most? The answer is that the Central Valley benefits and Los Angeles with a huge population suffers a great deal.</p> <p>Where is the fairness in this?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. 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. The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
1039	1	I drove on California State Route 4 a couple of days ago and in Stockton saw streets being watered, due to poorly aligned nozzles. Also, the watering was being done during the hottest part of the afternoon, when the water evaporates at its quickest. Those who want our water have to show they can be frugal with it.	<p>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.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p> <p>It is important to note that the 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 agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
1040	1	<p>Do not waste our money and do not indenture our children on water projects that do not make more water. Tunnels will be as empty as the lakes in drought years. Tunnels are not needed in wet years. What are you thinking?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1040	2	<p>The state must start metering every water user. At the least, start measuring communities that do not meter their customers. If a community more water than their share of what is available before the end of each month, cut that community off for the rest of that month. The rest of us have rights too.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and water conservation.</p> <p>Although components such as 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 proposed project. The project cannot impose obligations on third parties that are not applicants under proposed project.</p>
1040	3	<p>Do not waste our money on projects that cannot contribute water supply in drought years. If this does not make sense to you, watch me vote!</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>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.</p>
1041	1	<p>For pity sakes start acting like a Democrat and get out of the oil companies hip pockets. We are conserving water at our homes. Limiting how often we water our yards, flush the toilets, and installing water saving devices. Then we find that our government is wanting to divert a</p>	<p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		huge amount of water to special interests.	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed California WaterFix 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. Please see Master Response 34 for information on beneficial uses of water, and Master Response 38 for information on demand management.</p>
1041	2	I know of people who live in the Central Valley who are limited to how many gallons they can use per day because they are on a community well system. If and when that well fails they have no idea what they are going to do for water then. What happens to those people when the government diverts huge amounts of water to agri-business and the oil business so they can continue to destroy by fracking?	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1041	3	Please, reconsider. It is not the will of the people. We are conserving, the government needs to step up and do the same.	Appendix 1C (Demand Management Measures) of the EIR/EIS that describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. Please also see Master Response 6. Although such water demand management strategies 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. For more information on the purpose of the project, see Master Response 3.
1042	1	When you can prove to me that agribusiness and big farmers are held accountable for the water they indiscriminately waste, then I will start to consider such a drastic measure as a tunnel. While they clamor for more and more public subsidized water, the general public is told to keep cutting back. Why are we told to conserve water while big business is given a free pass?	<p>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.</p> <p>The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural practices.</p>
1043	1	<p>The issue is part of the larger project we must adopt to adapt to climate change; so much has been irrevocably destroyed, but if we move fast to hasten the transition to renewable energy resources and to plan wise changes to our agricultural use of the land, we might be able to mitigate some of the damage.</p> <p>Please, Governor Brown and other decision makers for our state, put climate at the top of the list and take leadership on this issue.</p> <p>Transition could involve many, many jobs and when the infrastructure is built (hopefully regionally controlled) we will benefit from stabilized energy prices, lesser cost from climate change and a better world, which I hope you will want as your legacy.</p> <p>Finally, the need for the tunnels is questionable.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Transition to renewable energy sources has been addressed in chapter 22 of the DEIR/EIS. All action alternatives are consistent with and would be operated according to DWR's Climate Action Plan Phase I: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (GGERP) which outlines how DWR will reduce its GHG emissions by 80% from 1990 levels by 2050. One of the major strategies of the GGERP is the rapid conversion of energy resources to operate the State Water Project from conventional sources to renewable energy sources.</p>
1044	1	Building the tunnels, or any sort of bypass around the Delta, will not result in more precipitation. There is no available water from the Sacramento River for diversion at this time. Given the limited water supplies in California, even in wetter years, the diversion of water for irrigation of lands without safe drainage facilities in the western San Joaquin Valley is wasteful and an unreasonable use of water, in my opinion. Even more so is the use	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
		of fresh water supplies for hydraulic fracturing by the oil and natural gas industry; this use of water also endangers the potable groundwater needed for domestic and agricultural use by injecting polluted water deep into the ground under high pressure to release oil and gas.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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 with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3. For more information regarding beneficial use of water please see Master Response 34.
