

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
1790	1	<p>The tunnel is an environmental disaster. It would spoil many areas, including our beloved Delta. Southern California residents are going to have to conserve water like the rest of us.</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 large corporations. In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project would allow the federal and state water projects to deliver water supplies reliably in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1791	1	<p>I am hoping there is someone in your organization that can read longhand and try to have some compassion for all "Delta residents" and what we have gone through the last 8 years. Yes, it's been lots of meetings and much frustration over the fact that we could lose our "heritage" on these islands and our livelihoods. Our family has been farming since 1856 and most of us don't know another way of life.</p> <p>You have to ask yourselves if you are willing to change the lives of 10,000 people to get water to Southern California. It doesn't even sound right. Does it? We don't have the water anymore. We are also rationing water for our crops. We only wish Southern California does the same.</p> <p>We can only hope and pray for a "decent bond" to protect us and other communities that are in the same spot we're in.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 26 and 3 regarding changes in Delta exports and the purpose and need of the proposed project.</p>
1792	1	<p>As farmers in the Delta since 1856, our main concern is the prospect of the building of the "tunnels" to transport water to southern California from our Delta. If this happens, there will be no more Delta. We are the largest estuary west of the Mississippi.</p>	<p>The now preferred California WaterFix Project (without the HCP as proposed by the BDCP) would provide secure California water supplies and improve the Delta ecosystem by implementing a 9,000 cfs water diversion point in the north Delta, where its operations would improve water flows. Constructing new water diversion points in the north Delta with state-of-the-art fish screens and providing a means to transport water supplies under the Delta, rather than through sensitive natural channels, would help maintain reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California's population while balancing the needs of the Delta ecosystem. 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			diverted in the last 20 years. For other points raised by the commenter, refer to the following Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM, Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), and Master Response 4 (Tunnel Alternative).
1792	2	If Jerry Brown builds the "tunnels" we will have lost our Delta and our heritage.	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. Please see Master Response 24 for information on the Delta as a place. 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.
1792	3	Please concentrate on water storage through-out the state. Yes, I mean especially southern California, to try to solve this problem of thirst that they have made it ours. Please be smart and reasonable about this whole situation and please make them use those 3 lakes in the Tehachapi to bring them water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. See Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Please also see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.
1793	1	I am told that the entire BDCP is 40,000 pages and very complex. It is stated in the California Environmental Quality Act. Section 15124 that an EIR must be written in a way that is understandable to the general public. The BDCP is not so written and maybe it is impossible for it to be so.	The BDCP and EIR/EIS attempt to balance readability, thorough technical analysis, and responses to public and agency requests for information. Please see Master Response 38 for an explanation of document length and measures the lead agencies undertook to enable public review.
1793	2	I am personally concerned with the Twin Tunnels which will take a large amount of fresh water from the Delta. Am I oversimplifying the problem by stating that a wetland or body of water cannot be maintained or restored by taking water out of the system? This is what I understand the Twin Tunnels will do. I am therefore opposed to the construction of the tunnels.	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>elements of the BDCP. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only deliver 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. The Final EIR/EIS analysis indicates that annual water diversions from the Delta would be within 10 percent of the historic, 20-year average.</p>
1793	3	<p>In the past I've spent time in the Suisun tule marshes. The tules (<i>Scurpis ocutus</i>) grow to fifteen feet tall and produce more biomass per acre than tropical rainforest. As such they are performing a function which I believe has been overlooked by the BDCP. For thousands of years they have been creating a peat soil which sequester large amounts of carbon dioxide. These plants require a great deal of fresh or brackish water to prosper.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.
1794	1	A quick summary: It's a bad idea. So please write a new plan that addresses these issues. The Twin Tunnels are not viable.	Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1794	2	Agriculturally: The plan calls for the destruction of highly productive farmland, more uncertain water availability within the entire state, increased salinity and decreased fresh water flows through the Delta which will cause another severe blow to many areas of agriculture in the state.	In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the BDCP seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed BDCP.
1794	3	Environmentally: The plan necessitates the killing of unknown multitudes of endangered smelt, salmon, bass, geese, ducks, herons, sand hill cranes, salt marsh mice, and frogs -the same species it seeks to protect. All told 250+ species will be impacted.	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For detailed responses on the primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.
1794	4	The habitat restoration portion of the BDCP is not well thought out, is only in the "theoretical" state according to the EIR, and will take years of research to figure out if it will work, and even then may not.	The analysis for CMs 2-21 was completed at a programmatic level, as described in Section 4.1.2 of Chapter 4, Approach to the Environmental Analysis. Additionally, the RDEIR/SDEIS released in 2015 introduced a new preferred alternative, 4A, which does not include a HCP or conservation measures. The alternative implementation strategy allows for other state and federal programs to address the long term conservation efforts for species recovery in programs separate from the proposed project. Please refer to Chapter 3, Alternatives, for additional detail about the habitat restoration proposed under Alternative 4A.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
1794	5	<p>Legally: The BDCP conflicts with six other current water plans for the state of California, numerous county land use plans, and an international treaty of bird migration between multiple countries from Columbia through Canada. It defies water rights and land use practices that have been in place since before 1914. There are already several large suits in the Courts against the State regarding its proposals and actions on the BDCP.</p>	<p>The action alternatives could only deliver 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.</p> <p>The BDCP 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 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.</p>
1794	6	<p>Financially: The tunnels portion of the plan requires financing by the water agencies who benefit from the water use including Metropolitan Water (L.A.), Westlands Water (San Joaquin Valley farmers), Solano Water District (including Benicia), Contra Costa county, and the City of Yuba City among others. Water rates for all those places will be elevated and there will be no guarantee of water consistency or water quality.</p> <p>The tunnels financing also requires funding by state and federal resources. The state has a water bond on the November ballot, while the legislature tries to write a better one and can't. The Feds have declined so far to provide any funding.</p>	<p>The entire cost of construction and operation of the proposed water conveyance facility will be paid by the participating state and federal water contractors, not the state or federal government, as described in the 2013 public draft BDCP, Chapter 8.</p> <p>Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA’s requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 5 regarding the proposed project’s funding strategy.</p>
1794	7	<p>Economically: In addition to the funding issues, the plan has significant indirect costs as well. For example, the "preferred alternative" plan would cause Highway 12, SR 160, and parts of I-5 to be rerouted. Several bridges would need to be moved or extended, and the railroad (Capitol Corridor line) would need to be moved. Of course, buying off farmland to build the tunnels and the habitat mitigation area would also come at a high cost. The</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		<p>amount of these expenses is largely unknown which is one reason the Federal government hasn't agreed to any funding yet. The Water Contractors have set limits (in the millions) on what they will spend on this multi-billion dollar project.</p>	<p>elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1795	1	<p>It has been very frustrating to try to understand the BDCP. The EIR/EIS and other BDCP-related documents are, it seems, intentionally complex and confusing. They are biased toward the twin tunnel "answer" without seriously examining alternatives.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1795	2	<p>Research from the Pacific Institute and the Natural Resources Defense Council has shown that "California could be saving up to 14 million acre-feet of untapped water ... with an aggressive statewide effort to use water-saving practices, reuse water, and capture lost storm water ... " San Diego is building a desalination plant, and Orange County effectively reuses water. Were these and other alternatives adequately evaluated?</p>	<p>See Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as those mentioned by the commenter) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The specific proposals that were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies are discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including the NRDC Portfolio-Based Proposal, Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan, and other similar concepts that would require actions that are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</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. 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 they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information regarding water demand management please see</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			Master Response 6.
