

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1850	1	As a participatory stakeholder who has attended at least 15 public information meetings re: BDCP process, I want to acknowledge, recognize the superb work that the BDCP staff from the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) has performed to respond consistently to the BDCP stakeholders' concerns, inquiries about both the BDCP/EIR/EIS during the past 3 years. For example, they were quick to reformat the online website to make it easier for online users to obtain relevant materials re: BDCP process in a transparent manner; this writer particularly appreciated the multiple brochures which clarified valuable information as well as made it easier for the ordinary person to understand bilingually the BDCP process in a non-technical framework with countless graphs as well as colorful pictures. So, that I thank again both Mr. Jerry Meral and his BDCP staff for their outstanding help with regards to my stakeholder's interests in both the BDCP and associated EIR/EIS.	Lead agencies appreciate the commenter's interest in the BDCP/California. 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.
1850	2	Even though I realized that the amount of water flow was reduced from 15K CFU [sic CFS] to 9K CFU [sic CFS] during the BDCP discussions with regards to the water flowing through the dual-tunnel conveyance system, I still do not understand why the tunnels need to be constructed underground rather than above ground from an engineering viewpoint. While, I am still concerned that the realignment of the underground tunnels will impact eventually the Sandhill cranes & associate species in the State public lands within the Staten Island area.	Please see Master Response 17 which provides additional information on the Greater Sandhill crane.
1850	3	Considering the increasing drought and socioeconomic impacts to our agricultural lands within Solano County, I would like to encourage both the BDCP staff and the Delta Stewardship Council to work cooperatively with both our governmental agencies such Department of Resource Management (Solano County) as well as local farmers, land/property owners, urban/rural residents to expedite the BDCP and associated EIR/EIR process in both fair and impartial manner. While, clarifying the necessary funding sources to implement the BDCP restoration with regards to water-usage in an equitable method; based proportionally on the heavy water-users.	Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the proposed project.
1850	4	Reflecting on the Bus trip (April 17-18, 2014) with the BDCP independent scientific panel/board with regards the scientific criteria to preserving the targeted fishes such as Delta/Longfin Smelts, Chinook Salmons, Sacramento Splittail, Central Valley Steelhead fishes and associated species such as Western Pond Turtle within the Bay Delta waterways such as Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers as well as its tributaries, I would strongly suggest that an effective state-wide water conservation plan be simultaneously implemented and continued to reinforce the restoration efforts to improve the Bay Delta (or regional Bay Deltas) and anticipate environmental problems such as levee deterioration, increasing salinity, as well as climatic changes within the BDCP project site during its 50-year period.	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.
1851	1	This is a hugely expensive solution to a simple problem... slow the planting of agricultural crops that require 80% of CA's water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS were raised.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1852	1	<p>Regarding the Delta Tunnels and the incredible expense of the construction and maintenance of them to supply the increasing water demands of Southern California, it would be reasonable to ask that an unbiased comparison to the installation and operation of a desalinization plant has been considered. With Southern California so close to the clear blue water of the ocean (unlike the sediment ridden waters of Northern California and the bay/Delta region) it does not make much sense to incur the costs of these additional tunnels and their maintenance much less the destruction of land and marine ecosystems. There are already pipelines from the Delta region to Southern California which are obviously unsustainable. Cabo San Lucas, Mexico has been using modular desalinization technology to make clean drinking water from the ocean for 10+ years with claims of 95% efficiency and is modular to keep up with increased future demand. Please check out their web site at http://www.energyrecovery.com/cabo-san-lucas-desalination-plant-mexico Desalinization technology is proving its sustainability in other countries. Shouldn't this kind of science be utilized in California, a front-runner in technological advancement?</p>	<p>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 explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including Initial Screening Conveyance Alternative B7, which included desalination, and other similar concepts. Alternative B7 was not evaluated in detail in the EIR/EIS because the effectiveness of this alternative would depend upon the capacity of the desalination facility (could be several square miles in size), with the intake along the San Joaquin River shoreline extending several miles. This could result in substantial impacts on land use. In addition, desalination would result in substantial energy use and, absent the development of practicable “green” power sources that could replace fossil fuel inputs, substantial greenhouse gas emissions. Such emissions could undermine California’s ability to meet its legislative mandate under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 to reduce the state’s 2020 greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. The ability to divert water in the western Delta could be limited due to the presence of Delta Smelt in the western Delta.</p> <p>Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The BDCP/California WaterFix is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p>
1853	1	<p>I see no reason to send more water to SoCal. I watched the news today & saw water being totally wasted. I understand it was broken pipe but it makes no difference to me. We use our water to support crop growth to keep our farmers in business. We cannot water crops with salt water & without our farmers, everyone in the state will be in trouble. The salmon and other fish will die, wildlife will suffer, and on & on.....I think so cal should look into desalination programs.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Refer to the following Master Responses regarding water deliveries south of the Delta: 14 (Water Quality), 35 (MWD Water Supply), 43 (Water Transfers), 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), 32 (Water Rights Issues), and 28 (Operational Criteria). In response to other issues raised by the commenter, refer to Master Response 5 (Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities). Also, refer to the RDEIR/SEIS including Sections 4, 5, and Appendix A (e.g., Chapter 11 [Fish and Aquatic Resources], Chapter 12 [Terrestrial Biological Resources], and Chapter 14 [Agricultural Resources]). The Lead Agencies acknowledge the discussion of community character in Chapter 16 of the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State. Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B describes the potential for additional water storage, and Appendix 1C describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the project, they are important tools in managing California’s water resources. See the following Master Responses: 4 (Selection of Alternatives Analyzed), 6 (Demand management), 7 (Desalination), and 37 (Storage).</p>
1854	1	<p>Sorry don't want the tunnels</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.</p>
1855	1	<p>Please let the Sacramento River flow through the entire Delta before it is pumped south. Instead of the tunnels, create a core superlevee channel and greatly improved fish screens at Byron. Install an anti-back flow gate as used in Europe to prevent saltwater back flow during any emergency. The flow of ample fresh flushing water through the Delta absolutely vital to the health of the Delta's ecosystem and economic health. The Delta is a treasure for all Californians -- indeed, all Americans -- and must be preserved and restored. The peripheral tunnel plan does precisely the opposite.</p>	<p>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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1856	1	Your EIR process has been a secretive, closed-door, unethical sham. No tunnels to divert Sacramento River freshwater to places where it does not belong.	The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree with the assertion that the documentation is “a secretive, closed-door, unethical sham” by the commenter. The documentation generated by this project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]). Refer to Chapter 32 (Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination) in the Draft EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 (Public Outreach Adequacy). Alternative 4A, also known as the California WaterFix Project, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative (see Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS). The Draft EIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS do analyze the project’s impacts to the Delta the documentation, e.g., impacts to rivers/water flows can be found in Chapter 6 (Surface Waters) in the Draft EIR/EIS and in Sections 4 and 5 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, along with Appendix A (Chapter 6) also of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The remaining issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
1857	1	Your EIR process has been a sham. No tunnels. Period. No tunnels to divert Sacramento River freshwater to places where it does not belong.	The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree with the assertion that the documentation is “a sham” by the commenter. The documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]). Refer to Chapter 32 (Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination) in the Draft EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 (Public Outreach Adequacy). Alternative 4A, also known as the California WaterFix Project, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative (see Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS). The Draft EIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS do analyze the project’s impacts to the Delta the documentation, e.g., impacts to rivers/water flows can be found in Chapter 6 (Surface Waters) in the Draft EIR/EIS and in Sections 4 and 5 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, along with Appendix A (Chapter 6) also of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The remaining issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S documentation.
1858	1	No tunnels. Period. No tunnels to divert Sacramento River freshwater to places where it does not belong.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S documentation.