1045	1	It is time for all of us to look to the care and conservation of our precious resources... or possibly to lose them forever. In particular, water is far too scarce, and far too important to our survival, to waste on such as fracking or unsupportable and greedy ag-business that will primarily be exported. Please be responsible with our irreplaceable environment and 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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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 with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1046	1	These tunnels will hurt small farmers greatly. Governor, please do not go forward with this ridiculous, dangerous project. We are in a killer drought. You want to save water; easy fix: save millions of gallons of water by a temporary moratorium on hydro-fractionation. You are not the guy to worry about political power players. Give big agribusiness a clear message: we embrace our small farmers, those hard-working folks we see at our local farmers' markets. Give us a democratic response and rethink our water dilemma: stop the tunnel 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 project 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 preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of corporations. The issue of corporations is beyond the scope of the proposed project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. Refer to RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation for a complete analysis of how the project will affect Delta farmland that in turn would be of concern to affected farmers. An analysis of economic impacts, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are evaluated in the Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report as online at: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx . Please see Master Response 34 for information on beneficial use of water.
1047	1	Fossil fuel extraction, especially by fracking techniques, must stop. Water diversion projects must stop. We need to scale back our water and energy use; we	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
		must support agricultural practices that are appropriate and sustainable. The tunnel proposal is the antithesis of all of these goals.	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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 with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding beneficial use of water please see Master Response 34.</p>
1048	1	<p>This is not conservation. This is environmental destruction and corporate thievery. Future Californians will forget all the good you have done, and remember you for selling us out to big business. You are too smart to go along with their false promises of jobs and recovery.</p> <p>We can do better. People are still watering lawns in the desert, and factories are dumping waste water into the waterways, and we still have millions of rooftops without solar or wind turbines or even greenery.</p> <p>Think about real solutions and then think harder to promote and implement them!</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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. How land use and population trends are directed are topics beyond the scope of this project. The Lead Agencies do not have land use/zoning authority. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Water Use in Southern California). 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 project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts.</p>
1049	1	Stop corporate greed and take over of your rights. You want my vote, then act like it!	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1050	1	I am not totally opposed to water for agriculture use, depending on many factors, but I am completely and totally opposed to water being moved like this for fracking. There is no way that taxpayers should pay for that or that it should be allowed no matter who is paying for it.	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1051	1	I am concerned that the cost of this project will not be shared equitably by the beneficiaries of the project. Those that will receive the water should pay the cost. Those promoting the project claim it is environmentally sound. Shipping enormous amounts of water away from the Delta sounds more like a huge environmental risk, not a benefit.	<p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Even if this project can be shown to be environmentally sound, given the fragile state of the economy, it seems to me that this is not a good time to embark on such expensive projects.	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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 that is more protective of fish than the current system. 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.</p> <p>Information regarding BDCP costs and funding is provided in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP. State Water Project and Central Valley Project contractors would be responsible for funding construction and operation of new water conveyance facilities, as well as the costs for mitigating the impacts associated with facility construction. If an HCP alternative is chosen, the remaining costs for implementing the conservation plan would come from a variety of public sources, including federal appropriations, state and federal grants, and the water bond. Please see Master Response 5 for more information regarding costs of implementation and funding for proposed project.</p>
1051	2	I understand that similar projects have provided little or no benefit to the general public.	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.
