

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1300	1	<p>This will be devastating to the ecosystem of The Bay Area, the most important estuary on the Pacific Americas' coast.</p> <p>I personally was in a conversation with a man who bragged about his cousin's large rice farm in Northern California. Rice is a monsoon crop. This is an example of the unconscionable water waste that needs to be addressed before destroying natural ecosystems.</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>
1301	1	<p>Why the double standard in a time of drought? Consumers, you must cut back by -----%. Frackers, you can have all the water you want. Drop 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>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 to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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>
1302	1	<p>With the current drought, we cannot afford to pollute our freshwater with fracking. Nor can we afford to waste drinkable water to force oil and gas out of the ground, especially not in the amounts required.</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. 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 to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1303	1	<p>How does this project ensure that my family is guaranteed a sufficient water supply if the current drought conditions continue? We need a plan that protects the resources that we have and a plan to be able to generate water from the sea. Let us fund that project instead of one that makes corporations money!</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>Please refer to Master Response 5.</p>
1304	1	Not one drop of our precious water for fracking!	<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>
1305	1	<p>It appears this is not a good idea, especially considering the drought problem in California.</p> <p>And what if a large earthquake occurs?</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>With respect to the drought problem, the proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Flow criteria would be applied month by month and according to water year type. More information on the ranges of water project diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in BDCP, Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy. 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. With regards to earthquakes, Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the geology and seismicity of the study area. From a review of the last 20 years of precast tunnel lining seismic performance histories, it can be concluded that little or no damage to precast tunnel lining was observed for major earthquakes around the world. It is anticipated that the Delta tunnels can be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. Impact GEO- 1 and GEO-7 discusses the possibility of loss or damage resulting from strong seismic activity during construction and operation of water conveyance features. Overall, the proposed facilities would be designed and managed during and after construction to meet the safety and collapse-prevention requirements of the relevant state codes and standards listed in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, of the RDEIR/SDEIS for the anticipated seismic loads. For specifics regarding tunnel design, see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report. Additionally, refer to Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the Draft EIR/EIS for discussion of potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action Alternative scenario and to Master Response 16 (Seismic Activity).</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1306	1	<p>Please respect the salmon fishery and the other wildlife in the Delta.</p> <p>Do not send more water to the big agricultural corporations in the Valley.</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. 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 agribusinesses. The issue of corporations is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. Resource areas are addressed in both the Draft EIR/EIS and in the RDEIR/SDEIS (see Appendix A), including but not limited to surface water (Chapter 6), fish and aquatic resources (Chapter 11), and terrestrial biological resources (Chapter 12). The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted on by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the CEQA and NEPA processes.</p>
1307	1	<p>Has the use of grey water for landscaping been sufficiently considered? During our droughts in Marin County we very effectively watered our gardens with washing machine and shower water. Please consider this alternative.</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 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and water conservation.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>
1308	1	<p>The State of California ought to use antitrust laws to break up large, water-wasting farms for the benefit of the natural world and for small farms. California agricultural society warned us in the 1890s that too few farms and those too large endanger society and democracy. Also, at a time of drought, it is irresponsible to grow water-demanding crops like alfalfa for export.</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/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>
1308	2	<p>I urge you to reject the tunnels.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1309	1	<p>Governor Brown, with one hand you say we need water, and with the other you support hydraulic fracturing, which is a major waste of water for a questionable technology.</p> <p>As long as we have boondoggles such as the Westlands Water District, and virtually no</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
		restrictions on pumping groundwater, I have no trust in state water policy and feel like most of it is bait-and-switch with corporations getting the benefits and the taxpayers and ratepayers footing the bill.	to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. 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. Please see Master Response 34 for information on beneficial use of water and Master Response 5 for information on funding of the proposed project.
1310	1	No precious water to fracking!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1311	1	Stop the oil pipeline in the Midwest! Use those pipeline segments to build a water distribution from excess water areas to drought stricken California. Make the Koch brothers pay for it!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1312	1	Ban fracking to save water.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1313	1	Governor Brown, We Oppose the BDCP! Our communities urgently request your consideration and action to reject and stop the tunnels. Our hard worked for taxpayer dollars must reflect the most benefit for the larger greater good. These horrendously costly tunnels are not the people's priority. Stand with the people who voted for you, your constituents, and stop the tunnels and act to provide a better life for the public, the families and community members who voted for and depend on you! Make the better choice and stand up for and with us!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Please see Master Response 5 for information on costs of the proposed project and Master Response 5 for information on funding of the proposed project.