1795	3	<p>The lack of transparency in this whole review process is appalling. Why it was decided not to post all comments online as they come in, so that everyone can see what others are saying-- and be assured that our comments were received. Posting comments in an online docket during an EIS process is a standard federal government procedure. Why has this highly controversial project been selected for special, secretive treatment?</p>	<p>For information pertaining to how the BDCP/California WaterFix has been developed in an open and transparent manner, please refer to Master Response 41.</p> <p>The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of CEQA or NEPA or a standard practice of lead agencies.</p>
1795	4	<p>Failure to meet dual goals.</p> <p>The EIR/EIS documents fail to meet the co-equal goals of conservation and water supply stability. Why is the so-called "balanced and neutral" BDCP so focused on "tunnel vision" without seriously examining alternatives? How [can] a project that does so much harm to the Delta be labeled a "conservation" project?</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 EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. Please see Master Response 5 regarding CM 1 as a conservation measure. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed.</p>
1795	5	<p>Why is it OK to destroy one set of farmland in order to send water to another?</p> <p>The various documents fail to explain why many times more water than exists, even without a drought, has been promised via contract\$. Researchers from the Pacific Institute and the Natural Resources Defense Council have examined the large and growing gap between water use in California and the available water supply - a water deficit in excess of 6 million acre-feet, most of it from the Sacramento-San Joaquin watershed. The current drought also has highlighted problems of overdrafting ground water. There are solutions - but they need to be seriously considered, instead of the current "tunnel vision" approach.</p> <p>The proposed twin tunnels will not produce additional water for California</p>	<p>In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the BDCP seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed BDCP.</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. 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 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
1795	6	<p>No economic plan.</p> <p>The EIR lacks a viable economic plan. How will the tunnels be paid for? What happens if the water contractors who promised to pay for construction default? What guarantees are there that water taken from the Delta will not be resold at a profit?</p>	<p>The funding strategy for 2013 BDCP is outlined in Chapter 8 of the 2013 BDCP, not the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 5 regarding the proposed project's funding strategy.</p> <p>Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5.</p>
1795	7	<p>Recent news stories indicated that property taxes could be increased to cover construction costs. How could this happen without a vote? And who will pay for the severe damage construction will make on Delta habitats? What guarantees are there that the "muck" is not toxic and will actually be reusable - or that we will not be left with pyramids of smelly muck and once-navigable waterways reduced in depth.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			CEQA/NEPA process.
1795	8	I urge you to reject this EIR as incomplete and to look for better solutions as to how to meet the many needs of everyone in California and not just a small, elite group.	Since 2006, the project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.
1796	1	<p>General Comments: Geographic Scope of the Plan Area -</p> <p>The Plan Area is not a true representation of the affected area, therefore recommend reevaluating The Plan Area to include the entire watershed of the Sacramento and San- Joaquin River Basins.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	2	Pg 3.2-4 line 11: Conservation measures based on the Plan Area is not adequate, because the affected area is much greater than the Plan Area. Have additional conservation measures the areas outside Pan Area been evaluated? If none, then recommend considering the greater area.	<p>The Plan Area encompasses the Sacramento–San Joaquin River Delta and additional areas in which certain conservation measures will be implemented pursuant to the Plan.</p> <p>The conservation strategy is primarily focused on the statutory Delta, as defined in California Water Code Section 12220. However, certain areas</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>outside the statutory Delta contain desirable locations for actions that advance the goals and objectives of the Plan. Suisun Marsh, Suisun Bay, and the Yolo Bypass have been included in the Plan Area to provide important sites for habitat restoration that directly supports goals and objectives for natural communities and covered species (Figure 1-1). In addition, the conservation strategy includes measures that will be implemented outside of the statutory Delta to support or complement regional conservation planning efforts underway in Yolo, Solano, Contra Costa, San Joaquin, and Sacramento Counties (Section 1.5, Relationship to Other Plans in the Delta). As such, the Plan Area will also encompass habitat lands that are conserved through covered activities taken in conjunction with these other regional conservation programs. To the extent appropriate, these actions will be implemented through cooperative agreements, or similar mechanisms with local agencies, interested nongovernment organizations, landowners, or other parties.</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 EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</p> <p>Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>CEQA/NEPA process.</p> <p>Because the SWP and CVP water infrastructure is operated as an integrated system, the effects of implementing the project may extend to aquatic systems beyond the Delta, both upstream and downstream, and will implicate water operations parameters as well as species and their habitats located in those areas. As such, the project effects analysis (Chapter 5, Effects Analysis) takes into account these upstream and downstream aquatic effects, both positive and negative, and describes, analyzes, and addresses the overall effects of the project. Areas potentially affected by the implementation of the project located outside of the Plan Area, have been included in the analysis of effects to ensure that all of the potential effects within the action area (all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action), as defined by Section 7 of the ESA, have been adequately assessed.</p>