1052	1	An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale corporate agriculture welfare queens who depend on taxpayer financed subsidies to export high value (to them) nut crops to China. They are taking California's limited water and basically shipping it overseas for self enrichment. Allowing this to go forward is tantamount to cutting ones own throat, period. Stop the insanity, please!	<p>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.</p> <p>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 that is more protective of fish than the current system. 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.</p> <p>Information regarding costs and funding is provided in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP. State Water Project and Central Valley Project contractors would be responsible for funding construction and operation of new water conveyance facilities, as well as the costs for mitigating the impacts associated with facility construction. If an HCP alternative is chosen, the remaining costs for implementing the conservation plan would come from a variety of public sources, including federal appropriations, state and federal grants, and the water bond. Please see Master Response 5 for more information regarding costs of implementation and funding for the proposed project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 34 regarding use of water associated with the proposed project facilities. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the US Bureau of Reclamation do not regulate the beneficial uses to which State Water Project or Central Valley Project (CVP) water supplies are put, nor does the proposed project make determinations regarding what constitutes a beneficial use or modify stipulations in water service contracts between the DWR and the SWP contractors, Reclamation and their contractors, or between water transfer sellers and buyers. Beneficial uses are designated by the State Water Resources Control Board.</p>
1053	1	As a small farmer, environmental engineer, past city planner and concerned citizen of the this state, I know how clean water is quickly becoming the next oil, the next resource that	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
		will determine where we live, what we eat, and who is going to make money from it.	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS documentation were raised.</p>
1054	1	This project has the potential to be devastating to farming and wild life in the Delta. Find different solutions, as soon as possible.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 4 for information on project alternatives considered.</p>
1055	1	<p>As a person of faith and a grandmother, I strongly oppose this project.</p> <p>We are called to be husbands of creation, so we should support what benefits the many, not the few.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
1056	1	<p>Obviously, cost is not a consideration because it is the consumer and taxpayers who will pay for it, not the primary benefactors.</p> <p>It is very obvious that corporate interests control our state. But in drought-stricken California, this is tantamount to complete disregard for the public welfare. At least pretend to care about people by stopping this expensive project that will only be beneficial to only the oil and agriculture corporate interests. It is a shame it has gotten this far to date. Cut it out!</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but the lead agencies 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>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. 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.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
1057	1	Please stop the incorporation of more government. This is the hijacking of taxpayers taxes. Please represent the people who elected you.	<p>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.</p> <p>The cost of the construction and operation of the new water facilities, as well as for mitigation necessary to address impacts to terrestrial and aquatic species associated with construction and operation, will be paid by participating state and federal water contractors.</p>
1058	1	<p>I do not care how many voters they have in the southland! How about a more sensible conservation plan where the pain is felt equally across the citizenry.</p> <p>Unlimited water in Sacramento? Cotton subsidies that are excessive for a surplus crop that does not put healthy food on anyone's plate. We have been down this road. I like and generally admire the Governor, but how can this possibly fly alongside his desire for high-speed rail? We need to keep in mind that infrastructure upgrades are crucial for our state's future, but these projects must be prioritized for greatest impact on base needs of the majority.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed California WaterFix 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. Please see Master Response 34 for more information on beneficial use of water.</p>
1059	1	I am opposed to diverting one drop of water from the Delta. I am opposed to diverting water from north California in order to give the water to frackers and giant agro. I am sick and tired of being required to support measures that help corporations but harm me.	<p>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.</p> <p>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 with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project 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), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1060	1	Whoring for big agribusiness and big oil is a crime against Californians. Stop taking dirty money.	<p>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.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding of the project.</p>
1061	1	Since the inception of the Central Valley Project I have watched the Delta decline, and this new segment will accelerate it. Too much water is removed from the Delta now and making it easier to remove more in the future is not going to help no matter how you try to spin it off as helping out the estuary. The plan to set aside 100,000 acres for wildlife habitat is simply a ruse to get the flow that keeps out saltwater in that end of the Delta and if nobody is farming this ground, nobody is complaining. Sure, you say that science will drive the decisions on how much water to divert, but the same science is available now and is ignored. It is fact that no more than 3 million acre-feet. Of water should be removed on a normal rainfall year but this year over 6.5 million acre-feet. Have been shipped south. If completed this project will only make this easier.	The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only 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. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.
1061	2	I believe the process for promoting this project is totally corrupt. I am incensed that a supposedly public project is being advertised using taxpayer funds. The Dept. of Water Resources has been turned into a talking head for the water groups promoting this project which is a perfect case of the fox designing the henhouse. Your estimate of project cost is ridiculously low to sell the project to the public, and inconclusive of how much taxpayers have to pay for the wildlife mitigation cost, which in fact should be paid by the benefactors of this, not the public. This project only benefits a small public segment; it is designed to benefit large corporate farming interests and water brokers. So I will do everything in my power to stop this example of corrupt California politics that benefits a special interest while throwing the general public under the bus.	Please see Master Response 5 regarding the estimated cost and to see the funding strategy for mitigation measures related to impacts to the covered species.