1314	1	How about letting them build the tunnels and set up a fee structure so that the cities and counties through which they build can tax or otherwise benefit from the use of their property?	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. Construction and long-term operations of the conveyance facilities could result in the removal of a portion

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			of the property tax base. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act commits entities receiving water from the state and federal water projects to provide mitigation or lost property tax and assessment revenue associated with land needed for the construction of new conveyance facilities. Losses may be offset in part by an anticipated increase in sales tax revenue resulting from increased income and employment in the region.
1315	1	This is shocking! To send fresh water to fracking drills is insane. How dare you, Governor Brown?! I am usually a fan of yours and I usually do not get angry, but this makes me very angry!	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 to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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).
1316	1	There should be a statewide moratorium on fracking, not an expensive ploy to accommodate this profanity in earthquake territory! We should not play fast and loose with public safety!	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.
1317	1	We should wait for this project because of water shortage. As of right now we are pulling groundwater which will cause more earthquakes; it was the federal government that forced mining corporations to fill the mining caverns with water to support the sides and top of the tunnel to prevent cave-ins and earthquakes.	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 SWP and CVP water deliveries in the Central Valley change as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative with each alternatives, as described in Chapter 7, Groundwater. For example, SWP and CVP water deliveries into the San Joaquin Valley would be greater under Alternative 4H1 as compared to the No Action Alternative (see Figure 7-28); and groundwater elevations would rise under Alternative 4H1. However, water deliveries would decline under Alternative 4H4; and groundwater elevations would decline as compared to the No Action Alternative conditions (see Figure 7-29).
1317	2	Where are you going to get water to send to these sites? The California aqueduct was proposed to send water to the farmers, not to be sold to Los Angeles for a higher price. We are going to drain the rivers and lakes which have effect on the nature of things. Do not send water to San Francisco Bay that dilutes their polluted water; stop it at the source [and enact] stronger pollution laws to the offenders.	The proposed project would not affect upstream water rights or Table A amounts; instead, it is designed to be a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. 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. Refer to Master Response 26 for possible effects to northern California. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative (see Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS). RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 6 (Surface Water) and Chapter 8 (Water Quality) describes waters and related quality of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River basins, including the Delta and Suisun Marsh, and San

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Francisco Bay directly or indirectly affected by SWP and CVP operations and environmental commitments identified in the action alternatives. Where impacts are found to be significant, mitigation and/or environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The enactment of stronger pollution laws is beyond the scope of this project and also falls within the jurisdiction of other state and federal regulatory agencies.</p>
1318	1	<p>It seems to me that a few powerful agricultural interests and oil companies on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley are demanding more water for themselves on the backs of Californians. Oil companies want more water for fracking, which contaminates fresh water with toxic chemicals. Big agribusiness wants to continue growing water-intensive crops like pistachios and almonds in the desert, mostly to export. These companies support the tunnels as long as they are guaranteed massive amounts of water. Who pays for this? We, the taxpayers. We also pay in increased pollution from these industries, we pay by having an ever more precious potable water supply poisoned by these industries.</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>Regulatory oversight of agribusinesses and oil corporations is outside the scope of the project. Also, the Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authority or have the mandate to modify local zoning. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. For the project's agricultural impacts and proposed mitigation, refer to Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS and of the RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Agricultural Resources) and Master Response 18. With respect to fracking by the oil industry, State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking presumably would 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].) An analysis of economic impacts of the project, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are evaluated and described in the BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx.</p> <p>For more information on funding and costs, see BDCP Chapter 8, cost-benefit analysis on the project website, and Master Response 5.</p>
1319	1	<p>We especially do not want any of our precious water being used in fracking, a dangerous plan if enacted.</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>
1320	1	<p>No tunnels! Build more dams! Increase storage capacity on existing dams!</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>
1321	1	<p>The farmers and frackers et al will just have to adapt to their present water supply. There is a limit to what California can provide to the more arid parts of the state. With the present drought and ongoing climate change to greater water scarcity, the limit has been reached. Change crops, quit fracking. Move to Northern California, the Sacramento Valley. We cannot</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
		play water Santa Claus anymore.	<p>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 "farmers and frackers." In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority over large corporations such as agribusinesses and the oil/gas industry. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, the California WaterFix 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. The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness [drought], increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the State, with or without the project. The State is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the BDCP alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change. More information on ways in which the project proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, Draft EIR/EIS and for the new sub-alternatives in Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Additionally, refer to Master Response 19 (Climate Change and GHG).</p>