1859	1	I support the No Action Alternative. We need a plan that restores resiliency to the Delta. That's a long road but perhaps not longer than this huge BDCP document.	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, 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>
1860	1	<p>The proposed changing of the regulations will have dramatic negative effects, if implemented.</p> <p>I am employed at Sweeney's Sports located in Napa. Thirty percent of Sweeney's business is involved with Large Mouth Bass and Striper fishing. This nearly fifty year old, family owned business has nine employees. It is likely that if the Large Mouth and Stripers are eliminated, Sweeney's will also be eliminated.</p> <p>Stripers, Large Mouth, Salmon and Steelhead have co-habituated in the Delta for over 130</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.</p> <p>The proposed project does not propose to eliminate stripers or other sportfish from the Delta. In fact, that is likely impossible to do. Rather, the proposal is to evaluate the potential for removing these predatory fish from specific locations during juvenile salmon migration to improve the potential for these salmonids to successfully migrate out to the ocean.</p> <p>EC 15: Localized Reduction of Predatory Fishes (Predator Control) would reduce populations of predatory</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>years.</p> <p>What is the science that has indicated that if these two fish are removed, the Salmon and Steelhead numbers will rebound?</p>	<p>fishes at locations of high predation risk (i.e., predation hotspots) associated with construction and operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities. Implementation of this action would be consistent with the revised description of Conservation Measure 15 (see Appendix 11F, Substantive BDCP Revisions); however, for the purposes of Alternatives 4A, 2D and 5A, this action would be applied only to the reach of the Sacramento River adjacent to the north Delta intakes and to Clifton Court Forebay. Environmental Commitment 15 would remove predator refuge habitat and reduce predator abundance in the construction areas. At a minimum, Environmental Commitment 15 will target the removal of an amount of predator refuge commensurate with the amount that may be created by construction of water conveyance facilities. These measures are expected to fully mitigate any indirect effect on predation rates associated with construction and operations.</p>
1861	1	<p>Another canal diverting water from the Sacramento River is not solving our drought problem. If there is no rain, the reservoirs are not going to be filled. The main beneficiaries of this project are the contractors who build the project, the politicians who support it and Southern California.</p>	<p>The main issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation. The project process has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project would stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.</p>
1861	2	<p>Desalinization can solve our drought problems in the near time frame. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not the solution. Desalinization plants will provide water long term and nearer term than the rain dependent reservoirs. It will also create jobs throughout the state. It will save our agricultural industry in the nearer term. We need water from desalinization plants throughout California as they have done in Australia, Israel, Saudi Arabia and even El Paso Texas.</p>	<p>See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions.</p>
1862	1	<p>In researching information compiled pertaining to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan I see the Proposed Action (Tunnels) is in direct conflict with the California Water Code 85021; Violating the directive to stop reliance on the Delta for water needs. Also the violation of CWC 85021b will negatively impact the Delta as "Place" through the loss of species and habitat.</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 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>
1862	2	<p>The reduction in River flows will allow salt water intrusion into the Delta. Recent reports from the California Water Foundation state the following:</p> <p>The state's growing groundwater overdraft problems have resulted in a number of adverse consequences, including saltwater intrusion. Furthermore; Failure to provide meaningful ground water management will also increase energy costs due to pumping from greater depths, environmental degradation, and land subsidence that results in costly damage to infrastructure.</p>	<p>As noted by the comment, because salinity-related parameters have the potential to be altered by the project alternatives, these parameters, including bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity were analyzed in detail for all alternatives in Chapter 8, Water Quality. The water quality assessment addresses effects of changes in salinity on agricultural and fish and wildlife resources due to the project alternatives via the EC assessment (Impact WQ-11) through evaluation of compliance with agricultural and fish and wildlife objectives in the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and degradation relative to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. Similarly effects to drinking water uses are addressed via the changes in chloride concentrations in Impact WQ-7. In addition, the assessment of bromide (Impact WQ-5), another salinity-related parameter, addresses effects to drinking water uses via assessing concentrations relative to relevant thresholds and degradation. Where significant impacts to beneficial uses would occur due to the alternative, as opposed to other forces including climate change and sea level rise, mitigation to lessen those</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			impacts is provided.
1862	3	<p>The BDCP 7.10.3, pgs. 7-21 Funding: Fails to adequately identify funding and wrongfully expects the taxpaying citizenry to accept an empty promise of fiduciary actions in an after-the-fact manner and not in the forthcoming and transparent path that is to be legally expected.</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>
1862	4	<p>The BDCP chapter 7 Impementation Measures: The Authorized Entity Group (AEG) appears to fail to represent all vested interests as well as fails to adequately identify the stakeholders and their interests and ALL affiliations.</p> <p>I have personally witnessed the profound abuse of water resources by Central Valley growers in their use of sprinkler systems during windy days experiencing sustained winds of 20-30 miles an hour. No significant water made it to the intended crops and just blew away.</p> <p>The planting of inappropriate crop products in an arid location defies intelligence, to demand water be diverted from its natural flow in the Delta to support inappropriate farming is counter to best management practices.</p> <p>I am opposed to this proposed project to divert water resources from Northern California to Central and Southern interests who repeatedly demonstrate willful abuse of water resources and wasteful practices.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Authorized Entity Group is to represent those who hold state and federal endangered species permits, not all stakeholders. Stakeholder input will be the purpose of the Stakeholder Council.</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>
1863	1	<p>I wish to comment on the issues with the BDCP.</p> <p>I am not really sure how the "Bay" is effected after reading several chapters and highlights of the document.</p> <p>I grew up in Sacramento and have witnessed the decline of riparian landscape and aquatic life over my 28 years.</p> <p>Currently water in the Sacramento and American rivers is at an all-time low.</p> <p>Simultaneously, farming and wetland around the Sacramento Delta has made a stunning comeback through the efforts of truly sustainable farmers and pioneers in the area.</p>	<p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analyses in the EIR/EIS documentation were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, and as such the 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 project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 for the Purpose and Need of the project.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>UC Davis has contributed significantly to these efforts.</p> <p>I do not support any falsely named "conservation" plans that would divert yet more water from the Sacramento Delta.</p>	
1863	2	<p>I do not believe this will help our salmon populations any. I believe the proposed diversions and construction of the twin tunnels will only cause more damage to already sensitive salmon populations.</p> <p>My friend did some of the research for NOAA (National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration) and California Fish & Game that helped to close the commercial salmon fishing down for a season in 2008. As I am sure you are aware, Chinook numbers were lower than they had been in California's history. Please consider this report from University of the Pacific:</p> <p>"Recently, there has been much discussion in California about the relationship between water and jobs. Water deliveries from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta have been reduced due to drought and environmental protections for fish including salmon that are harmed by the powerful pumps which generate reverse flows on some rivers in the Delta. The decrease in water deliveries resulted in fallowed fields and reduced agricultural production in some areas of the San Joaquin Valley supplied by Delta water. California's salmon fishery was closed in 2008 and 2009 due to collapsing fish populations. The political battle over pumping restrictions has been characterized by some as fish versus farmers.</p> <p>We estimate the salmon fishery closures resulted in the loss of 1,823 jobs and \$118.4 million in income compared to the level of the salmon fishery in 2004 and 2005."</p> <p>We do not need to supply Southern California with more water from the Delta. What needs to happen, is smarter residential and industrial water practices down south, more efficiency, and more sustainable agricultural practices.</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>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>For more information regarding water demand management and purpose and need please see Master Response 6 and 3, respectively.</p>
1863	3	<p>The water in the Delta is a finite resource. This BDCP is essentially the same as not addressing our countries wasteful over reliance of oil, and before addressing efficiency and actual conservation, attempting to pump more of it by drilling in Alaska. The restoration of vernal pools and seasonal wetlands is unlikely to aid the salmon populations, especially no more considering the stressors created by diversions.</p> <p>Please put this project on hold. The water crisis is already bad enough, this will only compound issues and provide a temporary relief.</p> <p>I propose no modifications and no increase to Delta outflow for the time being. This is too grave a project to carry out without the majority of Californians being aware of the issue and having a say in it.</p>	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The BDCP/California WaterFix 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, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p> <p>The Proposed Project would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal.Wat. Code, § 85001(c)). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment at the south Delta export facilities. Adding an additional point of diversion would add flexibility in the way water is conveyed through the Delta, which would provide resiliency and adaptation benefits for dealing with the combined climate change effects of increases in sea level rise and changes in upstream hydrology.</p>
1864	1	<p>We as a state cannot afford such a massive public works project. I would rather we put \$10 billions towards actual water efficiency measures and conservation in agriculture and urban</p>	<p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		settings. That would at least create jobs and actually benefit our sensitive water resources.	<p>facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. 2013 Public Draft Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website.</p> <p>Please see Master response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p> <p>For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.</p>
1864	2	"Paying for the \$25 billion project--which is certain to face years of lawsuits and probably a statewide ballot measure--is also uncertain. State officials say water agencies will pay for about two-thirds of the cost through higher water rates. The rest they project to come from a state water bond on the November 2014 ballot and money from Congress, neither of which is guaranteed."	<p>Please see Master Response 5 regarding the adequacy of the funding strategy for the purpose of the regulatory authorizations under the federal ESA and state NCCP Act. 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 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>
1865	1	Please do not build the Delta Tunnels. It is not the solution for a sound, long-term plan for the health of the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental impact analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
1866	1	I emphatically object to the plan to build the two massive water diversion tunnels. You are about to strangle what is left of the Delta permanently. The proposal to remove striped bass and largemouth bass from the system is ludicrous. The two species have coexisted with salmon and steelhead for 130 years.	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.