1062	1	It is time to focus on sustainable water development in California -- increasing capture and storage capacity, reducing runoff and waste, and implementing more robust conservation measures. Building tunnels to ship massive quantities of water that we do not have does not make sense.	<p>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.</p> <p>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 proposed project. 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, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the FEIR/EIS.</p>
1063	1	Stop the water waste of fracking and then let us talk. Agribusiness is also a big drain on waning water supplies. No more wasting please.	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
			<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1064	1	<p>We are in the worst drought in centuries. Northern California cannot afford to lose its water to Southern California big agriculture and oil industry. This is our state, our water, our wildlife that depends upon water to live.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The BDCP process has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of large corporations (i.e., agribusinesses and oil industry). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1065	1	<p>Consider the environmental consequences of diverting massive amounts of water like this. Are we not killing our planet hard enough already?</p> <p>We should instead be capturing our rain water that just flows out to sea in Los Angeles storm drains; it should instead percolate back down into the water table.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p>
1066	1	<p>There are viable alternatives to meeting the water needs of our state.</p> <p>Please do not succumb to pressure or ill-advised logic leading to the approval of tunnels. Environmental coalitions of many stripes are ready to help plan a successful alternative to tunnels.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected.</p> <p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS.</p>
1067	1	<p>We in California do not want the peripheral canal whether above ground or in a tunnel. We do not want to ship more water to greedy misusers of the state's water to grow cash crops that use too much water and to frack for oil -- which is damaging to ground water.</p> <p>No tunnel shipping water south.</p> <p>Californians know water is for fighting. We will fight.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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. The project 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), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).
1068	1	<p>With the shortage of water, we need to stop wasteful use of water.</p> <p>There are other ways to get our energy needs met. Big agriculture needs to find other ways to make use of the water they have, and not be so wasteful with it. We need to pause and really assess the possibilities not, plunge into this.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed project is not the sole project in California tasked with solving California's water supply future. The project 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 proposed project 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 the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>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. 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, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p>
1069	1	I object to the name of the plan. Since when does water removal help conserve the flora and fauna of the region? If large-scale agricultural enterprises and the oil industry need water, let them invest in Pacific Ocean water de-salinization (and let them fund it).	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
1070	1	Farms need to adapt to changing climate and grow products that use less water.	<p>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.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. 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, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
1070	2	I resent sending water to communities in Southern California that do not conserve water. We in Northern California have been conserving water for many years while in LA people are watering lush gardens and maintaining swimming pools. Water conservation should be based on gallons per household not just a small reduction from previous overuse.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Over the last two decades, southern California has instituted demand management measures that have significantly reduced per capita water use. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and water conservation. For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.
1071	1	What, by the way, happened to the desalination plants? I know they were built and functioning at one time. Why are we not using 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. See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time.
1072	1	The Sacramento Delta is already in danger of salt-water intrusion due to overuse of water and diversion to other areas. It is sheer insanity to risk the most productive, fertile farmland in the state by draining more water 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 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>
1073	1	Sacramento has already shipped a huge amount of Northern California water to the Central Valley and Southern California. Here in Northern California, we are suffering from lack of water and farmers in the Central Valley are farming where there is no water and farms should never have been built. This is desert and the rest of us should not be expected to subsidize their growth. So many farms have been added, that the ones who were there before the aqueduct do not have enough water for their crops. This has to stop. Add this to the current fracking craze and a good portion of California will end up with no water or poisoned water.	<p>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.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p> <p>It is important to note that the 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 agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p> <p>The EIR/EIS indicates that additional water contractors may become project proponents in the future (see Chapter 1, Introduction). Please refer to Master Response 5.</p>
1073	2	The Nature Conservancy and others have made improvements to the Sacramento River and we need this river. To ship its water south is wrong!	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. The commenter is referred to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Water Use in Southern

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			California).