1322	1	<p>Come on, Governor Brown. Save our water and our money, tell the big oil people and agribusiness to shut up and sit down. This is our state and our water and you sir are sworn to protect it -- now do your job and say no to these people who will destroy our state, our water supply and our lives for a buck. If you do not get on the stick and save our environment, I will have to look elsewhere for competent leadership.</p> <p>Listen up. No tunnel and no more water for big biz!</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>Regulatory oversight of agribusinesses and oil corporations is outside the scope of the proposed project. 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>
1323	1	<p>Instead, we should be taking more steps towards sustainable agriculture and farming, and energy projects such as solar and wind to avoid damaging our already damaged planet.</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 lead agencies do not have any authority to such actions on a statewide basis.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>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>
1324	1	<p>I personally know ranchers in Butte County that have had to decrease the number of their animals due to lack of water for the grasses that have been providing enough food for their animals. I have heard of Butte County residents turning on their tap, and nothing comes out.</p> <p>We cannot create a desert in Northern California because growers in the Central Valley are growing nut trees that require water all through the year. They see big profits with their shipments to other countries, at the expense of farmers and ranchers in Northern California.</p> <p>Tunnels of the magnitude you are planning are a very dangerous idea.</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/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>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>
1325	1	<p>Leave our northern California water alone! We do not need the Westlands! Our water is used by big agriculture, and the profits go to corporate fat cats who live out of state, mostly (I know there is one lady in San Francisco who rakes in big bucks from the Central Valley).</p> <p>We need to stop growing items that grow better in other areas, e.g., cotton. Leave that to the southern states. The Central Valley had a big lake until it was destroyed in the 19th century. We have far too many people in California. San Francisco Bay and the Delta need continuing influxes of fresh water for their particular fauna (and flora). As much as I love almonds and pistachios, the Central Valley is not an appropriate place for them. They also grow in the Sacramento Valley, so leave them there. Again, rice grows here in Northern California, and that may be appropriate (it also may not). It certainly does not belong in drier areas.</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’s opinion regarding California water use is acknowledged. 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>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>
1325	2	<p>Climate change is here. What we need to do in California is cut down on the number of people we have, which in turn will cut down on water use. Northern California water in no way should go to the Central Valley or to LA. The Central Valley has mountains nearby, and it should make use of the water from those mountains. What water it gets from them should be what it can use.</p> <p>Southern California is the same thing. In fact, it should become its own state.</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 comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</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 was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Leave our water alone! No tunnels!	<p>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 purpose and need, beneficial use of water, and Southern CA water supply please see Master Response 3, 34, and 35, respectively.</p>
1326	1	It is not an intelligent decision in a water scarce state. Unless of course, you are taking money under the table.	<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>
1327	1	Most offensive is polluting what precious water we have with toxic fracking chemicals rendering millions to billions of gallons useless and harmful.	<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>
1328	1	<p>Back in 1982 it was called the Peripheral Canal. It failed because it is sure to destroy the estuary waters of the Bay as they meet the river waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin.</p> <p>Our current drought should teach us an important lesson. We need to stop wasting water and curtail its use by big agriculture and big oil. We need to replenish and recover more groundwater. We need to look at cost effective desalination and recycling of wastewater. We need to capture more rainwater. We need to put an end to the water guzzling ornamental gardens in Southern California. We need to live within the means of our water supplies without resorting to gigantic boondoggle projects. We need to face reality without throwing billions of dollars at the twin 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>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 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 and Master Response 6 regarding demand management.</p> <p>For more information regarding the differences between the proposed project and the peripheral canals please see Master Response 36.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
1329	1	Water for health and not for wealth. Please listen to the good of the public's need for powerful figures like yourself to respect the money we work so hard for; stand up for our rights and protect our drinking water, and reward the citizens, not the big agriculture/big	<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>business oil companies. It is common sense--they may be hurting in the budget, but so are we, and we care about simple things that have to come first in life--health and safety of our state, our people and our society and our world. Please take a stand in our honor, as you were chosen to speak for the people, not honor only the rich and corporate companies.</p>	<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>Regulatory oversight of agribusinesses and oil corporations is outside the scope of the proposed project. Also, the Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authority or have the mandate to modify local zoning. For the project's agricultural impacts and proposed mitigation, please refer to Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS and of the RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Agricultural Resources) and Master Response 18. With respect to fracking by the oil industry, State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking presumably would 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].) Finally, 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 on by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the final environmental documentation for both CEQA and NEPA.</p>
1330	1	<p>We need a moratorium on hydraulic fracking not more water sent to them so they can make it toxic and unusable for humans or wildlife. Please protect our water resources. This diversion of Sacramento River water through tunnels is a terrible idea.</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. 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 to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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>