1867	1	Save the Delta. This would be the biggest mistake that we could make. Stop trying to change Mother Nature!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental impact analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
1868	1	<p>I would like to iterate and urge you to take the time--as much as is needed--before acting on any of this entire proposal. There are too many crucial decisions that have the real potential to ruin the Delta or, at the very least, create certain obstacles that are part of a domino effect when you are referring to delicate ecosystems.</p> <p>I can only ask that every single one of the issues brought before this governing committee is thoroughly researched, explained and, equally important, understand how the various parts of the plan and Delta will be affected by this linking of the different parts of the Delta ecosystem coupled with the tunnel project and conservation project.</p> <p>What would be extremely sad and detrimental, is if the greed (and don't kid yourself here, where there is massive money spent, there is greed and personal agendas), is allowed to gloss over ANY area of these concerns and components, there is the real potential for disaster, possibly in a way or ways we can't even foretell.</p> <p>Please, Please, Please!....</p>	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. The Lead Agencies have gone beyond what has been required by CEQA and NEPA to allow for a thorough analysis of impacts and proposed mitigations that can be considered by the decision makers, while providing ample opportunities for public participation and discourse.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Take the time to do this right to protect not only the physical landscape of the Delta but, more importantly, the ecosystem of the Delta. AND see clearly the ramifications and try to gain the insight as to the insight of the participants involved.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and implementation of this idea of cautious and fastidious discovery of all facts and mechanisms involved in these projects.</p>	
1869	1	<p>In my experience as CFO of several corporations, the most vital aspect in evaluating any project is the cost. Something might be "good", but the only way to compare it to any other approach is by comparing the costs along with the benefits. I have waited anxiously to the last minute, to see whether the backers of the BDCP would come up with a cost figure. They have not, while opponents have detailed many objections.</p> <p>The only logical conclusion is that (a) nobody really knows the cost, or (b) it is a public funds give-away to those who sponsored it and stand to profit mightily from it. Or both. Until the public knows what they will pay, what the environmental and other costs are, and who will benefit how much, BDCP is a fraud</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>
1870	1	<p>I am a 72 year old lifetime resident of California. I liked the Delta better the way it was when I was a boy. There were many more fish then, and I do not believe any species were endangered. Today many huge trees lining channels have been replaced with rocks. Also, because too much water is being diverted to the south, special dams have been constructed specifically to reduce the amount of salt-water intrusion into the Delta. I understand many farmers are concerned that the salinity of the water they pump to irrigate their crops is increasing. Crops do not grow in soil that is too salty.</p> <p>Now add huge tunnels to further degrade the Delta. Salmon, sturgeon, smelt, and many other animal species are not designed to deal with huge tunnels. Please image yourself a few miles into one of the tunnels. It would be dark beyond compression. I cannot imagine a more hopeless situation.</p> <p>When Teddy Roosevelt set aside the Grand Canyon as a National Park he stated: "Let this great wonder of nature remain as it now is. Do nothing to mar its grandeur, sublimity and loveliness. You cannot improve on it. But what you can do is to keep it for your children, your children's children, and all who come after you, as the one great sight which every American should see."</p> <p>I believe this statement applies equally to the beautiful Delta. The proposed tunnels put the Delta at risk for the sake of water just as the Hetch Hetchy Dam altered the wonders of Little Yosemite Valley.</p> <p>If the tunnels are built, the project will provide high paying jobs for a few years and the workers will no doubt generously thank the tunnel supporters. But when the project is completed, the effects of the tunnels will be around long after the workers have moved on.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. 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. 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), Master Response 4 (Tunnel Alternative), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 14 (Water Quality). In addition, please refer to the RDEIR/SEIS including Sections 4, 5, and Appendix A (e.g., Chapter 6 [Surface Water], Chapter 8 [Water Quality], Chapter 11 [Fish and Aquatic Resources], and Chapter 12 [Terrestrial Biological Resources]). The discussion of community character is in Chapter 16 of the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics), which identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Because the Delta is a national, if not international, treasure, it would be wrong to construct the tunnels without addressing the variety of concerns that many people have expressed. If it is a good idea, and valid arguments can be made for why the tunnels should be built, is there an honest reason why the project should not be voted upon by the citizens of the counties in which the Delta exists? Ask San Franciscans if they like Hetch Hetchy Dam and they probably would say they do, but ask the entire nation if it is right to build a dam in a national park, and the answer would probably be no. The same issue and difference of opinion is true for the Delta.</p>	
1871	1	<p>I attended one of the public information meetings and studied the DVD along with many editorial pieces about the proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan.</p> <p>To my mind, the most important factor in resolving California's water problem is greater storage. Our water supply is variable, so we need to store water during the wet years to carry us through the dry ones. This plan makes no provision to increase storage, only to speed the transit of water from northern to southern California. This would be accomplished at great cost, fiscally and environmentally, at a time when California can afford neither.</p> <p>In short, we cannot guarantee delivery of water downstream unless it exits upstream. Even if this plan could achieve all of its projected benefits while simultaneously avoiding all destructive consequences it would fail to address the underlying reality of a variable water supply.</p> <p>The benefits are not worth the cost and the risks are large. I oppose this plan.</p>	<p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 37 for further information regarding water storage.</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. While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the FEIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 37 for further information regarding water storage.</p> <p>Please see the BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx), which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial net economic benefit to the State of California. An updated cost/benefit analysis is currently being conducted for the current preferred Alternative, 4A.</p>
1872	1	<p>Any plan that recommends killing striped and black bass as part of a "recovery" is misguided. The problem is not the fish swimming around in the Delta -- it is the people taking all the water out of the Delta that are the problem. The tunnels are just the latest effort to destroy the Delta to get more water for farmers and Southern California and the BDCP seems to be content to just blame it on the fish so that once the fish are all gone, the fishermen will be too and nobody will complain about more water leaving the Delta.</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 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>
1873	1	<p>We are strenuous in our objection to the background engineering work and the socio/economic work that exists for the Delta Water Diversion. Little to no work has been researched and communicated regarding the displacement of the HUMANS living in the Delta and the impact that tunnel building will have. We do not consider a 10-year project as</p>	<p>The chapter also uses "short-term" and "long-term" to describe the temporary (e.g. not permanent), durations of construction. Additionally, the RDEIR/SDEIS analysis includes updated construction durations.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		having short-term impact on the lives of those Californians directly impacted.	
1874	1	I have serious concerns regarding the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Taking fresh water out of the Delta does not conserve the vital resource that is necessary for the ecology and economic stability of Stockton/Sacramento area. We need the fresh water for farms that are here. The food/crops that are grown here are vital to our society and our world. This so called "conservation plan" does not give us any new fresh water; it just takes it all away from us. This project is a big waste of money and time. We need to implement water conservation measures.	All of the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. 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, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
1875	1	I am writing to provide support for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and its coequal goals of protecting the environment and providing for human use. We must invest in our infrastructure to provide water reliability for 25 million people. The San Joaquin Valley has been devastated by drought and lack of water conveyance and storage to meet the needs of the environment and its people. As a young professional who travels the nation, I have considered moving to another part of the country not faced with so many economic, regulatory, and resource challenges. BDCP is a step in the right direction, but we must also invest in aboveground water storage, specifically Temperance Flat Dam, water banking, and robust conservation measures.	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The BDCP/California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. 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, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</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.</p>
1876	1	I could write pages of specific comments on the Draft BDCP and EIR/EIS. You have already read them all. So I will just say as a 78 year old man, who spent over 50 years as a professional engineer, these documents do not make sense as a way to protect the Delta or provide any additional water to the Water Districts who want it. Less expensive alternatives were not seriously evaluated. Some of these would provide added earthquake protection to the Delta levees, and could provide better fish and habitat protection. Costs are not completely paid for by the water contractors, as advertised. Costs are not honestly presented, as the taxpayer will pick up much of the mitigation cost. The Delta farmers and residents will pay by losing their livelihood and quality of life for many years.	<p>The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree about the inadequacy of the documentation. On the contrary, the preparation and processing of the documentation are in compliance with state and federal environmental planning laws and regulations. For example, documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]). Since 2006, the BDCP(Alternative 4) and subsequently the California WaterFix Project (Alternative 4A) have been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Refer to Chapter 32 (Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination) in the Draft EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 (Public Outreach Adequacy). Fifteen alternatives and three new sub-alternatives were analyzed extensively in the Draft EIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS, respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the environmental documentation: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. 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. The process and evaluation by the Lead Agencies to develop and screen alternatives are in the following Master Responses: 4 (Alternatives Development, Tunnel Option), 6 (Desalination/Demand Management), 7 (Desalination), and 37 (Storage).Furthermore, the documentation was prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal ESA and the state NCCPA, and is environmentally beneficial to the region. Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS describe the geology and seismicity of the study area. Based on preliminary data, it is anticipated that the Delta tunnels can be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. For information on tunnel design, see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report. Additionally, Appendix 3E of the Draft EIR/EIS discusses the potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action scenario and Master Response 16 explains related seismic activity. The Delta ecosystem is in steep decline, which jeopardizes the Delta's ability to provide water</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>supplies and support fisheries. Over the last 150 years, the Delta has been altered by a system of manmade levees, reservoirs, and dredged waterways constructed to support farming and urban development and to provide flood protection for local towns and cities. Hence, the Delta is threatened by continuing land subsidence and flooding. These critical issues are discussed in Appendix 6A and Master Response 16 (Seismic Issues and Subsidence). Chapter 5, Effects Analysis describes the anticipated effects of the Plan on covered fish and wildlife species in consideration of the covered activities, included changes in outflow. Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Draft EIR/EIS, describe effects of the project and several alternatives on fish and wildlife species in the Plan Area (see also Section 4 and Appendix A-Chapters 11 and 12 in the RDEIR/SDEIS).</p> <p>Refer to RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigations for a complete analysis on important farmland in the Delta that in turn would be of concern to affected farmers. (Also refer to Master Response 18). Socioeconomic effects of the alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16 of the Draft EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State.</p>
1877	1	<p>The Bay Delta Conservation Plan appears to select winners and losers. The winners are the people who are supplied with water from the Central Valley Project, most particularly farmers in the southern half of the Central Valley who use most of the water diverted from the Delta. The losers are the people who live around the Delta whose water quality will decrease (particularly Delta farmers), who will bear the hardships of construction, and who will never benefit from the water diversion of the tunnels. The people of the Delta are already suffering from increased salinity due to the drought and current pumping into the Central Valley Project. The problem of salt in our water will only be exacerbated by pumping freshwater away from the Delta.</p>	<p>The action alternatives were developed to provide more reliable water deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in accordance with their existing water rights and water quality requirements issued by the State Water Resources Control Board. Water rights of senior water rights holders, including those in the Delta, would not be changed under the action alternatives. However, as described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, salinity would increase in the Delta with or without the proposed project due to climate change and sea level rise. Additional salinity increases also would occur in some months due to implementation of any of the action alternatives.</p> <p>For more information regarding salinity please see Master Response 14.</p>