1073	3	The citizens of California do not want you to subsidize more areas and/or the greedy oil companies while we pay for it. You have done a decent job of balancing our budget. Let us put some money back into education so we can be better prepared for our future, not into more Central Valley (AKA desert) areas and the oil companies.	<p>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 that is more protective of fish than the current system.</p> <p>State Water Project and Central Valley Project contractors would be responsible for funding construction and operation of new water conveyance facilities, as well as the costs for mitigating the impacts associated with facility construction. See Master Response 5 for more information regarding costs of implementation and funding for the proposed project. .</p> <p>Please see Master Response 34 regarding use of water associated with project facilities. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the US Bureau of Reclamation do not regulate the beneficial uses to which State Water Project or Central Valley Project (CVP) water supplies are put, nor does the proposed project make determinations regarding what constitutes a beneficial use or modify stipulations in water service contracts between the DWR and the SWP contractors, Reclamation and their contractors, or between water transfer sellers and buyers. Beneficial uses are designated by the State Water Resources Control Board.</p>
1074	1	<p>We need to end all of the giveaways, tax loopholes and special favors to big oil, big agribusiness, big pharmaceuticals, and all monopolized corporations and conglomerates and the rich in general. The money that would generate could be used for many things like education and renewable energy.</p> <p>The time is now to seize history's moment and do whatever we can to turn our climate, economy and future around so that life as we know it will still be a reality for future generations. If we do not act now we are just as responsible as the big business forces that threaten our Nation and indeed the Earth.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The issue raised by the commenter on "giveaways, tax loopholes and special favors to... and conglomerates and rich" is beyond the project scope. Also, rates charged to water users by individual water agencies receiving SWP or CVP supplies are based on the independent rate-setting policies of those agencies. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect how agencies distribute water supply costs among their water customers. 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 part of the proposed action, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. The commenter is also referred to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). The BDCP, as well as the California WaterFix Project, is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the proposed project seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. 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. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of large corporations.</p>
1075	1	We live in a semi-desert state but continue to support growing crops that are water intensive. I realize this is a complex matter but we should end the growing of cotton and alfalfa in this state and help farmers find other crops. Also, almonds and other nuts	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
		require water year-round. They bring the state, and especially agribusiness, millions of dollars but are clearly not sustainable in California.	<p>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.</p> <p>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 BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1076	1	Diversion projects are environmentally disastrous, on top of the economic burdens. Corporate agriculture does not pay a fair price for the water and they are wasteful with what they get. I drive through this area and see them spraying water into the air on hot summer afternoons, when evaporation and wind diversion are at their peaks. If corporate farmers want more water, let them pay a fair price for what they now get and learn to use their current supply more judiciously.	<p>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.</p> <p>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 BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p> <p>Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. 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, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
1077	1	This is outrageous! What are you thinking? Protect our water for people, salmon and family farms, not big agriculture and especially not oil/gas companies.	<p>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.</p> <p>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. Regulating large agribusinesses and oil/gas companies is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1078	1	What has happened to you, Governor Brown? Yes, fracking is a good thing. And now tunnels diverting precious water. Wake up! Big business will be (soon) of the past. What side will you be on?	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed California WaterFix 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 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.</p>
1079	1	Since the profits go elsewhere, the reapers of the profits should shoulder all the costs 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		endanger none of the rest of the population!	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding of the project.</p>
1080	1	Stop the tunnels. The water should not be used for water-wasteful agriculture and even worse for the oil industry. Our citizens need water, our nature, and our fishing industry. Diverting unlimited water to these water-intensive is bad for California and bad for the planet.	<p>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.</p> <p>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. Regulating large agribusinesses and oil companies is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). The project would stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. 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. 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.</p>
1081	1	There was an article in the Times a few days ago re: shipping California alfalfa to China. Alfalfa needs huge amounts of water. Are you going to subsidize corporate alfalfa growers with our water so they can continue to make profits off the public's resource?	<p>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.</p> <p>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 BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1082	1	Water for fracking in a drought or really at any time is wrong. The oil industry only pollutes! Agriculture on this scale that is not even to feed people here in California but for export is also wrong. Taxpayers should not pay for their profits.	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1083	1	People's dependence on their lawns bothers me. Why not use non-thirsty native plants instead?	<p>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.</p> <p>The commenter raises issues related to water conservation and demand management. For additional</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			information about landscape replacement, please refer to Appendix 1C (Demand Management Measures) of the BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. In particular, on page 1C.4-42, it is noted that DWR has provided financial assistance to various public agencies to encourage residential customers to replace their lawns with more water-efficient plants.