1331	1	<p>It is a mistake to confuse a few big donors with the general public.</p> <p>Most of the water would serve to further abuse the environment from the siphoning off of fresh water that enters the Bay, to the terrible waste and abuse of water to frack large parts of the state, to the subsidy of industrial agriculture that poisons the ground water and destroys bees through widespread use of RoundUp and other toxins. There is nothing sustainable about any of 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 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 "a few big donors." In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority over large corporations such as agribusinesses and the oil/gas industry. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, the California WaterFix 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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1332	1	We cannot afford to pollute our water with fracking.	<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>
1332	2	Agriculture must get much better at conserving water, and using methods such as drip irrigation. It makes no sense to give big oil and agriculture big water without making demands to improve processes.	<p>The BDCP/CWF is not the sole project in California tasked with solving California's water supply future. The BDCP/CWF is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The BDCP/CWF is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and 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 (e.g. water conservation) have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the BDCP/CWF.</p>
1333	1	Agriculture and biz should work to fit in with nature and preserve it for many generations to come -- not exploit it for short-term selfish monetary goals.	<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 or agribusinesses. The issue of large corporations and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. 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.</p>
1334	1	Let almonds and pistachios be grown elsewhere, we are a semiarid desert. Those crops were fine when we had an abundance of water, but that was millions of people ago, thousands of home developments ago, thousands of malls, mini malls and strip malls ago, and before climate change started rearing its ugly head.	<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/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>
1334	2	We, the taxpayers do not want our money spent propping up fracking either as it has been shown to be carcinogenic to water tables, and thanks to Cheney, fracking got rammed through with no oversight from the Clean Water Act. No, no, no, to the proposed tunnel	<p>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. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		projects.	\$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project. 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).
1335	1	The preamble to the Constitution does not state "We the corporations". The petroleum, and fossil fuels industry generally, have had far too much influence on policy to the detriment of the citizenry, the people, and the environment. Trashing the environment for export products should be criminal.	<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>
1336	1	We absolutely must move to small organic farms and personal home gardens if we are to survive for many more years! We thus must dismantle big agriculture with their poisonous practices and total disregard for human health and the environment.	<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>
1337	1	This seems to be just more of the best government money can buy. I would rather pay higher costs for energy and food than higher taxes. That way, I at least get the benefit of competition and free market economics.	<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>The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
1338	1	<p>This is like the zombie Peripheral Canal that will not die! How many times do I have to vote against the same thing in my lifetime?</p> <p>Have you seen the new report that clearly shows how the whole state and especially big agriculture can use rainwater capture, water re-use, and conservation measures to allow us to live within our ecological limits, and at much lower cost, sustainably? You should be promoting those solutions, not this corporate profit-driven hype.</p> <p>I want solutions for people and other living things, not for profit. Corporations, the economy, the government should serve the people and protect the resources all life depends on.</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>Master Response 36 provides a comparison between the proposed project and the Peripheral Canal.</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>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination or water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. 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>
1339	1	<p>The tunnels will harm the environment, kill fish, and only help dangerous fracking operations and large agribusiness interests that do not benefit ordinary Californians.</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>Regulatory oversight of agribusinesses and oil corporations is outside the scope of the proposed project. Also, the Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authority or have the mandate to modify local zoning. For the project’s agricultural impacts and proposed mitigation, please refer to Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS and of the RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Agricultural Resources) and Master Response 18. With respect to fracking by the oil industry, State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking presumably would 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Code, § 3106[b].)
1340	1	<p>The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and 8 similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers. In addition, providing water to the Los Angeles area when there is a scarcity here seems to me to be foolish and dangerously shortsighted.</p> <p>We need to work out a plan for the whole state that takes into account the drought and increasing temperatures on a long-term basis.</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 BDCP 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>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The 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 how the proposed project differs than the peripheral canals please see Master Response 36. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan. 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 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>
1341	1	<p>In short, the project does not provide a return to the taxpayer that justifies the expense (mostly for corporate and some private interests)..</p> <p>Has anyone ever figured the evaporation rate (loss) of these aqueducts? I suspect it is pretty high which may account for the non-release of the figures.</p> <p>Better to put the money into investigation and breakup of our top heavy educational administration system whose rise seems to pair with the decline (and increase in expenses, tuition, etc.) of the California education system. Clear out the deadwood; we do not need a hundred administrators for every teacher.</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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Work on ending corporate tax subsidies and collecting taxes from them. Time to stop running California on the backs of property owner and automobile owners.	