1796	3	<p>Methods and Approaches Used -</p> <p>Pg 3.2 3: Unclear as to as to what will happen if the flows unpredictably change direction. Has an unforeseen change in flow direction been examined?</p> <p>Page 3.2-9, line 44: "5,000 acres riparian natural community will be restored." This is a very small area that is to restored compared to the area that is being affected by the diversion system. The Sacramento Delta, as claimed by Wikipedia, is roughly % of a million acres. I order to truly help restore more than 5,000 acres of the riparian natural community should be restored.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	4	<p>Appendix 3A Background on the process of Developing the BDCP Conservation Measures</p> <p>Was the "Do Nothing" alternative considered? It is recommended that all options even the Do Nothing alternative should be evaluated to compare the feasibility of this project.</p> <p>If the goals are not met and/or the effects of the BDCP are contrary to the goals, whom is to take responsibility and fund new efforts to remediate the negative effects?</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	5	<p>Page 3.A-21: The max diversion is stated as to 15,000 cubic feet per second. What is duration of diversion? What are limiting factors; water flows for fish or water usage for the public? During a long duration of drought years how will the diversion system be operated?</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	6	<p>7.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Entities Involved in BDCP implementation -</p> <p>The Authorized Entity Group has a majority of the power to impose regulations for the BDCP. How can members be removed or added based on the performance of the BDCP? Will any Native American tribes be a voting member on the Authorized Entity Group?</p>	<p>The Authorized Entity Group is composed of the parties receiving take authorization from the state and federal fish and wildlife agencies. Members would only be added or removed from the group if an entity was added or removed to the state and federal endangered species permits. Native American tribes could not be voting members of this group because tribes would not be named on the state or federal endangered species permits.</p>
1796	7	<p>Pg 7-12 line 9: A minimum of "quarterly meetings" for the Authorized Entity Group is not adequate, at least for the beginning stages of the project. It is recommend that for the first 5 years a minimum of one monthly meetings take place to continually address the changing environment and system.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 5 for a discussion of the governance structure proposed in the 2013 public draft BDCP.</p>
1796	8	<p>Page 7-15 line33: It is recommended that a minimum; ie: quarterly bases, independent science review be required for the Adaptive Management Team. If the review process is solely a choice of the Adaptive Management Team then mismanagement could occur.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	9	<p>Overall, the BDCP is still not ready to be implemented because to the lack the research covered thus far. Some of the comments above may be answered somewhere in the document, but due to the size of this document it is difficult to locate the answers. Please take these comments as suggestions.</p>	<p>Regarding the length of the Draft EIR/EIS, please see Master Response 38, which explains that the EIR/EIS reflects an unprecedented effort to analyze a proposed project and all alternatives under both state and federal laws for special status species protection.</p>
1796	10	<p>General Comments</p> <p>It is unclear which body governs which part of the plan. If restoration is a success than who gets the credit and adversely if there is a failure then who gets the blame and who has to fund the repairs?</p>	<p>The responsibility to implement the BDCP, including all required restoration, rests with the permit holders and Reclamation, called the Authorized Entities. If restoration fails due to changed circumstances described in Chapter 6, the Authorized Entities are required to remediate the failure and pay for it. Decision-making authority is described and summarized in Table 7-1 and Chapter 7 of BDCP.</p>
1796	11	<p>Overview</p> <p>"The conservation strategy is based on the best available science</p>	<p>The proposed project reflects the outcome of a multiyear collaboration between DWR, Reclamation, state and federal fish and wildlife agencies, state and federal water contractors, nongovernmental organizations, agricultural</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		and was founded on an array of broad conservation goals adopted and agreed to by stakeholders in 2006." Who are the stakeholders?	interests, and the general public.
1796	12	(SEE CH 10 section 3) - independent science review ???	Please see responses to comment letter 1448 for a comprehensive response to comments from the Independent Scientific Review Panel.
1796	13	<p>Geographic Scope of the Plan Area</p> <p>Comment -The BDCP will affect the entire Sacramento and San-Joaquin River Basins therefore the BDCP Plan Area is much greater in reality than in the Geographic Scope. I propose to increase the size of the BDCP Plan Area to the full extent of the Sacramento and San-Joaquin Rivers and all their tributaries. (See CH 5 Effects Analysis)</p>	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For additional detail on the primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.
1796	14	<p>Covered Species</p> <p>"Rather, the covered species list reflects the range of species that might experience incidental take associated with the activities covered by the BDCP" Please define???</p> <p>"Take that is not purposeful and that occurs during the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity."</p>	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	15	<p>3.1 Introduction</p> <p>"including substantial alterations to water conveyance infrastructure and water management regimes" - Is this talking about the tunnels? What type of alterations are to be made?</p>	<p>This comment refers to the following statement on page 3.1-1 of the 2013 public draft BDCP: "The BDCP proposes fundamental, systemic, long-term physical changes to the Delta, including substantial alterations to water conveyance infrastructure and water management regimes; extensive restoration of natural communities, and measures specifically designed to offset ecological stressors on covered species." The alterations to water infrastructure posed are primarily Conservation Measure 1, the proposed new water conveyance facility. This new facility would add a new point of diversion on the Sacramento River with three proposed new intakes.</p>
1796	16	<p>3.1.31 To whom is in charge of the "adaptive management" process and what is the over-site body?</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.