1877	2	<p>The Delta is a sensitive ecological zone that has been changed and disturbed by human habitation for decades. It is likely to be the site of a natural disaster in the upcoming century. There are hundreds of miles of levees that are keeping water off of what was once marshland. Due to subsidence, a majority of the Delta islands are below sea level. There is abundant seismic activity near the Delta. It would appear that the best reason for building the tunnels would be to prevent the loss of water to southern California when a natural disaster, such as sea level rise or severe earthquake, strikes the Delta. However, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan does little to avert a disaster in the Delta and does nothing to protect the people living in the Delta from natural disaster.</p>	<p>Although the Plan does not purport to provide seismic upgrades of levees and other infrastructure, it nevertheless does intend to reduce the vulnerability of the water delivery system by making it less reliant upon the Delta levee system (and associated risks thereto).</p>
1877	3	<p>Back in April 2000, the U.S. Geological Survey publication "Delta Subsidence in California" proposed several strategies for how to combat subsidence, including shallow or deep water flooding. Shallow water flooding and soil deposition could reverse the trend of subsidence, and flooding with freshwater would decrease the danger of large levee breaches. It seems possible to me that methods could be developed for sustainable agriculture in the Delta that would not exacerbate the dangers of subsidence. The Bay Delta Conservation Plan does nothing to conserve the Delta -- rather it would protect the recipients of the Central Valley Project at the expense of the Delta ecosystem and the people living there.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 Chapter 2 of the FEIR/EIS for the project purpose and need. The proposed project intends to increase water supply reliability in the threat of climate change, sea level rise, and seismic events, while reducing the stress the existing water conveyance system has on the Delta ecosystem.</p>
1877	4	<p>The Bay Delta Conservation Plan does not develop any new sources of water. It is generally recognized that there is a fixed supply of water in California, and the amount is likely to decrease in the years to come due to climate change. Rather than investing heavily in a plan that would deplete the Delta, we should invest in strategies to recycle and use desalinated water. Both of these strategies would increase the water available to the people of California. Recycling has been shown to be the least expensive source for water, but desalination has proved to be a successful strategy for a number of countries in the Middle East. The way of the future for California should be to develop sources of water that are sustainable and capable of increasing with our population. Draining and destroying the Delta ecosystem is not our only choice.</p>	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
1878	1	<p>The BDCP rises as one of the most important [projects] California has undertaken yet this century and yet most Californians do not know a lot about it despite the very high total cost of the project. Yet not enough Californians are informed of the benefits versus the costs of the Twin Tunnels taxpayer-funded part of project, the delayed introduction to conservation measures in the plan, and the missing treatment of connected Bays. Surely the BDCP deserves to be rejected in its current version.</p> <p>California needs a plan that uses our precious taxes, fees, and benefits more wisely in our warming world. Indeed, the world is looking to us for the smart and efficient ways to provide water and food for all. The BDCP would be a great setback compared to what we can do with \$50,000,000,000 dollars. As for conservation and water management, farming should shift just as the species your not doing enough to maintain are doing.</p> <p>So please do not let your opinions be swindled by the big money interests in this debate. We, the informed people, know they want "their water" even with such a wasteful and unhelpful plan. And why not, they do not have to pay their fair share under the BDCP! Instead, they probably figure they can buy public servants for a lot cheaper!</p> <p>Well, please do not let that happen!</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>
1879	1	<p>I am a new arrival in California (2011), and only recently discovered this huge proposal, so my review is quite limited. However, I am an Oakley resident and strongly endorse the recommendation the City has submitted to you, in particular, the lack of formal and long-term community representation in this process. Along with my friends and neighbors, I am opposed to the project's obvious negative environmental impacts on this huge ecological area. Even a cursory screening of the list of biological species concerned demonstrates the very cursory view of species impacts. Simply avoiding an evaluation of migratory waterfowl, let alone the numerous species of migratory birds that pass through the area because they are currently not endangered or threatened expresses shortsightedness on the part of the reviewers.</p>	<p>Analysis of impacts to biological species is provided in Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDIES as well as Chapter 12 of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and includes the analysis the commenter is seeking.</p>
1879	2	<p>I was also rather stunned at the clandestine way the project was introduced to the reader as a "Conservation Plan" when the clear goal of the project is to send water south to large,</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 supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta; make</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>wealthy agricultural interests without so much as a mention in the introduction. That to me reflects disdain for the taxpayer who has already been burdened with huge bills over the past 100 years primarily to benefit a relative few large landowners and lined the pockets of benefitted legislators. This project represents a sham of the highest order. Perhaps a reference to the book, "Cadillac Desert" by Marc Reisner should be referenced in the plan and EIS?</p>	<p>Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP; and improve portions of the Delta ecosystem, as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS. The proposed project, like the SWP, would be funded by the water users. 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.</p>
1880	1	<p>With reference to EIR/EIS chapters 22 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases), 24 (Hazards and hazardous Materials), 25 (Public Health), and 29 (Climate Change), I ask that the BDCP staff examine the potential for BDCP-related construction and maintenance activities over the 50 year Plan period to add to the risk of increased incidence of Valley Fever (coccidioidomycosis) among both construction workers and Delta residents and visitors. Valley Fever, a soil-borne fungal infection, can cause life-long debilitation and death. According to information available from the California Department of Public Health, Division of Communicable Disease Control, Valley Fever is already present in the counties of the BDCP Plan Area. (See "Valley Fever Fact Sheet" September 2013 and "What you need to know about Valley Fever in California" May 2014.) Although the area of highest incidence in California now begins just south of the Delta and extends south to Kern and San Luis Obispo counties, the EIR/EIS should examine whether with the higher temperatures brought by climate change this highest incidence area could move north into the BDCP Plan Area. Any activities which disturb soil, such as construction of and/or management of habitat areas and construction and use of unpaved roads, can heighten the risk of infection of "anyone who lives, works, or visits" a Valley Fever area. ("Valley Fever Fact Sheet" - see also "Prison disease price tag may rise" The Sacramento Bee, July 28, 2014). Possible mitigations might include monitoring of soil, air, disease incidence, use of N95 masks or respirators, dust suppression actions, and public education for Delta visitors, residents, and those engaged in BDCP construction activities.</p>	<p>Impact AQ-18 in Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, evaluates potential exposure of sensitive receptors to <i>Coccidioides immitis</i> (Valley Fever). As shown in Table 22-22, Valley Fever is present throughout the Plan Area. However, the presence of <i>C. immitis</i> in the Plan Area does not guarantee that construction activities would result in increased incidence of Valley Fever, or that exposed individuals will become ill. Nevertheless, Impact AQ-18 acknowledges that earthmoving activities during construction could release <i>C. immitis</i> spores if filaments are present and other soil chemistry and climatic conditions are conducive to spore development. Implementation of advanced air-district recommended fugitive dust controls outlined in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, would avoid dusty conditions and reduce the risk of contracting Valley Fever through routine watering and other controls. Occupational exposure to Valley Fever would be addressed through compliance with Cal/OSHA rules for injury and illness prevention programs (IIPPs), control of harmful exposure, and respiratory protection.</p>
1881	1	<p>The Bay Delta Conservation Project (BDCP), also known as the "Twin Tunnel Project", is in its basic function, a plan developed and supported by numerous private, corporate, State, Federal and NGO organizations to move and divert Northern California water. The BDCP states that this is a "long-term strategy to secure California's water supplies and improve the ecosystem of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta." [footnote 1: see: Fast Facts of the BDCP http://goo.gl/ioY2Nx] They reason that there are Co-Equal goals for the project, to improve water supply and to restore San Francisco Bay Delta ecosystems.</p> <p>Our position is that 30 miles of water tunnels will negatively impact the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and Northern California aquatic wildlife ecology now, and for generations to come. Killing and destroying fish and aquatic life, wildlife, and infiltrating 30 miles plus of land mass as a means to divert water to large scale agribusiness and Southern California water districts is short sighted and is an unsustainable method of caring for our water, watershed ecology and natural resources living far beyond the Sacramento Delta.</p>	<p>The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances or controlling what crops should be planted). Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS or the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1881	2	<p>The Bay Delta Conservation Project claims that the following benefits will improve water supply and Bay Delta ecosystems: [footnote 2: California Department of Water Resources: http://www.water.ca.gov/tribal/bdcp.cfm]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure water supplies for a "vast" part of California economy from the Bay Area to San Diego and more than 3 million acres of farmland - Create and protect jobs: Boost the economy by \$84 billion dollars 	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts. As such, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, 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>Please refer to Master Response 5 for information pertaining to costs and funding.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>- Ecosystem Restoration for Delta fish and wildlife</p> <p>These claims deserve our utmost attention and concern.</p> <p>In securing water supplies for a "vast" part of California economy, what is the actual cost? The foundational economic goods and services of a healthy Bay Delta ecosystem include clean water, exclusion of salt water infiltration, rich land mass, food, beauty, recreation, tourism and many other benefits that sustain healthy Bay Delta communities.</p> <p>The study that states that creating and protecting jobs will boost the "economy" by \$84 billion dollars. Nature provides a wide array of market and non-market benefits to society, ranging from recreational and scenic qualities, to extractive uses such as fishing, farming, production of oxygen for the air we breathe. All Northern and Central California Tribes, planners, watershed managers, forest owners, natural resource agencies, scholars and businesses must be included in the research and communication process to adequately determine the value of nature's capital assets.</p> <p>In stating that ecosystem restoration for Delta fish and wildlife will be enhanced, do the majority the aforementioned voices Tribes, planners, watershed managers, flood rush managers, forest owners, natural resources agencies, etcetera, agree?</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 32 in the EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP).</p>
1881	3	<p>Social Alliance Network also ask that National Marine Fisheries Service not support this proposal to disrupt the long term sustainability of this watershed and associated ecosystems.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental impact analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.</p>
1882	1	<p>I am adding my comments to the many I am sure you have received regarding the BDCP plans. Since the management of those who wrote the plan made it so difficult to read what is exactly in the plan it has taken a great deal of effort for the public to be aware of what is included in the plan. This is both devious and undemocratic. The public deserves to have full disclosure on both the actual plan and the unintended consequences. At that point, public meetings and public comment periods should be opened.</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. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Chapter 2 of the FEIR/EIS and Master Response 3.</p>
1882	2	<p>I am a resident of El Cerrito and have lived in San Francisco, Berkeley, or El Cerrito for 70 years. I have spent 65 years on the Sacramento River during the summer and have watched and experienced the changes in the Northern Delta. There have been a number of them, all as result of previous water engineering projects. The BDCP plan at this time is one more of these. The previous changes in water movements that were engineered to send water to The South are basically the cause of the negative changes in the Delta.</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 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).</p>
1882	3	<p>Now you want to reengineer the water by adding tunnels that will drain the water out just below Sacramento that will cause the unintended consequences of loss of water to North Delta farmers, fishermen, recreational boaters . As well Northern California water users will be losing their fresh water supply in order to supply water to other parts of the State. Why do plan another source of water for other parts of the state.</p>	<p>The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. The project would stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Hence, under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the ESA, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			channels dry, including the Sacramento River. For other issues raised by the commenter, refer to the following Master Responses: Master Response 28 (Operational Criteria), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), Master Response 25 (Upstream Reservoir Effects), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place). The proposed project does consider impacts to recreation. Chapter 15 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses water dependent recreational activities that occur in the Delta, and describes mitigation measures and environmental commitments designed to reduce effects.