1084	1	All for the tunnel project.	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1085	1	<p>I recall the disaster of selenium contamination at Kesterson Bay Refuge due to the inappropriate introduction of agriculture to the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. It was a boondoggle then and it is a boondoggle now. Only more so given that climate change will reduce overall rainfall.</p> <p>The tunnels are a bad idea. Conservation and appropriate sustainable agriculture are the right way forward.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed project 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For more information regarding selenium please see Chapter 8 of the FEIR/EIS and Master Response 14.</p>
1086	1	<p>It is time to stop spending unnecessary money on stupid schemes to make the rich richer. We have many struggling families now in CA due to the high taxes on everything, the cost of utilities, food, etc. It is time to get rid of Governor Brown and his corrupt buddies and get some people in office who are for the people not for corrupt politicians.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1087	1	<p>I cannot believe it is even a consideration to ruin the North State to send water to the South. Let them put a lid on their building, farming crops not suitable for arid climates and fracking.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1088	1	Fracking should not be happening. Growing products for export and asking the taxpayers to fund a water project for it is a slap in the face.	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports.</p>
1089	1	Ground water recharge is the most vital link in preparing for the future, move on this issue now!	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage – surface and groundwater--either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>
1090	1	Millions of gallons are wasted as not only home owners but cities water, water, water and it goes down the drain. Stop the overwatering, do not destroy the Delta please.	<p>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.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances). The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The comments do not raise any environmental issue related to the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS or the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS. Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, 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.</p>
1091	1	What the [expletive deleted] is wrong with you? Citizens are being told to conserve water. Water bills are going up for citizens. You are just giving huge amounts of water to agriculture and to the most profitable industry in the history of the earth - the oil industry? Are you insane? You obviously do not want to keep your job. When word of this gets around, your number is up!	<p>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.</p> <p>The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of oil corporations or large agribusiness. 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. 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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 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.
1092	1	We can put together many small savings to help get us through this drought. First of all stop using potable water for any kind of well stimulation or fracking. Make sure all farm land is being irrigated in the most efficient manner possible. Have 25% of farm land idle this year. Have urban dwellers cut their use by 15%. We will make it.	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1092	2	Spend the money on creating desalination plants up and down the coast for cities to use instead of stealing water from conservation efforts.	<p>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.</p> <p>See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time.</p>
1093	1	<p>Governor Brown Jr.,</p> <p>Enough abuse of power! Enough robbing citizens of what they need to get by.</p> <p>You think our gardens, our pets, our families, including California's wildlife and ecosystems do not need much water, but these rich corporations need it more? How does depleting more of what little fiscal, social, and biological needs, benefit US citizens in California by giving these soulless and heartless corporations the lion's share of water, for fracking, which has increased the incidents of earthquakes to an already geologically unstable state? Even states whose politicians have agreed to fracking that previously did not experience earthquakes are getting them now. Go to USGS if you do not want to believe me! I am tired and fed up with spineless politicians who can be bought and sold by major corporations and the uber-wealthy at the expense and detriment of the citizens, the human being who hired you to represent them, and their rights.</p> <p>If you are not for the rights of individual men, women, children and infants in California, then I do not care about your political authority, and clearly you are not the same person that was elected Governor from the 1970's to 1980's!</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of corporations. The proposed California WaterFix 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 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.</p>
1094	1	Protect our water supply further by banning fracking, which injects nasty chemicals into our water for the sake of oil company profits. A clean water supply for 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>is much more important than helping oil corporations make even bigger profits than they already are. Is 175% and billions in profits not enough for them?</p> <p>What will we drink when all of our water is polluted by them?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1095	1	<p>The oil/gas industry frackers use mega gallons of water mixed with undeclared chemicals in order to free gas from deep in the earth; we have no idea what the fate of the subterranean toxic waste will be, not to mention the earthquake potential in fracturing further our already highly fractured state.</p> <p>None of this makes any sense.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1096	1	<p>I live in a community where we were supposed to be getting recycled water for the landscaping. There are separate meters for landscape water. The last time I inquired, about a year ago, I was told there was no recycled water in use yet. The meters were installed 10 years ago! The water district has very recently started offering incentives for eliminating turf (grass) and replacing it with drought tolerant plants. I have never had grass, but my neighborhood keeps the gardeners busy mowing very green grass. To our credit, we do water at night.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1097	1	<p>Give the water to the smaller farmers and get rid of big agribusiness.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities and Master Response 26 for additional discussion regarding exports and water rights.</p>
1098	1	<p>[An entire river] should especially not be sent to be used for fracking, which pollutes our ground water, and creates other environmental problems.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project 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), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1099	1	<p>Please stop the carnage to this earth, its wildlife and our ability to have enough water to grow the crops we want to grow in California.</p> <p>Redirecting the water will have detrimental effects to all, especially the wildlife. We need to</p>	<p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>stop all this nonsense, and protect our lands and its inhabitants. There are far too many species of wildlife going extinct already. What is this saying about our decisions as humans, that we prefer letting corporate bullies in the oil industry have their way, for money, rather than protecting our rights, the earth and all wildlife?</p>	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, 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 34 for information on beneficial use of water.</p>