1796	17	<p>3.2 Methods and Approaches Used</p> <p>3.2.1.1 "The conservation strategy is divided into near-term and long-term implementation timeframes. The 29 near-term implementation period, anticipated to be 15 years, begins with the issuance of the BDCP's 30 final permit and ends with the onset of operation of the new north Delta diversions and 31 tunnel/pipeline facility to allow for dual conveyance." -first mention of the tunnels</p> <p>"For example, diversions in the north Delta will reduce the need to export at the south Delta diversions, thereby reducing reverse flows in Old and Middle Rivers." Pg 3.2-3 line 5 and 6</p> <p>"For example, restoration of tidal natural communities in the Cache Slough area is projected to result in reduced tidal range and greater unidirectional flows in Sutter and Steamboat Sloughs, increasing habitat suitability for, and speeding the passage of, juvenile salmonids migrating through these sloughs and thereby reducing their exposure to predation"</p> <p>pg 3.2-3 line 14,15,16 What happens when the inverse of these examples take place?</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	18	<p>3.2.1.2 Pg 3.2-4 line 11 In the list on this page 2. is a major concern because it is stated that the level on conservation is based, "Only [on] limiting factors/stressors that occur in the Plan Area". The "Plan Area" considered does not take into account a true representation of the area affected there the "level of conservation" Cannot be accurate</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA’s requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	19	<p>Pg 3.2-4 line 34 Monitoring Data- will this be done with one or many agencies and how will these agencies be monitored to make sure they are recording true measurements?</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA’s requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	20	<p>Pg 3.2-7 line 24 "diversions are essential... to achieve improvements in water supply reliability" in the meantime it could provide new opportunities to restore the ecological health of the Delta. What about using these funds to solely restore the ecological health of the Delta water quality, improve native habitat, and create a safer water conveyance to increase safety?</p>	<p>This comment addresses analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5.</p>
1796	21	<p>Pg 3.2-9 line 44 "5,000 acres of riparian natural community will be restored. This seems like a very small area that is to be restored compared to the area that is being affected by the tunnels. The Sacramento Delta as claimed by Wikipedia is roughly % of a million acres.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.
1796	22	<p>3.6 Adaptive Management and Monitoring Program</p> <p>Pg 3.6-2 line 17 "dedicated Adaptive Management Team is essential..." Who?</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	23	<p>Appendix 3A Background on the Process of Developing the BDCP Conservation Measures</p> <p>Pg 3.A-10 line 14-16 Options 3 and 4 provide "significant improvements over options 1and 2". Not sure this is the case</p>	<p>The options referenced in "Options 3 and 4" do not include changes in water withdrawal, only changes in the way that water moves through the Delta.</p> <p>Section 3.A.6 describes how the biological goals and objectives were developed. The process for when biological goals and objectives are not met is</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		<p>because how is removing water going to help the delta?</p> <p>Pg 3.A-17 line 19-30 Where does it mention the actions taken when goal are not met, or worse the effects are contrary to the goals?</p>	<p>described in Section 3.6 of the BDCP (Chapter 3). The adaptive management and monitoring program is designed to address issues such as that described by the commenter.</p>
1796	24	<p>Page 3.A-11 The max diversion as stated as up to 15,000 cubic feet per second. What is the duration of this diversion? What are the limiting factors; water flows for fish or water usage for the public? During a long duration of drought years how will the diversion system be operated?</p>	<p>As described in Section 3.6.4.2 of Chapter 3, Description of the Alternatives, in the EIR/EIS, use of the north Delta intakes (quantity of flow and duration of the use) would be dependent upon requirements to protect fish and Delta water flows and quality, including north Delta diversion bypass flow criteria, south Delta OMR flow criteria, south Delta E/I ratio, flows over Fremont Weir into Yolo Bypass via operable gates, Delta inflow and outflow criteria, Delta Cross Channel gate operations, additional Rio Vista minimum flow requirements, operations for Delta water quality and residence criteria, and water quality criteria for agricultural and municipal/industrial diversions. Tables 3-16 through 3-25 provide specific factors for each of the alternatives.</p> <p>During critical dry years, the use of the north Delta intakes would be extremely limited, as shown in Tables C-11-1-2 through C-11-1-25 in Appendix 5A, Section C, Modeling Results in the Draft EIR/EIS.</p>
1796	25	<p>Chapter 7 Implmentation Structure</p> <p>7.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Entities Invovled in BDCP Implmentation</p> <p>"Authorized Entity Group", who is this consisted of and if they are not doing the right job how can they replace? See 7.1.3</p>	<p>See response to comment 1796-6.</p>
1796	26	<p>7.1.3.1 Page 7-12 line 9; A minimum quarterly meeting is not adequate to make sure everyone is on the same page within the Authorized Entity Group.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 5 for a discussion of the governance structure proposed in the 2013 public draft BDCP.</p>
1796	27	<p>7.1.5 page 7-13; When there is a conflict between the Authorized Entity Group and the Permit Oversight Group, whom has the right to accept or reject the other? What is the hierarchical system? See 7.1.7</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA’s requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1796	28	<p>7.1.6 page 7-15 line 33 The Adaptive Management Team will decide when and on what terms to seek independent science review to evaluate technical issues for the purpose of supporting adaptive management decision making. There should be constant independent review on a monthly or quarterly basis.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA’s requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1797	1	<p>After reviewing the Draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and the draft EIR/EIS for the BDCP many concerns regarding the project have been brought to my attention. Ultimately, I feel that the BDCP is insufficient at combating its proposed goals of restoration, relieving the stresses of climate change, and providing an adequate and reliable water source for Californians (1.1 of BDCP). The proposed method of the construction of tunnels, canals, intake areas, and expanding water storage facilities contradict the restoration goals also part of the BDCP. The irreversible and environmentally damaging construction plans have significant adverse affects on the environment as well as the future of our state.</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 EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state’s long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
1797	2	<p>Although mitigation measures are proposed for relieving many adverse effects on the environment, it is hard to overlook the areas that do not have sufficient mitigation measures and will cause significant unavoidable impacts that will alter the health of Delta communities. As part of the background and introduction it is explained that in the past, irreversible damages, such as altered soil hydrology, acquisition of 60% of important delta lands/habitats, and changes in water quality, have been a result of the construction of levees, dams, and flood management programs (2.2 of BDCP). If the BDCP is aware of these historical damages, then shouldn't it be obvious that the construction of an even larger water infrastructure system is not a solution to the declining health of our state? The BDCP attempts to link restoration projects with the construction of pipelines that will change the flow of our already suffering waterways. It is clear the BDCP is more focused on the construction of the pipelines and tunnels than it is the restoration projects or improving the environmental health of California. The construction of the pipes directly contradict restoration goals as they damage or destroy physical aspects of the environment, as well as important cultural and aesthetic features of California.</p>	<p>Conveyance facility construction impacts are fully disclosed throughout this Final EIR/EIS. When these construction impacts are determined to be significant, mitigation measures are presented to attempt to reduce these impacts. In cases where the mitigation measures will not fully reduce the impacts or where there is uncertainty about whether impacts would be reduced they were identified as significant and unavoidable. All of the mitigation measures identified for these impacts will be fully implemented, to the extent feasible, to reduce these significant impacts.</p>