1342	1	Support diversity and sustainability in farming, rather than industrial mono cropping.	<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>
1342	2	Protect clean fresh water and clean energy over unsustainable and environmentally dangerous hydrofracking.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1343	1	This project is an environmental disaster in the making and will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford 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 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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.</p>
1344	1	The politics surrounding this project have been dishonest. The name of the bill, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, implies that the bill is designed to conserve S.F. Bay and Delta wetlands, when in fact the proposed project is designed to deplete current S.F. Bay and Delta wetlands of fresh water. This fraudulent posturing is reason enough to reject this 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 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>
1345	1	Big agribusiness is definitely part of the problem, with the contaminated run off from extended use of pesticides and harsh fertilizers on gigantic fields of monoculture crops and genetic modification techniques, not to mention water intensive cultivation techniques.	<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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1345	2	<p>Big oil is creating possibly irreversible pollution of precious water resources to extract dirty oil, most of which is being exported (with no reduction in our fuel costs) while causing an immense addition to our carbon footprint at a time when renewable, clean technologies are readily available. This squandering of financial resources to facilitate the further squandering of precious, evermore limited and irreplaceable natural and essential resources for the enrichment of a very few has got to stop.</p> <p>The first job of government is to protect us from this very sort of thing. Do your job. Namaste.</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 more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
1346	1	<p>This is a terrible idea and goes against nature. That dry part of the country is not meant to support the populations that big business wants it to. We need the water here where it belongs! Please do not do it!</p> <p>Stop it!</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. Overall, 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>
1347	1	<p>Water for the people, animals and nature to survive. Not for corporations to profit from please!</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/S documentation.</p>
1348	1	<p>Governor Brown is out of his [expletive deleted] mind, and does not represent the progressive majority in California. It is time we had a governor that addressed the interests of the people, rather than pandering to corporate avarice.</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>
1348	2	<p>Governor Brown may think this is good for the economy of our state, and I understand that, but he is being stupidly short-sighted. What good is a strong economy when there is no safe environment left in which we can live?</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. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
1348	3	<p>Extreme drought calls for conservation, not granting agribusiness and big oil all the water they can waste!</p> <p>Get real, Governor Brown! You are out of touch with your people!</p>	<p>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>
1349	1	<p>Oil frackers should not be getting more of our precious water! Just another reason to invest in clean alternative energy! This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmeasured agriculture and the oil industry.</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 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. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p> <p>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. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project. 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>
1350	1	<p>These tunnels do nothing more than take away water from the San Francisco Bay Delta. They are meant to help big agriculture and big oil. This is a supply for fracking and nuts, not people. The people will pay, in more than just hard-earned money.</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>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 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). Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1350	2	<p>The water crisis in California needs innovative solutions. Storage and tunnels do not make more water. Desalinization plants and regulations for agriculture are needed. Nuts do not have to be grown in Kern County, a desert until water was diverted there. Now they seem to have enough water for thousands of acres of nuts as well as thousands of fracking wells.</p> <p>Enough is enough. Northern California has learned, or is learning how to live within their means, and Southern and Central California are not going to steal any more of our water.</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>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>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.</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.</p>
1351	1	<p>The plan is not clear on costs, impacts, or benefits. In addition, it further threatens ecosystems already stressed by over-use of water sourced from those locations. While reduced access to water has an economic impact on the state, it is also time to adjust how we create revenue before adding weight to a further collapse of the agricultural system in the state. The practice of farming heavy-water demand crops in areas of low supply has far surpassed the practicality of those products. Just as consumers are changing our individual water usage at the residential level, we need to accept the fact that we also need to change other habits to deal with the ecological changes in front of us.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to expect these changes to only happen for individual households. The biggest use of water is industry. Individual taxpayers should neither be the only ones at risk for the burden of public projects nor the only group expected to change their behaviors based on the changing needs of the state.</p> <p>I do not support this project as being in the best, long-term interest for the state, our financial situation or overall well-being of 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 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>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the 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. 2013 Public Draft 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
			For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
1352	1	<p>This project reminds me of the Los Angeles subway. Delays, cost overruns, defaults, and ultimately a worsening of the situation it was intended to mitigate.</p> <p>Instead of finishing off the state's shaky economy with a long shot project, why do you not instead consider investing in development of solar desalination of sea water, a path which has a much better chance of meeting all of your constituents' 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 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 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 for more information regarding desalination.</p>
1353	1	We should only provide water to farms and ranches that feed our country, not for specialized foods that are exported, and never to be used for fracking. Not only does it waste a precious life-giving resource, it horribly pollutes the water that is left over.	<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>
1354	1	I am strongly opposed. California should be leading the way in renewable energy, not chasing after technology that creates environmental disaster.	<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>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1355	1	I do not want my tax dollars used for the benefit of the oil companies, for fracking or for giant agribusinesses!	<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>