1882	4	This plan and the tunnels will be very costly... I notice that water districts that receive this water plan to pay a large part of the cost.does this not tell us that these groups will benefit and others will lose greatly. Or does this not tell us that these groups control the political power that is pushing this plan through . Conservation and environmental protection should not be controlled by money and politics.	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.
1882	5	Think about spending the same amount of money on desalination plants before you ruin the Northern Delta.	Although components such as desalination plants and water demand management have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project cannot impose obligations on third parties that are not applicants under 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.
1883	1	The Bay Delta Conservation Plan is a ridiculously long document that addresses 50-year "solutions" to some of the major issues of concern such as management for endangered species within the California Delta, fulfillment of agricultural river diversions, and fulfillment of water supply for the southern Delta's 'consumption. I do not believe the implementation of waterways and large tunnels will be beneficial to the latter issues on the long term basis. Based on some of my knowledge and experiences at the delta reservoirs that were created, I can say that these type of projects only harm our landscapes and affect the natural regimes of the planet.	Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. With respect to the length of the documentation, refer to Master Response 38. The remaining comments do not raise any environmental issue related to the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS or the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1883	2	The California Delta has been managed as a tidal/freshwater system for over 70 years. This has declined the ecological productivity of the Delta, altered water flows, and affected the fish and habitat availability due to levee construction and channelization. I don't believe that continuing to alter out freshwater by routing and timing the water flows will improve these conditions , since it leads to the need for many other efforts.	The Delta ecosystem is indeed in steep decline, which jeopardizes the Delta's ability to provide water supplies and support fisheries. Over the last 150 years, the Delta has been altered by a system of manmade levees, reservoirs, and dredged waterways constructed to support farming and urban development and to provide flood protection for local towns and cities. The natural flows in the Delta also are altered by operation of the SWP and CVP, which deliver water to millions of Californians. Refer to Appendix 6A for further information. The now preferred California WaterFix Project is designed to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation.
1883	3	After reading some of the proposed activities of the BDCP, I can see why the plan wants to be put into effect. The debate between the needs to improve the water supply reliability or protecting the endangered fish and habitats is controversial. I think this debate is redundant because we wouldn't have to be in this situation if there would have been appropriate water regulations and maintenance based on traditional knowledge of our waterways. Water is a sacred source to all species, the fact that anthropogenic modifications are consuming the landscape only brings more issues to the availability of it, and increases our	<p>Although some critics of the project have been keen to liken the proposal to the The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.</p> <p>Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is subject to the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>dependence and demand for it even more.</p> <p>If we look back on our history, we can see that a similar situation took place with the creation of the Los Angeles Aqueduct and the draining of Owens Lake. The applications and description of alternatives only sound to me like another recipe for degradation of the landscapes and water transfer to millions of users.</p>	<p>reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. Many of these efforts are highlighted in Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, which describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives development, water demand management, and purpose and need please see Master Response 4, Master Response 6, and Master Response 3.</p> <p>For other issues raised by the commenter, see the following Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 31 (Compliance with Delta Reform Act), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
1883	4	<p>From some of the proposed activities, one that highly concerns me is the excerpt about activities to reduce methylmercury contamination. It is upsetting to see how the contamination of the water is becoming a problem in some areas, I don't think this is fair to native fish species. I have read many articles, some of which include analyses on Chinook Salmon in the Central Valley (Merz and Moyle 2006) and management for ecotoxicological considerations due to municipal discharges into streams (Brooks et al. 2006), and can only see the continued decline of other populations.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 14 regarding the effects of the proposed project on methylmercury.</p>
1883	5	<p>Another proposed BDCP Activity that I have concerns about is the habitat restoration, creation, enhancement and management activities proposal. I think that there is only so much you can try to manage in restore compared to the magnitude of the facility sites.</p>	<p>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.</p>
1884	1	<p>The current state of the BDCP is a document designed to dissuade and fool concerned citizens of the Central Valley in regard to the health of the Delta. In its current form the BDCP is a behemoth document of impractical size, a physical copy would be an eleven-foot tall document. The size of the documents is only the surface of the actually shortcomings of the BDCP, the content is a mixed bag of political jargon and political persuasion.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 38 for comments pertaining to the readability and length of the document. To aid readers, the lead agencies posted online documents highlighting important aspects of the BDCP and the EIR/EIS. They produced 17 informational webinar episodes regarding the BDCP and EIR/EIS that were available online, distributed one-page factsheets throughout the comment period, and conducted open house meetings throughout California.</p> <p>Please see 1.1.4 Section 1 of the RDEIR/SDEIS for the updated project objectives and purpose and need.</p>
1884	2	<p>The BDCP identifies urban advancement over wild habitat in the Delta as an increase of spatial diversity and complexity, which is just about as close to a lie as possible. Urban</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		development of riparian wetlands creates a disturbance that introduces invasive species, species that are quick to dominate an area, which develops into a monoculture (Park, 2004). [footnote 1: Park, K. (2004). Assessment and management of invasive alien predators. Ecology and Society, 9(2), 2060-2068.]	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.
1884	3	As if demolition of the little remaining wetlands in the Central Valley was not enough damage, the BDCP is seeking out to receive incidental take permits, which allow the destruction of threatened and endangered species due to "incidental" damage from covered construction. What the BDCP also fails to reveal about incidental take permits is that the issuing agencies often provide incidental take permits without major scientific input in almost ninety percent of take permits issued.	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.
1884	4	The BDCP is convoluted plan between the water agencies and water contractors to continue to profit on the destruction of wetlands in the Central Valley.	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.
1884	5	The delta smelt is a critical species to riparian wildlife and removing water in no way benefits this species, additionally current river capacity in the Central Valley barely reaches capacity to support a salmon run.	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.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1884	6	I fail to see how any EIR or EIS can claim how less water will protect the ecology of wetlands. The BDCP uses a lot of literature to run around and avoid any actual input on the topics they bring up, a sign to the fact that the EIR and EIS is to have little to no actual scientific input.	<p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A.</p> <p>DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p> <p>For information on impacts to wetlands refer to Chapter 12, of this Final EIR/EIS.</p>
1884	7	Mitigation efforts seem impractical due to the fact that the lack of water available will make any type of mitigation an effort in futility.	<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>
1884	8	The BDCP is a cleverly developed document prepared for the profit of water contractors with no scientific input and complete disregard of the ecology of the Delta and Central Valley wetlands.	<p>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. The documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]). Refer to Chapter 32 (Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination) in the Draft EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 (Public Outreach Adequacy).</p>
1884	9	To meet the dire needs for water for Southern California farmers other alternatives should be considered. Desalination, fog harvesting, crop conversions, and improved water efficiency are all environmentally friendlier alternative to the installation of more tunnels in the Delta. Too long has southern California relied on crops that require large amounts of irrigation.	<p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project . For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
1884	10	If the BDCP really had the best intentions of the Delta and wishes to see the ecology preserved the best possible plan of action would to leave it alone and remain with the status quo.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, 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 project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under full-implementation of the proposed project (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>
1885	1	After careful reading of the BDCP plan, I question the environmental protection, timing, and mitigation measures that will be provided to ecological wildlife and native plant species that live in the Delta region. The direct processes of protecting the native vegetation, soils, and ecological wildlife have not been clearly identified.	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.