1797	3	<p>In Chapter 17 the EIR/EIS proposes that Clifton Forebay, Byron CA undergo construction</p> <p>to expand and add intake areas as part of the larger BDCP plan. This construction will cause significant aesthetic changes to the community. Section 17.3.3.2 explains that the proposed Forebay will not blend with the existing visual environment and will be in</p>	<p>The visual analysis has come to the finding that a number of proposed project features would result in adverse/significant and unavoidable visual impacts, even with mitigation, due to the scale of proposed facilities, changes to the visual character of affected lands and communities, and impacts to sensitive viewers. This includes impacts to the study area's visual character and quality, impacts to scenic highways and scenic vistas, and impacts resulting from changes in light and glare. Mitigation Measures AES-1a through 1g, and</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		<p>view of sensitive receptors in the area. In addition to negative aesthetic impacts, the construction may also cause dust clouds that impair visibility, which affects the health and safety of nearby residents (17-53). In addition, lines 35 and 36 of page 17-53 explain that residents will be displaced while construction occurs, which could take as long as 7.5 years. Following construction, the community's visual resources will be damaged without sufficient mitigation measures (lines 1- 12). Construction plans include permanent topological changes to the area and will remove vegetation (lines 30-42) which will cause adverse aesthetic changes as well as possible environmental damages that seemed to be overlooked in the plan.</p> <p>Permanent topological changes, the removal of vegetation, and increased dust particles in the air do not seem to follow the BDCP goals of environmental integrity. Proper mitigation measures are needed so that residents in this area do not have to suffer aesthetic and environmental changes and will not be displaced for construction. The plan does not currently account for the significant consequences that will occur as a result from construction in this area.</p>	<p>specifically Mitigation Measures AES-1e and 1g, include design measures to improve project aesthetics. Mitigation Measures AES-4a through 4c include measures to reduce impacts associated with light and glare. Visual mitigation provides measures to lessen the visual impacts associated with the proposed project and to improve project aesthetics to the degree possible but cannot substantially lessen the significant adverse change in aesthetics or counter-balance the aesthetic changes that would result from the project and its alternatives because of the nature of the project, which is why the impacts are significant and unavoidable. This includes visual changes resulting from changes proposed at Clifton Court Forebay, which differ by alternative.</p> <p>The commenter is referred to DEIR/EIS Appendix 22C, Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix Health Risk Assessment for Construction Emissions. The health risk assessment evaluates the human health risks resulting from exposure to construction emission, including PM10 and PM2.5 from fugitive dust generation, produced by each action alternative. The health risks are evaluated on a local scale at sensitive receptors located near each construction source.</p> <p>Also, please refer to Impacts ECON-2 and ECON-25 in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, regarding housing and displacement of residents.</p>
1797	4	<p>Important cultural resources will be damaged and destroyed as part of the BDCP. I urge that more alternatives and mitigation measures be provided to save the states historical areas and resources. The first problem I noticed in the draft EIR/EIS was in section 18.1.5.3 that explained that no known ceremonial or sacred sites were found within the Plan Area (lines 13 and 14). Given the large size of the Plan Area and its proximity within and near numerous Native American areas it is hard to believe that all groups were asked and that no sacred or ceremonial site was identified. Page 18-78 states that many</p>	<p>For additional information about Native American outreach efforts, including identification and analysis of impacts on archaeological sites, Traditional Cultural Properties, and cultural significance of biological resources, please see Master Response 21.</p> <p>As indicated in pages 18-5 through 18-7, the NAHC's review of the Sacred Lands File revealed no documented ceremonial or sacred sites within the plan area. Outreach, both via written correspondence and in-person meetings, to all of the Native American contacts (37 in total) provided by the NAHC also yielded no information relating to ceremonial or sacred sites.</p> <p>For more information relating to mitigation measures relating to avoidance or</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		<p>significant cultural and historical resources will be destroyed or demolished as a result of the construction of intakes, the canal, and reusable material areas. Although mitigations will be used, it is stated that they are not sufficient in guaranteeing that these sites will remain. This is a major flaw in the BDCP that will result in the loss of important cultural resources for our state. Page 18-65 states that construction has the potential to damage or demolish Native American Gathering Halls or Activity areas. Page 18-74 through 18-77 explains that ground disturbing construction of intake areas 1-5 will negatively impact and impair archeological sites, including human burial sites. These sites are important for Native American groups who continually face the loss of important heritage sites. These sites are also important for the general California public by offering rich cultural and historical resources. Proper mitigation measures and alternatives need to be provided to mitigate for the loss of these resources or change the area of construction to exclude cultural sites.</p>	<p>mitigation of significant archaeological sites and human burials, please refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, and CUL-4 under alternative 1A in Chapter 18.3.5.2.</p>
1797	5	<p>My next concern was the emissions and air quality changes as a result of construction.</p> <p>Chapter 22 was clogged with acronyms that frustrated the general reader. Once I battled my way along I found this area to be a major concern. Despite the BDCP's claim of compliance with air quality laws, policies, and ordinances, I felt like the BDCP still needed better mitigation measures to combat air quality. Page 22-93 and 22-94 explained that the NOx emissions generated during construction of the water conveyance facility would exceed the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) threshold and would disturb 15 acres a day due to the 24 hour construction Monday through Friday. According to Table 22-26 Nox levels would be elevated above the SMAQMD threshold for 5 years (2014-2019) during construction. In addition, construction would also disturb PM levels without mitigation measures that reduce emissions below the threshold. This is a</p>	<p>The document and air quality analysis reflects several years of collaboration, responses to requests for additional information, careful thought, accumulation of the latest scientific information, and thorough analyses.</p> <p>Although the analyses that support the EIR/EIS, including the air quality and GHG chapter, are complex, the lead agencies have made every attempt to present the information in plain language and in a clear format with emphasis on the information that is useful to the public, agencies, and decision makers. For more information, please see response to comment 1787-255 and Master Response 38 regarding the length and complexity of the document.