1356	1	Here are two extremely cost effective solutions to the water supply problem that do not	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>require the tunnel boondoggle.</p> <p>First solution: stop water intensive farming in a desert. Duh!</p> <p>Second solution: stop fracking, stop using fossil fuels, and put the 25 to 70 billion dollar tunnel costs into solar and wind power.</p> <p>Save the rivers, save the Delta, and save the Bay.</p>	<p>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 of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. For more information regarding beneficial use of water please see Master Response 34.</p> <p>Fracking presumably would be an “industrial” use of water. The State Water Resources Control Board has the authority to modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the State Water Resources Control Board to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.</p> <p>On June 13, 2014 the California Department of Conservation (DOC) released proposed regulations for the use of well stimulation in oil and gas production for a 45-day public comment period. The regulations, which are to go into effect on January 1, 2015, are designed to protect health, safety, and the environment, and supplement existing strong well construction standards. They address a comprehensive list of issues, including testing, monitoring, public notice, and permitting. Through the rule-making process, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal compared to the average diversions from the Delta by the state and federal water projects for farms and cities.</p>
1357	1	<p>Let us look at new ways to conserve water. For one, we should not be using this precious resource to flush down the toilet. Someone should look into a pilot project for composting toilets in homes.</p> <p>In the meantime, we cannot waste money and water for corporate waste.</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. Please 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>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
1358	1	The use of our precious water by oil companies for fracking contaminates our water and further damages our environment.	<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. 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). Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
1359	1	Where is the bravery of an independent California? Where is the environmental Governor I thought I was voting for? The time is now to reject corporate dictatorship! We can no longer afford the Good German in this fight against global warming!	<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. 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>
1360	1	Is this really the best stewardship of our resources and of our 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 comment does 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>
1361	1	The citizens of California oppose the theft of our fresh water for the purpose of corporate profit! Governor, please redeem yourself and your legacy. 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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Protect environment, wildlife, climate, and people!	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. Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project.
1362	1	You are supposed to serve the people not the corporations.	<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>
1363	1	It is time for us to stop subsidizing industry and get back to real innovations that create jobs and make everyone's life better, spreading the wealth around and causing real industry growth to take place.	<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>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California.</p> <p>When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. Construction of water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the Draft BDCP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible and are described under each alternative in the RDEIR/SDEIS individual resource chapters and in the BDCP Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, EIR/EIS. An analysis of economic impacts of the proposed project, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are also evaluated and described in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx).</p> <p>Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the Draft EIR/EIS was revised based on the revised construction footprint for proposed water conveyance facilities, along with a refined set of construction cost and schedule assumptions developed for Alternative 4. Refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Section 16.3.3.9, in Appendix A for the revised analysis of Alternative 4. Additionally, one table from Draft EIR/EIS Appendix 16A has been incorporated into Appendix A.</p>
1364	1	<p>I have lived in countries where every house has a rainwater tank to supplement their water supply. This could easily happen in California.</p> <p>Bermuda relies totally on rainwater.</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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Southern California and Nevada have already used up the Colorado River so that it no longer reaches the ocean. Relentless over-development continues to drain our resources - are we next?</p> <p>I reject any idea of using our rapidly decreasing water supply to keep the golf courses and fancy lawns green. The reality is, we live in a desert area...let us treat it as such.</p>	<p>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>
1365	1	<p>I am really sick and tired of so called Democrats selling out to agriculture corporations. Northern California sends enough of it is precious water to Southern California.</p> <p>Stop this idiotic project!</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. Refer to Master Responses 26 (Changes in Delta Export) and 35 (Southern California Water Supply) for clarification on the conveyance of water from Northern California to Southern California.</p>
1366	1	<p>We must find ways to become more sustainable. This is not the answer. A whole region in which the water originates will suffer and it will not solve the problems it is meant to address.</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 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>
1367	1	<p>It would only be a giveaway to big agriculture, a form of corporate welfare that is unconscionable and unsustainable.</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>
1368	1	<p>Remember Mono Lake and the Owens Valley disaster.</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>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Although some critics of the project have been keen to liken the proposal to the The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.</p> <p>Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is subject to the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>The proposed project’s facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</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 project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources. 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>For more information regarding alternatives development, water demand management, and purpose and need please see Master Response 4, Master Response 6, and Master Response 3.</p>
1369	1	This is not the time to support a water tunnel project which would remove much needed Sacramento River water to the Central Valley during a declared crisis and water shortage. If water for the Central Valley is needed, buy it from a place that has excess water, do not steal it from voters here in Sacramento and Northern California.	<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 main 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. Refer to Master Responses 26(Changes in Delta Export) and 35 (Southern California Water Supply) for clarification on the conveyance of water from Northern California to Southern California. 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 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>
1369	2	The increased use of brown water for the Central Valley can also be implemented with very little or no cost to California voters and taxpayers.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1370	1	Water is important to all of us, not just big corporations.	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>Conservation is the answer. There is a limited amount of water and it needs to be shared fairly with the people and the environment. New orchards and vineyards are being planted in places where there is no water. Then they demand water for economic reasons. That means they want to steal water from others and get others to pay for it. This is not progress and does not lead to a good future for California. No water tunnels!</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>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 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>
1371	1	<p>Stop wasting our money and destroying our environment. What are you thinking?</p> <p>Or, have you been bought off by big agriculture and big oil, too?</p> <p>What a disgusting country we have -- and California is now no better than the rest.</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> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
1372	1	<p>There is no excess water to divert.</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 would stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
1373	1	Why should all of us pay for tunnels which will only benefit big companies? How about letting them pay for the tunnels? And the water?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding of the project.