1885	2	In multiple sections of the of the BDCP plan, environmental protection has been mentioned, but the direct actions have not been taken. For example in section 3.2.3, Development of DWR "Proposed project" in 2012, nothing was mentioned regarding the specific government agencies that are going to take the responsibility of protecting the ecological wildlife.	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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
1885	3	In section 3.4.1, it is mentioned that the implementation of fish screens would [go] into effect once the tunnels were built, but during spawning season, fish, particularly salmon, travel upstream for spawning, and this would interfere with that process.	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.
1885	4	The removal of sediment is also an issue because, in section 3.6.1.1, it states that the sediments are going to be removed, but in reality, this affects the plants and animals that feed on this sediment, because it helps water quality.	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.
1885	5	In section 3.5.2.2. - Conservation Components, would the soils that surround parts of the Delta be completely ignored? Or are they going to be taken into account when [implementing] the plan?	Section 3.5.2.2 does not contain a discussion of soils. Impacts on soils from implementation of the proposed project are discussed in Chapter 10 of the EIR/EIS.
1885	6	An issue that I would like to address is the project description. The project objectives have been clearly identified, but the description does not mention the effects on Native peoples who live in these areas. Is there going to be enough water left for them so they go on with their daily life?	Please see Master Response 21 related to the involvement of Native American Tribes in the planning and development of the proposed project.
1885	7	[The project] description does not mention the water delivery to Southern California. How much of this water is going to be diverted to that part of the state?	Total deliveries under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and the action alternatives to southern California are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the FEIR/EIS.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1885	8	I think that more of the potential take permits and other regulatory authorizations need to be clearly identified, and how carefully will these be enforced?	As part of the EIR/S, a summary of anticipated permitting agencies and their respective review/approval responsibilities, in addition to those under CEQA and NEPA, was prepared. This list includes all anticipated approvals and permits as identified by the preparers at the time the EIR/S Draft document was released. This list can be found in Chapter 1, Table1-2 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP or NCCP; instead the project will be covered under Section 7 of the Federal ESA and Section 2081 of California's ESA. Please see Master Response 45 for more information on permitting needed to implement the project.
1885	9	Does this mean that people can fish all of the non-threatened and non-endangered fish that they want to?	None of the alternatives propose changes to fishing regulations.
1885	10	The mitigation measures that were mentioned were well thought out. Great detail was provided with the proposed plan of the twin tunnels project. The materials that are needed for the project are well presented. The impacts that this project has on the environment and the timing of the water delivery could be thought out more.	The 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.
1885	11	The timing of this project was something that was hard to understand. Is this project going to take years to build, or will it be built within a couple of months? Also, when is this project going into effect?	Appendix 22B of RDEIR/SDEIS provides detailed schedule for construction activities. Depending on the selected project alternative, the total duration to complete construction would be 10 to 11 years. For more information regarding construction assumptions for water conveyance facilities please see Appendix 3C of the FEIR/EIS.
1885	12	Will the fish be moved to fisheries? Or will they remain where they are and slowly die off?	It is unclear which particular fish species and in which context this comment is referring to.
1885	13	Other concerns must also be addressed. In this plan, there is no mention of how the fish and other wildlife will be dealt with. Are there going to be specific conservation actions taken to protect the habitat for the wildlife that live in this region? Are these aquatic species going to be moved to a different place so they are protected?	See Chapter 3 of the 2013 public draft BDCP for a description of the conservation measures proposed to offset impacts to the species and contribute to their recovery in the Plan Area. 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 also see Master Response 17 regarding the biological impacts of the new proposed project.
1886	1	It is a very complex plan with many moving parts. Site maps for projects should be included, and the entire document as a whole should be condensed. A suggestion in doing so would to perhaps take out some of the redundant definitions. After reading it the plan gives the idea that it is an educational encyclopedia rather than a plan.	Chapter 1 of the EIR/EIS contains maps of the plan area and existing facilities. Chapter 3 provides maps of proposed conservation zones and restoration areas, as well as maps of potential water conveyance facility alignments. The EIR/EIS provides many definitions because a precise understanding of terminology and concepts is crucial to a reader's ability to comprehend the BDCP and the EIR/EIS. Many definitions are repeated so that readers of only portions of the document do not have to hunt elsewhere to locate definitions of terminology and concepts. For more information regarding document length and complexity please see Master Response 38.
1886	2	I had questions regarding the overall authority on standards in particular the Permits by the US Fish and Wildlife. Why include defined outline of the agency, and not simply state that such agency equals such standards or compliance. Also had a problem with the length of the permits being 50 yrs. Droughts can have significant impact and can happen in 1-2 years.	As part of the EIR/S, a summary of the agencies and respective review/approval responsibilities, in addition to those under CEQA and NEPA, was prepared. This list includes all anticipated approvals and permits as identified by the preparers at the time the EIR/S Draft document was released. This list can be found in Table 1-2 (BDCP EIR/S, Chapter 1, Introduction). While the permits for the alternatives involving an HCP component are for 50 years, in the instance that the project fails to meet standards set by the permitting agencies, those permits can be taken away. For more information regarding the permit term please see Master Response 5. Additionally, it should be noted that the new preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, is seeking a much shorter permit term than the previously sought 50 year period.
1886	3	Chapter 4 was a chapter that gave me some satisfaction, because it actually went into details of the project. The pipeline project, unfortunately, I felt it is an extreme project. It is	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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		40 feet in diameter and built along the Sacramento River. I do not know if they have been to the river lately, but there is not much water there. So that takes us back to the habitat restoration/preservation. If we take the little water that is left, than what is the point of all the water re-routes?	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.
1886	4	All of these circular problems bring me to conclude that this plan is silly, not because it is too long, an encyclopedia, or that it is unclear, but because it does not address the actual problem depletion of our water resource. I just read an article on Texas, they are already putting recycled black water back in to the tap water supply. When push comes to shove I am sure that we will resort to this as well. By that time however it will be too late, for the environment and the 56 species outlined in the BDCP. I suggest less mitigation on where to get more water and more focus on regulating our current use of the water we do have.	<p>The co-equal goals of the proposed project are to improve and protect the ecological health of the Delta, and improve water supply reliability.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination or water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project).</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination or water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
1887	1	After close review of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan I have concerns regarding water transfers and other voluntary water market transactions. In chapter 4, section 2.7 of the plan it states that under the BDCP there is no quantifiable maximum amount of water that could be delivered through State Water Project and Central Valley Project Facilities; this includes SWP and CVP water as well as water from voluntary water market transactions (pg. 4-90, 26-29). I believe that the amount of water being moved and transferred throughout the Delta should be regulated and monitored regardless of stakeholder or transaction. Maintaining water flows in the Delta is fundamental to the survival of valuable aquatic ecosystems. It also states in chapter 4, section 2.7 that, "separate environmental review and possibly take permits may need to be obtained that cover impacts to listed species or critical habitat that may result from the effects of such transactions on the source area" (35-37). It is the buyer or seller's responsibility to acquire such permits before the water transaction. I wonder how the BDCP can be completely effective if it is not regulating all water movement throughout the Plan area. Regardless of source area, the water is still entering and/or exiting the Delta, therefore affecting the natural communities and covered species.	<p>For a discussion on potential changes in the frequency and volume of water transfers under the BDCP/CWP, please see Chapter 5 (Water Supply) in the FEIR/EIS. Also, refer to Master Response 43 regarding water transfers under the BDCP/CWF. Chapter 30, Section 30.3.6 discusses potential environmental effects related to water transfers.</p> <p>Because specific agreements have not been identified for water transfers and other non-project voluntary water market transactions, project-level analysis of impacts are highly speculative and this EIR/EIS does not constitute the CEQA/NEPA coverage required for any specific water transfer transaction. Rather, it provides an analysis of how transfers relate to the BDCP/CWF facilities. Any future water transfers will require separate approvals, independent of the BDCP/CWF permitting process.</p> <p>Transfers requiring export from the Delta are done at times when pumping and conveyance capacity at the CVP or SWP export facilities is available to move the water. As such, operations to accomplish these transfers must be carried out in close coordination with SWP and CVP operations, such that the capabilities of the projects to exercise their own water rights or to meet their legal and regulatory requirements are not diminished or limited in any way. Parties to water transfers are responsible for providing for any incremental changes in flows required to protect Delta water quality standards. All transfers must be in accordance with all existing regulations and requirements. See Section 5.1.2.7 for more information on water transfers.</p> <p>The lead agencies do have the authority to regulate "all water movement throughout the Plan area". Operations under the BDCP/CWP will be consistent with existing regulatory requirements, including those under SWRCB D1641 and existing biological opinions, in addition to new criteria developed for the project. Potential effects to natural communities and covered species are analyzed in the EIR/EIS to show potential impacts due to implementation of the project alternatives.</p>
1887	2	Some of the covered activities proposed by the BDCP aim to change water flows within the Delta in order to improve water quality and benefit covered fish species. By reducing exports in the south Delta, and shifting them to the north it will increase outflow in to the Bay, resulting in reduced salt water intrusion and improved water quality (23-35 5.3.1.1). The BDCP has plans to alter the Fremont Weir to allow for more Sacramento River flood waters to enter the Yolo Bypass. This will restore habitat for many of the covered species. The BDCP also plans to implement intake pump facilities in the north Delta, with a combined capacity of 9000cfs. The combination of these plans will drastically decrease Delta inflow from the Sacramento River (5.3.1.2). Consequently, with lower flows from the Sacramento River, there will be less deposition of sediment into the Delta. The Sacramento River historically deposits more than 80% of its sediment into the delta, which makes up 85% of Delta sediments (pg. 5.3-24 5-6). This reduction in sediment will lead to less turbidity and higher productivity. The BDCP has plans to implement changes in the Delta that could have a very positive impact on aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. The BDCP acknowledges the potential for incidental takes due to the covered activities planned in the Delta; however it is taking actions to mitigate such losses by enhancing habitats through restoration and conservation efforts.	The commenter notes water flow as modified by the proposed BDCP within the Delta, how such changes would benefit fishes and aquatic resources, and cites the references back to the Draft EIR/EIS. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP.