</p> <p>With respect to air quality impacts and mitigation, the lead agencies have developed a comprehensive and aggressive mitigation strategy to address air quality and associated human health effects associated with construction of the water conveyance facility. As described in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, all feasible onsite emissions reduction measures have been incorporated into the project design. These include performance standards to ensure construction contractors utilize newer offroad and onroad engine</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		<p>particular concern since the BDCP claims to have goals in environmental restorative activities while also polluting our air? This doesn't add up. I urge that proper mitigation measures be added to reduce emissions so that our airways stay clean.</p>	<p>technologies that are significantly cleaner and generate fewer emissions than older models. The project proponents have also committed to a minimum of Tier 3 engines in all marine vessels, Tier 4 engines in all tunneling locomotives, fleet-wide average criteria pollutant emissions rates for off-road equipment greater than 50 horsepower that are equivalent to the use of a model year 2013 fleet, and on-road haul trucks meeting EPA 2007 on-road emission standards for PM10 and NOX. Finally, construction contractors will be required to comply with all local air district recommendations and requirements for fugitive dust control, which include onsite water application, vehicle speed limits, and use of vegetative buffers. The environmental commitments will limit onsite construction emissions to the greatest extent practical, reducing both regional and local pollutants and associated human health impacts. Remaining regional emissions will be offset through Mitigation Measures AQ-2a through AQ-4b. As described in Chapter 22, Air Quality, all offsets purchased by the project proponents must provide contemporaneous (i.e., occur in the same calendar year as the emission increases) and localized (i.e., within the Sacramento Federal Nonattainment Area) emissions benefit to the area of effect.</p> <p>Impacts related to fugitive dust are identified as less than significant, note fugitive dust generated by ground disturbance and earthmoving are anticipated to be reduced by approximately 75%, fugitive dust from concrete batching by 70%, and fugitive dust from aggregate and sand pile erosion by 80% with the environmental commitments identified in the Draft EIR/EIS (Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, Section 3.C.2.35). Finally, the project will also incorporate measures to reduce re-entrained road dust, as part of Mitigation Measure AQ-9.</p> <p>The combined benefits of the project's aggressive environmental commitments and regional offset program will dramatically reduce emissions generated by the proposed project.</p>
1797	6	<p>These are only a few of the concerns I have with the BDCP. Ultimately, I do not understand how restorative activities can be linked with a project that will destroy more of our environment. The expansion of our already flawed water infrastructure system is not a solution; but rather, just a way to further hurt our</p>	<p>The 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 was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		<p>environment. Changes to California's environment will irreversibly and adversely affect our resources. Building more infrastructures is not the answer we need to focus on restoring what we already have. I urge that proper mitigation measures be put into place and that more studies be conducted to determine how this project will affect the whole state. This is too big for so many people to have concerns and to not be allowed to vote on the project. Thanks for your time</p>	<p>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> <p>Under CEQA, feasible mitigation measures are required that could substantially lessen or minimize significant impacts. Mitigation measures are not required for effects which are not determined to be significant. For significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided, the EIR/EIS describes these in individual resource areas. Under CEQA, an agency may not approve a project with significant environmental impacts if there are feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen those impacts. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15092, subd. (b); see Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment v. City of Santa Clarita (2011) 197 Cal.App.4th 1042, 1052-1053.) Thus, for every significant impact identified in an EIR, the agency must adopt all feasible mitigation measures that would substantially reduce the impact. Even with all feasible mitigation, however, the level of some impacts may still be higher than the threshold of significance identified in the EIR.</p> <p>For more information regarding mitigation measures for each resource area please see each individual resource chapter in the FEIR/EIS. For more information regarding Environmental Commitments please see Appendix 3B of the FEIR/EIS.</p> <p>Prior to construction, the EIR/EIS must be certified and adopted by the implementing agencies, and permits must be obtained but does not require a public vote to move forward.</p>
1798	1	<p>I am concerned about future water resources for my family that lives in Southern California but my main concern is how future plans in the State Water Project and Central Valley Water Project will affect the thriving biodiversity across the state.</p>	<p>The effects of future operations of the SWP and CVP on aquatic and terrestrial resources are described in Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources, of the Final EIR/EIS, under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all the action alternatives.</p>
1798	2	<p>I am concerned that plans in the BDCP will decimate plant and animal populations in the region. To start, the migration of Chinook salmon has been decimated in the last 50 years through</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		<p>alteration of habitat and climate change. Chinook Salmon are a native species to the Pacific Northwest that has thrived for thousands of years. Not only do the Salmon have to adapt to loss of habitat along migration paths due to dams, levees and other infrastructure, the species is now faced with the proposed plan of tunnels that will greatly alter the estuaries in which they mature, grow and adapt. Salinity levels in these estuaries is so key to their survival, that any more alterations to estuaries or the tributaries and rivers that flow into them, could potentially decimate the populations even more. We have already seen populations in the Sacramento River decrease by nearly 70% between 1950 and 2000, and it frightens me what the next 50 years could have in store for Chinook salmon if these tunnels were put in place.</p>	<p>agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
1798	3	<p>The BDCP does not provide sufficient protection for these resources since wetland micro-ecosystems support larger aquatic and terrestrial animals in the food chain. From Tiger Salamanders to the many species of shrimp that inhabit these delicate and temperate ecosystems these species have an impact on life in the entire region. Wetlands rely heavily on stable groundwater levels and I am concerned that the planned tunnels will destroy these wetland habitats by permanently altering groundwater levels.</p>	<p>The commenter states that the BDCP does not provide sufficient protection for aquatic and terrestrial animals and expresses concern that the tunnels will affect groundwater levels in wetland habitats. The commenter does not specifically state how they feel the BDCP does not provide sufficient protections for these species. Although the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative, the alternatives that rely on the BDCP proposed to protect over 69,000 acres of lands and restore over 83,000 acres of lands. The tunnels would run 150 feet below ground and thus would not alter surface water or perched groundwater that they run beneath.</p>
1798	4	<p>Human populations will also be affected in regions such as the central coast because this "region has the most reliance on groundwater to meet its local uses, with more than 80% of its water use supplied by groundwater in an average year" (Chapter 5</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		of BDCP).	4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA’s requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.