1374	1	Maintain what is right and say no to big money.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
1375	1	Let the corporations that make the money raising unhealthy crops pay for where they get their water!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state 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. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1376	1	<p>How about banning fracking to protect our water and the amount needed for our state? How about building more catch basins? Why should we dance with the fracking monarchs, the Koch Brothers, and those who care nothing about our population? Why do we not establish limits on our population, to keep it from over-burdening our existing water supplies?</p> <p>The entire earth has already exceeded ability to sustain more than 2 billion humans, while politicians serve the cronies who want to build more houses and drill more oil wells, ignoring the reality that billions are starving and in need of ample access to water? How about addressing that, and building de-salination plants, instead of adding 67 Billion dollars to our deficit?</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. 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 to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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>
1377	1	<p>It is bad enough that some of the worst and biggest polluters of the world should get a pass on meeting the Clean Water Standards that the common citizenry of the U.S. must abide.</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>RDEIR/SDESIS 4.3.4 (4A) describes whether concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase or decrease with the project, relative to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. To the extent that concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase, 4.3.4 describes whether these increases are expected to result in impacts to beneficial uses of water in the Delta. For constituents for which adverse impacts were expected, mitigation and other commitments, such as additional evaluation and modeling and consultation with water purveyors to identify additional measures to avoid and minimize or offset these impacts, were introduced to address those impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, adding intakes in the North Delta will allow for operational flexibility that can improve natural flow in the Delta and avoid impacts to migratory fish based on real time data and operations.</p>
1377	2	<p>Your duty as a governmental representative is to work for the needs of your constituency that are human. People who need work that pays at the least a living wage, who need to eat non-toxic food, breathe clean air and drink non-polluted water. You do not work for corporations, especially ones that do all the treasonous acts that they do to our population.</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. 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>
1378	1	<p>I pay dearly for water from the San Diego Water District. Corporations must be responsible for paying their fair share. I am tired of being a slave to corporate America.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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. Additionally, Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. 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 (or as noted by the commenter “corporate America.”)</p>
1379	1	<p>This project is not cost-effective compared with water efficiency investments, less water for low-value crops, use of grey water, and removing the Westlands from any irrigated farming.</p> <p>Large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry should not be subsidized by the tax payers.</p> <p>We need to place a higher value on nature, nature's services, and sustainability.</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>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</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>For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.</p>
1380	1	<p>Brown, I am so sorry I voted for you! Well, I am not going to anymore! I will just leave that one blank next time! You are for the tunnels?! You are for fracking, what, are you fracking nuts?</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. 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>
1381	1	<p>The city I live in has announced intentions to raise the water rates annually for the next four years. I cannot pay these increases and use the water necessary to keep the yards and plants green, plus maintain personal water use. Something has got to give, and it cannot be me. It cannot be the rest of the vanished middle class who have been bled dry, either.</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
		Rethink this decision.	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.
1382	1	We elected you because we believed that you would seek justice for all of us. This is not justice.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1383	1	The tunnels pose a risk to human health and the environment.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, and as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 25 (Public Health) in the Draft EIR/EIS, along with Section 4 and Appendix A (Chapter 25) in the RDEIR/SDEIS, for discussions on risks to human health with project implementation.
1384	1	Please use common sense at this time of extreme drought in California!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness [drought], increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the State, with or without the project. The State is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project including the BDCP alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.
1385	1	When will Los Angeles capture the water that is going down concrete channels into the ocean?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, of the Draft EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, including capturing storm water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the now preferred California WaterFix Project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Additionally, refer to the following Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Water Supply).