1888	1	The objective [sic] are not clear on what the project [sic] but are supported by references that are on record in the proposal, although the references are not easily attainable since one reference may lead to another reference that has included other references throughout	The phases of the project are outlined in the Conceptual Engineering Reports which are posted on the project website. A construction schedule is contained in Appendix 22B, Air Quality Assumptions. Specific permits which are required are contained in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the proposal. The phases of project are not adequately described and the people who live in a 500 mile radius of the facility are not represented. The specific permits that apply and acquire authorization are not clearly identified and are only referenced without clear indication on where the exact name and detail of permit and authority is in the proposal.	
1888	2	Not all environmental resources that are potentially affected are not clearly described. There is no sufficient information to understand physical and cultural environmental factors at the time of the Notice of Preparation. There needs to be more information in decision making and analysis as baseline for the physical and cultural environment such as the Indians that use to resign where the facility will be and the wetland reserves. Appropriate protocol was used to perform surveys but I am unaware of the surveys of proponents that the agencies have analyzed by the obscure details for reference.	CEQA lead agencies are required, when preparing an EIR to "...include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective." (CEQA Guidelines, section 15125, subd. (a).)
1888	3	The minimal impacts have been poorly determined for all environmental resources including the threshold of significance and is substantially underrepresented with little analysis with support of direct and indirect impacts of project. The proposal had poor organization that it was difficult to find appropriate presentation of potential significance of comparing all resources impacts. The lack of organization also gave way to no presentation of cumulative impacts of past and foreseeable future when there is indeed a vast array of articles, survey and data on the cumulative potential effects on the physical and cultural impacts of altering the environment for the improvement of civilization such as deforestation and minimization of wetlands.	The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
1888	4	Mitigation was presented of potential impacts except no alternatives were. There was little to no detail on mitigation measures to agencies to defer information and decision making which gives little faith to DEIS/DEIR on the topic and potential outcome of the project and objectives. The economic infeasible mitigation measures are presented but is not clear on supporting evidence. The majority of agencies connected to the project have performed analysis that have been clearly stated but does not seem adequate to support conclusion of all measures.	This is a general comment on the adequacy of mitigation measures. Please refer to Master Response 22 which addresses mitigation measures, environmental commitments, avoidance and minimization measures and alternative-specific Environmental Commitments.
1888	5	There are a miniscule array of alternatives presented with no detailed evaluation on why alternative were not analyzed besides the insufficiency to objectives with little supporting evidence in the references. There is no adequate range of alternative in DEIR that are potentially feasible that would meet objectives or minimize impacts. Alternatives are not sufficiently supported as why to they are not economically feasible with the information and references given and it is unclear if this has been analyzed.	15 alternatives and 3 new subalternatives were analyzed in the EIR/S and the RDEIR/RSEIS respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. The alternatives included in the FEIR/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. Regarding development of alternatives for the EIR/EIS, a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives is provided in Master Response 4.
1889	1	After reading through some of the BDCP DEIR/DEIS, biodiversity and natural system health are mentioned on multiple occasions. However much of the restoration is intended to focus on primarily one species. The current environmental conditions have essentially performed that function already by restricting the environment and only allowing well adapted species to thrive. By restoring large areas in the thousands of acres targeting the success of one species such as the nontidal marsh is aimed at the giant garter snake will likely only be moderately successful (CM10 3.6.2.9). Instead of the attitude was changed from targeted species health to increase overall system health, a better way could potentially come from establishing overall system health and diversity to increase the strength of all populations	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 comment is noted about creating greater opportunities for native species to be sustained in niches throughout the Delta. The conservation strategy takes the approach of applying conservation measures at multiple scales. Some conservation measures are applied Delta-wide to address ecosystem threats and to affect changes Delta-wide (e.g., tidal wetland restoration). Other conservation measures are more targeted, addressing local species needs through focused habitat restoration. The combination of these approaches

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>thereby increasing the strength of the targeted species. By creating more niche opportunities these targeted species will have better odds of survival and establishment. This applies to all restoration efforts throughout the Delta.</p>	<p>was deemed to have the greatest likelihood of success.</p> <p>The originally proposed habitat restoration measures and related Conservation Measures (CMs) (i.e., CM2 through CM21) would not be included as part of the Proposed Action, except to the extent required to mitigate significant environmental effects under CEQA and meet the regulatory standards of ESA Section 7 and California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Section 2081(b). However, restoration actions that are independent of Proposed Action will continue to be pursued as part of existing projects and programs. Examples of these include the 2008 and 2009 USFWS and NMFS BiOps (e.g., Yolo Bypass improvements and habitat enhancements, 8,000 acres of tidal habitat restoration), (2) California EcoRestore, and (3) the 2014 California Water Action Plan.</p>
1889	2	<p>Another area of concern comes from the project objectives section ES.2.1 where it states that new operations or configurations of the water conveyance system are to be installed in the North Delta, and particularly how this may relate to mercury restoration. The Sacramento River and its tributaries feed a large portion of the water to the Delta, which at the current time is contaminated with mercury from mining (8.2.3.9). Mercury will naturally make its way through the system over time, and with higher disturbance rates there would likely initially be more contamination do to sediment movement. However over time the mercury would go the way of the cliched solution to pollution being dilution. A possible problem with pumping groundwater from the North Delta is that any sort of cone of depression that was created could easily reach the river and use that as a recharge point. A few wells is not a problem but if many wells or long pumping times present themselves the flow of the river will likely be diminished. The mercury section only states that local entities will likely be responsible for mercury reduction, this is inadequate as mercury has been shown to be very toxic. The restoration of natural flow regimes would contribute to mercury restoration based on movement out of the system into the ocean or be buried as the streams meander, so reducing the amount of water coming from the North delta is only going to hinder the mercury restoration further.</p>	<p>This comment addresses alternatives contained within the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS, including Alternative 4 (also known as BDCP). All of the action alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS included large-scale tidal habitat restoration. The large-scale habitat restoration resulted in increased Delta outflow rates in the wet winter months as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative; and therefore, could increase re-suspension of Delta sediments. 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 that does not include an HCP or NCCP component, or large-scale habitat restoration and does not result in changes in Delta outflow rates in the wet winter months as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board is completing studies to assess the fate and transport of mercury upstream and within the Delta. Therefore, the EIR/EIS focused on existing data related to river flow and concentration data to evaluate correlations; and because the river flows originate from reservoir releases, changes in methylmercury upstream of the Delta focused on whether a relationship between methylmercury concentration and flow exists. Please see Master Response 14 regarding mercury water quality analyses.</p>
1890	1	<p>After reading through the BDCP EIR draft and taking into consideration its proposed project I am concerned that there are some problems with the EIR and the BDCP that should be addressed.</p> <p>The BDCP did not address any cultural or historic valuable places that would be or could be impacted. The lead agency should contact the appropriate trust agency. Trust agencies could include the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), California State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO), and the California Coastal Commission. Native tribes would also be valuable to contact. The Department of Fish and Wildlife website http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/ceqa/intrnlproced/eir.html states that an EIR must be produced "When a project has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory." This is an EIR draft so that requirement is met but there is no cultural study addressed in this EIR therefore this EIR is incomplete. Even if there is no impact to cultural or historic assets a section must explain that. I understand that many of these cultural and historic sites are kept confidential to avoid vandalism and defacement, however, if the public is not made aware of the chance that culturally significant artifacts and places, perhaps places significant to knowledge of the prehistory of California, then the public is unable to make an informed decision about building the BDCP if they are not aware</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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		of all the impacts. It is the EIR's responsibility to provide full disclosure of a project to the public, therefore they EIR is incomplete and inadequate.	