1798	5	Apart from biotic effects of tunnel plans outlined in the BDCP, I am also concerned with human impacts from water contamination and potentially hazardous infrastructure. As surface water infiltrates into groundwater, vital filtration processes occur. Without these processes, the health and wellbeing of all California residents is at stake. Carcinogenic chemicals are already found in our water table due to industry, agriculture, and pharmaceuticals. If the proposed tunnels are put in place it is probable that many communities will have difficulty accessing potable water. Although current filtration methods are mostly effective in removing chemicals from drinking water, projections have not been made based on increased toxicity of water due to the destruction of wetlands that would take place if tunnels were put in place.	As described in Chapter 6, Surface Water, Chapter 7, Groundwater, and Chapter 8, Water Quality of the EIR/EIS, all proposed water conveyance facilities would be designed, constructed, and operated in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan permits that would be issued to protect both surface water and groundwater quality. Groundwater removed by dewatering or muck drying activities during construction and/or maintenance activities during operations would be tested, and if needed, treated prior to discharge to surface water bodies. Based upon information compiled by the U.S. Geological Survey for the CVHM groundwater model, the groundwater analysis presented in the EIR/EIS did not identify adverse impacts to potable water supplies due to construction of the wells, as described in Chapter 7 of the EIR/EIS. Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS addresses the loss of wetlands and waters of the U.S. in impact BIO-176 and Mitigation Measure BIO-176 ensures that there will be no net loss of wetland acreage and function and value in the plan area as a

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			result of the BDCP alternatives and the preferred alternative (Alternative 4A).
1798	6	Chapter 9 outlines threats of Geologic and Seismic activity to river systems and the delta but does not sufficiently plan for climate change and sea level rise. Even a slight rise of five meters in sea level could decimate infrastructure in rivers and estuaries, and even flood the state capital. Government published map projections of sea level rise predict frightening results in the northern valley and entire state. Residents of El Dorado Hills, Ca, Auburn, Ca and Rocklin, Ca could have prime beach front real estate in the coming years. The BDCP in no way prepares or addresses climate change in a realistic way. Negligence and slow political action on behalf of government agencies has sufficed in the past as environmental issues arise, but future climate change, flooding, and earthquakes could destroy all current and proposed hydrologic infrastructures in California. State political figures and multiple agencies could potentially have the blood of thousands of Californians on their hands if delta tunnels are put in place.	The commenter is referred to Appendix 3E (Potential Seismic and Climate 6 Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies), which describes the relationship of climate change and sea level rise to seismic risks in the Delta.
1798	7	I am a concerned citizen of California and I desire to see the state shift its water policies from being focused on economic gains and future building of dams and other infrastructure, to attempting to allow the state's hydrologic system to function as close to natural as possible. Further alteration of rivers and estuaries could be catastrophic to all forms of life including the human race. The majority of water in the State Water Project and Central Valley Project is used to feed the nation and world, which is also imperative to human survival, but I suggest removing farms in regions such as the Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley that use extreme amounts of water. These farmers need to be subsidized and supported in moving to other industries and careers, or simply move to a more agriculturally efficient region.	<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.</p> <p>As described in Section 1.1 of Chapter 1, Introduction, of the EIR/EIS, the proposed project was developed to improve water supply reliability by the project proponents. The action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply.</p> <p>The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta and water deliveries to SWP and CVP users located south of the Delta consistent within statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP, as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS. In</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need for the proposed project, no changes would occur to SWP or CVP water contract amounts. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
1798	8	I hope you, as a state agency, create the right policies and laws to protect the beautiful natural environment of California rather than destroying it for economic gain. Please consider the letters of my classmates and I, and I hope that you make the right decisions in protecting the well being of California's environment and water supply.	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.
1799	1	Preliminary assessments of the Delta based on observations made during our field trip suggest that the Delta is already under tremendous stress due to human impacts. The Natural Riparian wetlands are noticeably struggling to survive where human "improvements" have been made. Salmon populations (along with many other species of fish) have been declining for years now, and research has shown that human development is at least partly to blame. Hydropower dams, water diversions, non-native fish/predatory fish, habitat loss and fragmentation, and over-harvesting are only a few of the human impacts that salmon have suffered from. It is evident and conclusive that the natural ecosystems associated with the Delta need much restoration.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1799	2	Looking over some basic principles of Delta restoration, one could conclude that taking more water from the system would be the exact opposite of helping it. When regarding natural preservation, endangered species, riparian restoration, habitat conservation, and even economic stability (at least in northern California), it is obvious that they are all at risk if the BDCP gets approved. The BDCP implies that all of these things have been assessed and taken into account. It also suggests that the BDCP will help restore these issues, however research has shown that degradation of natural ecosystems are directly related to the declining state of the Delta. The fact that this project will be diverting more water from the natural waterways in the Delta greatly contradicts the idea that	<p>The commenter offers an opinion regarding the BDCP and the availability of water to restore habitats and protect species. No specific comments were made regarding the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
		this project will help restore the Delta.	alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input
1799	3	Another big issue in regards to the BDCP: it only takes into consideration a small amount of species that may be affected. Obviously people care a lot about salmon and delta smelt so these things need to be addressed and analyzed thoroughly before anyone approves this plan, but what about the other species? What effect will it have on them? And most importantly, how has this plan somehow surpassed the Endangered Species Act? The length of the document did not facilitate understanding of the environmental impact statement. I would like to know how this is going to help the endangered species of the Delta and I would also like to know how this evidence was gathered and by who?	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For additional detail on the primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.
1799	4	The biggest flaw I have found with the BDCP is that it has not properly analyzed the impacts it will have on the Delta. If this project was indeed a habitat conservation plan, it should provide conclusive evidence backing this claim. In the document itself I could not find any concrete facts that suggest this will be of any benefit to the state of the Delta. I would like to see some valid, evidence based facts/research that prove this will help the Delta.	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.
1799	5	The myth going around is that the BDCP is a gigantic cover up using habitat conservation as a mask for a huge water transfer. I would like to say that this is exactly what it is, a myth, however it hard to argue against when most of the research I have done on this project suggests that it is more concerned with financing and who is going to get how much water than it is anything else. Shouldn't the main focus be habitat conservation?	The Draft EIR/EIS alternatives do not include assumptions for water transfers except for the continuation of transfers associated with the Lower Yuba River Accord. However, water transfers are assumed to continue in the future. The EIR/EIS does include a general analysis of potential capacity that could be used in drier years due to reduced CVP and SWP water deliveries. Total cross-Delta water transfers could be greater under some alternatives considered in the Draft EIR/EIS than under Existing Conditions or the No Action Alternative, as shown in the analyses presented in Appendix 5D, Water Transfer Analysis Methodology and Results. Each water transfer is unique and must be considered using separate project-specific analyses. The EIR/EIS indicates the overall opportunities to transfer water across the Delta, but does not consider the specific sources or users of the transferred water.