1386	1	<p>This plan of yours terrifies me. I look at the drought map and see that our entire beautiful fragile state is red with extreme drought.</p> <p>Then I think of what you want to do with our water and I get so mad I do not even know what to say to you. I do not trust that you understand.</p> <p>We cannot keep supporting insanity like this. Think of the people, like me living on a well in Mendocino County. Think of the birds at the Central Valley refuges. Think about the whole state, not just the money. Please. Do not sacrifice our water & our future like 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 preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. With respect to drought, the proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Flow criteria would be applied month by month and according to water year type. More information on the ranges of water project diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in BDCP, Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy. 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.</p>
1387	1	<p>It comes down to people versus corporate profits. The future of California and the planet for that matter is not dependent on corporate fascism. Your job is though, Mr. Brown. Enough people are informed well enough now to assess the madness that is underway. You have been ineffective and invisible since you have been in office. Stop fracking, dodex, expose the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), tell the inside story of Enron and strongly consider siding with the Constitutional Convention to oust the banking syndicate that has you and the rest of us by the neck. What will your legacy be?</p> <p>Will you even see this suggestion? Democracy, what a hoot!</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. 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>
1388	1	<p>Try conservation by metering agricultures water usage plus ground water pumping to avert the next disaster.</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 Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for or what types of agricultural practices are used. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including water conservation. 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. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for or what types of agricultural practices are used. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>information on demand management measures, including water conservation. 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>
1389	1	<p>We can harvest all the water that is needed through water conservation in urban areas and improving agricultural irrigation efficiency. We do not need to take more water from natural sources.</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 Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for or what types of agricultural practices are used. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including water conservation. 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. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for or what types of agricultural practices are used. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including water conservation. 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. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1390	1	<p>What are you going to do when (not if) the well runs dry??</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>Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR/EIS evaluates groundwater supplies and impacts, along with Appendix A (Chapter 7) and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that 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.</p>
1391	1	<p>Please review how water can be most judiciously conserved and used to promote a healthy ecosystem and economy instead of sacrificing water resources only for businesses that use and waste it so unwisely.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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> <p>Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Water Demand Management, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project.</p>
1392	1	This will cause an enormous environmental disaster.	<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 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>
1393	1	<p>I have supported you throughout your political career and my family also supported your father.</p> <p>You have an opportunity to truly leave a memorable heritage by bravely changing your mind about the tunnels! I urge you to take this opportunity to be a Political Hero!</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. 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>
1394	1	Our exploitation of natural resources has already degraded the health of the state and the planet. Spend money to re-establish natural water flow of the rivers and to reverse some of the damage we have already done. Do not further degrade our state and Northern California's environment by re-directing water to the desert of water-wasters!	<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/EIS documentation were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, and as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1395	1	Stop the greed of special interests. Farming should not be in the big agribusinesses deep pockets. Real American farmers should be producing food in this country - not the current	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>corporate monsters who destroy through greed.</p> <p>We want real farms - with real farmers.</p> <p>Not destroyers of our soils turning this country's farmlands into dust bowls.</p> <p>No more industrial chemically-laden, genetically-modified Frankenfoods!</p> <p>No more weaponized foods set on the tables of Americans. Period.</p>	<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 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>
1396	1	<p>If this proposal goes through, all of your work on the budget will be lost to "we the people." There has to be another way to help "we the people," rather than us building tunnels for big business interests. It is just disgusting that we are always asked to foot the bill for the very businesses that could well afford to pay their own way.</p> <p>No, no, no, not one more project forced on the back of California citizens.</p> <p>You all were doing so well -- please do not start this nonsense.</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> <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>
1397	1	<p>We need to look out for the entire state and the environment not the rich large-scale agriculture and land barons.</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.</p>
1398	1	<p>Over the years, you have shown that you view the use of resources and the care of the environment in a pragmatic, wise, and balanced way.</p> <p>You also have been a courageous and steady voice on these matters despite the pressures from corporate and political voices who would personally benefit from getting their way. Please do not give in to these pressures now when the stakes are so high. You have been an inspiration to many people because your lifestyle has reflected your beliefs. There are many, many of us that support you and want to protect the precious resources and environment that we have been blessed to have. There are alternatives to this tunnel project. Please</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		promote these alternatives instead of this destructive and expensive idea.	salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 4 for information on alternatives to the proposed project. 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.
1399	1	Northern California wildlife and fish need water. In a time of drought more water should not be diverted. We all have to learn how to use water more efficiently. Farmers in Central Valley have been getting cheap water for years.	<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>