1799	6	I am not just some conspirator who wants to complain about government corporations and policies. I believe that the Delta is in dire need of some sort of human intervention and I would support the implementation of the BDCP if its intentions were indeed sincere and the outcome would be as proposed. All in all, my biggest fear is that the effects of this project are being overlooked and catastrophic results will follow the project. I don't want to see a repeat of the Owens valley disaster, I want my home state to remain beautiful through the years and I would like my grandchildren to be able to enjoy the fruits of our state and not have to suffer from the consequences of our actions. The magnitude of this project makes me and many other Californians very nervous because ultimately this project is irreversible and whatever the outcome is we have to live with for the rest of our lives.	<p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
1799	7	If the BDCP gets approved/built and things go horribly wrong, what will be done to counter the effects of the BDCP? Furthermore, who would be responsible and pay for damages?	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA’s requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 3B RDEIR/SDEIS for more information regarding Environmental Commitments.</p> <p>For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p>
1799	8	If the salmon populations continue to decrease after the BDCP, what will be done to prevent total extinction? For delta smelt?	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			CEQA/NEPA process.
1799	9	In the proposal of the project it implies that the Delta is vulnerable to a great number of things including natural disasters or tidal fluctuations, how can this be if the Delta has been around long before humans impacted it? Has it never encountered a natural disaster before? Why all of a sudden is that a big fear?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1799	10	As a civil engineering student I couldn't help but notice some of the infrastructures in the levees were not up to code, shouldn't we be focused on fixing the problems that are currently at hand rather than inducing another potential problem?	Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF.
1799	11	What will happen to the agriculture of northern California if this project destroys wetlands and lowers aquifers?	In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the BDCP seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed BDCP. Please see BDCP EIR/EIS Chapter 7, Groundwater, for a discussion of potential effects on groundwater as a result of implementing the BDCP Please see BDCP EIR/EIS Chapter 12, Terrestrial and Biological Resources, for a discussion of potential effects on wetlands as a result of implementing the BDCP.
1799	12	Lake Oroville, along with many other lakes that extra water will be extracted from, are already extremely low, if California is already in a drought, where is the extra water going to come from?	The action alternatives would only export water allocated to the SWP and CVP under existing water rights, as limited by hydrologic conditions and regulatory requirements issued by the State and federal agencies. The Final EIR/EIS provides a comparison of conditions between action alternatives and the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative under long-term operations. It is recognized that different SWP and CVP operations would occur during emergency situations, including flood and drought conditions. During droughts less water would be exported in a manner as occurred under the recent drought.
1799	13	What if the promised amount of acre footage of water to contracted agencies is not available? Where will it come from?	SWP and CVP deliver water in accordance with existing water rights and federal, State, and local agency regulatory requirements. Frequently, compliance with these requirements results in reductions in SWP and CVP

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>water contract deliveries including periods with no deliveries under some alternatives, as shown in Part 13 of Appendix 5A, Section C, Modeling Results, of the Final EIR/EIS. Under the range of alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS full contract amounts are not delivered in the majority of times to the SWP and CVP water contractors, as presented in Figures C-13-1 through C-13-13 in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS.</p>
1799	14	<p>If conditions for northern California agriculture continue to get worse after the BDCP is in place, what will be done to prevent the loss of farmland in Northern California?</p>	<p>The proposed BDCP aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish.</p> <p>See Master Response 18 for more information regarding BDCP agricultural impact mitigation. Please see Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the EIR/EIS, for discussion of potential effects on agricultural production and employment in the Delta.</p>
1799	15	<p>Assuming that everything goes according to plan and the BDCP does fulfill the proposed requirements; will the BDCP actually be more sustainable than the current state of the Delta?</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach and are no longer pursuing the BDCP as the proposed project. Instead, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.
1799	16	The universal question I would like ask is: is the BDCP really necessary? Are there no better ideas to follow? Is this really the solution to our problem? What if it is not? How will it be fixed if it is a gigantic failure?	Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the Draft EIR/EIS, describes many of the challenges that led to the creation of the project. The project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from 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. Fifteen alternatives and three new sub-alternatives were analyzed extensively in the Draft EIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS (to analyze the now preferred California WaterFix Project), respectively. Other proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix 3A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. For a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives, refer to the following Master Responses: Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development, Tunnel Option), Master Response 6 (Desalination/Demand Management in BDCP), Master Response 7 (Desalination), and Master Response 37 (Storage).
1799	17	The BDCP document is obsessively long, convoluted, hard to follow, misleading, and extremely confusing. It makes me feel like this was intentional to prevent people from opposing it. It seems as though it doesn't matter what people say and think, that the plan will continue anyways. The fact that the BDCP has somehow become exempt from the regulations provided by state and federal policies makes me very uncomfortable and I propose that further research is to be conducted and displayed in an understandable way so that an accurate public review is possible.	<p>The proposed project is a joint RDEIR/SDEIS prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. Before the selection and approval of an alternative considered, the Lead Agencies must comply with the necessary state and federal environmental review requirements. This document, along with the BDCP Draft EIR/EIS, and expected Final EIR/EIS are intended to provide sufficient CEQA and NEPA support for approval of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives for either compliance strategy. As implementation of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives will require permits and approvals from public agencies other than the Lead Agencies, the CEQA and NEPA documents are prepared to support the various public agency permit approvals and other discretionary decisions. These other public agencies are referred to as responsible agencies and 20 trustee agencies under CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15381 and 15386) and cooperating agencies under NEPA (e.g., USACE and EPA).</p> <p>For more information please see 1.1.5 of Section 1 introduction of the RDERI/SDEIS.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt #	Comment	Response
			<p>For information pertaining to the size and complexity of the document, please refer to Master Response 38. Please refer to Master Response 40 and Master Response 41 for comments related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement.</p>