1890	2	There is not an adequate project description. The BDCP EIR draft does not specifically explain what the project will entail. Project clarification needs to be included in the Final EIR. The draft has a lot of environmental settings, which is appropriate because that is the baseline for a reader's decision but not even that is complete. The BDCP EIR draft fails to explain the actions the proposed project will include. The EIR draft for the BDCP is not specific enough in regards to what actions will take place.	<p>For updated project objectives and purpose and need please see 1.1.4 Section1 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. EIR/EIS Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, provides an extensive discussion of all alternatives. Please see Master Response 5 regarding proposed project's governance structure and proposed implementation, and Master Response 3 regarding the project's purpose and need.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3 Section 5 of the RDEIR/SDEIS for project description of the new preferred alternative, Alternative 4A.</p>
1891	1	After reviewing the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, I have to argue that it fails to reach its intended goal of securing water security for the future of Californians. Although this process of implementation has included over 300 public meetings as advertised, the true voice of the general public is held back due to the lack of insight and information that can be gained from a 20,000 plus page paper. The general public has been excluded in the process of what could be one of the most socially important projects in the history of California. For example, California has a very diverse population, yet the state fails to meet the needs of those people who cannot read a few pages, let alone a 20,000 page report that is very unorganized in structure and compositions.	<p>For information pertaining to how the BDCP/California WaterFix has been developed in an open and transparent manner and the public outreach conducted, please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41.</p> <p>For information pertaining to the size and complexity of the document, please refer to Master Response 38.</p>
1891	2	Aside from the unorganized nature of the document, the BDCP fails to address the qualifications and criteria required to deem "Successful" in the conservation of species covered under the Federal Endangered Species Act and how the monitoring of these species will be covered. There is no guarantee and no logical way of thinking that by diverting water from the north Delta to the south Delta by means of large (3,000 cubic feet per second (cfs)-15,000 cfs) underwater tunnels will ensure the conservation of critical aquatic species found in the Delta and the areas north of the BDCP plan. Therefore I withdraw any support for any of the implementations of construction including any sort of underwater tunnels. The smaller the tunnel, the less cost effective for the taxpayers, and the larger the tunnel, the worse the environmental repercussions will be for species in the Delta and the areas north of the plan.	<p>The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree about the inadequacy of the documentation (refer to Master Response 38 [Length of Environmental Document]). On the contrary, the preparation and processing of the documentation are in compliance with state and federal environmental planning laws and regulations. For example, documentation generated by this project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many opportunities for public participation than normally is required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]). Since 2006, the BDCP(Alternative 4) and subsequently the California WaterFix Project (Alternative 4A) have been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Refer to Chapter 32 (Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination) in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 (Public Outreach Adequacy).Fifteen alternatives and three new sub-alternatives were analyzed extensively in the Draft EIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS, respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the environmental documentation: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. 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 information on alternatives including conservation, the commenter can refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development), Master Response 4 (Tunnel Option), Master Response 6 (Desalination/Demand Management in BDCP), Master Response 7 (Desalination), and Master Response 37 (Storage). Furthermore, the documentation associated with the project was prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal ESA and the state NCCPA, and is intended to be environmentally beneficial to the region. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Refer to a discussion on compliance with the federal ESA as presented by Master Response 5 and with discussions on monitoring in Master Response 44 (Decision Tree) and in Master Response 33 (Adaptive Management and Monitoring). Monitoring is also discussed in Chapter 3 of the Draft BDCP. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16 of the Draft EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State. For information on funding and costs, see BDCP Chapter 8, cost-benefit analysis on the BDCP website, and Master Response 5. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted on by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the CEQA and</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1891	3	<p>I suggest a conservation plan should start with a plan on reducing water use in the future, which is not covered whatsoever anywhere in the BDCP. Conservation is not achieved when over-consumption of a natural resource is assisted by large infrastructure. In fact, we can assume over consumptive agricultural practices will continue at the same pace they occur today, especially with a "guaranteed" supply of water coming from massive tunnel system in the middle of the Delta.</p>	<p>NEPA processes.</p> <p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount of water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination or water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>
1891	4	<p>I suggest a revision of the BDCP that is supported by current science and not "studies in the future." A crucial part of the BDCP that is lacking is the analysis of the BDCP's plan for habitat restoration and the true explanation of "How and to what degree" the proposed effect of species restoration will be achieved if the BDCP were to be placed into action.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.
1892	1	<p>I am writing this letter to make it very clear that I do not support the plan to build giant tunnels under the Sacramento Delta in order to move water to the south.</p> <p>The BDCP is designed to protect 56 covered species. This is something that most people would agree is a good thing yet the BDCP does not explain specifically how it will protect these species. And I fail to understand how removing millions of acre feet of water from the Delta will help any native species. The BDCP claims conservation measures will restore up to 83,200 acres of natural communities, including tidal wetland and associated estuarine and upland natural communities distributed across the Delta. Yet the BDCP never explains how removing such vast amounts of water from the Delta will restore this land.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The proposed 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. In response to other points raised by the commenter, refer to the following Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM, Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), Master Response 5 (Compliance with ESA), and Master Response 14 (Water Quality). In addition, please refer to Chapter 6 [Surface Water], Chapter 8 [Water Quality], Chapter 11 [Fish and Aquatic Resources], and Chapter 12 [Terrestrial Biological Resources] of the FEIR/FEIS for a detailed discussion of how the proposed project would affect these resources.</p>
1892	2	<p>This BDCP is nothing more than a 20 billion dollar project that will only benefit a very few Californians. Furthermore while my grandchildren will still be paying for this project there is no clear evidence that the BDCP will be able to provide the water that is promised.</p> <p>The problem is not a lack of water; the problem is that water is used incredibly inefficiently in this state. We produce more agriculture in California than any other place on earth, which I believe is a good thing. And we should continue to strive to be the world's leader in agriculture yet it is foolish to continue to subsidize water. Let all Californians pay fair wages for the water they use. Let them pass on that cost to the consumers. Only then will Californians learn that water is a limited resource and it is infeasible to grow highly water dependent crops in arid regions.</p> <p>Any person with any common sense can see that this state's financial health is in dire straits. And any one with common sense can also see that the BDCP is going to cost the state billions of dollars in order to make a few people millions.</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. 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.</p>
1892	3	<p>This project is going to cost all of us in order to benefit a very few and even more devastating to this state this project is going to destroy a diverse ecosystem in irreversible ways all in the name of financial gain.</p> <p>As a fifth generation Californian, a registered voter, a tax payer and a veteran I urge you to not build these tunnels. There is plenty that can be done at a far lesser cost to the state both financially and environmentally.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Fifteen alternatives and 3 new sub-alternatives were analyzed in the Draft EIR/S and the RDEIR/SDEIS, respectively. Other proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR/S and Appendix 3A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. For information on the alternatives, see Master Response 4. The commenter is also referred to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities). For more information on funding and costs, see BDCP Chapter 8, cost-benefit analysis on the BDCP website, and Master Response 5. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted on by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the final environmental planning process for both CEQA and NEPA.</p>
1893	1	<p>While reading through the Bay Delta Conservation Plan my main thoughts were that it was awfully confusing. It was repetitive with the plan's goal. I did not think it was very helpful that throughout the whole draft it would refer to different acts or different parts of the draft. I wanted to understand what it was talking about so I often had to mark my spot and jump to the section it was referring to. Which ended up taking too much time and really broke up the flow of reading the draft. Although I understand it is necessary to list all acts that it supports and such, it felt like it interrupted paragraphs. I appreciated the use of bullet points of ideas or goals. It made it easier to approach rather than a lengthy paragraph.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 38 for information on the length and complexity of the document.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1893	2	Specifically in section 9 about alternative options, it was easier for me to comprehend the details of each alternative through the tables given on pages 9-14 through 9-20. I thought it was much easier to get a quick overview of each alternative in a table rather than reading each specific section. Also with section 9.1.1 on page 9-1, line 37-39 mentioned the typically considered alternatives for habitat conservation plans. I thought it would be helpful to include examples of each scenario. If we want to be able to avoid incidental take permits we need to know examples of ways that would result in such incidental take.	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.
1893	3	Overall I thought the parts of the draft that I read were written so complex it made it difficult to read. Some things were repetitive and plainly not necessary to be mentioned again. However it was very thorough.	Please see Master Response 38 for information on the length and complexity of the document.
1894	1	As a result of my review and evaluation of the BDCP's chapter nine, the BDCP did not mention any ware about water transfer in tunnels. Except from the available table provide in page 100 Alternatives BDCP Approaches. By looking at the table it would seem that category H: More Restoration seems to have more of a better take alternative benefit.	Please see Appendix 1E of the 2013 public draft EIR/EIS regarding water transfers and Chapter 6 regarding their potential effects. Take Alternative H had a greater beneficial effect on covered species but it was deemed infeasible due to the difficulty of restoring a greater amount of tidal wetland than that proposed in BDCP.
1894	2	It may appear that the benefiteres of the BDCP project would be the agricultural and urban water agencies. In addition with the construction lasting 10 year, it would have a dramatic impact that would affect the health and wellbeing of the citizens and species who lives and depends on the stream and rivers. Although, the "Annual Water Delivers" table may present a reasonable and visible diagram of what might the BDCP would help improve the ecosystem, but it does not account for the number of families who may be affected.	<p>The economic costs and benefits of the project proposed in the 2013 public draft BDCP are evaluated in Chapter 9 of the BDCP to help inform the practicability of the "alternatives to take." The federal ESA requires that that Section 10 permit applicants specify in habitat conservation plans (HCPs) that the alternatives to the taking of federally listed threatened and endangered species were considered and why those take alternatives are not being proposed (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 17.22(b)(1)(iii)(C)). The state NCCP Act has no such analytical requirements. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Habitat Conservation Planning and Incidental Take Permit Processing Handbook (HCP Handbook) (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service 1996) provides guidance for the analysis of take alternatives. Specifically, the HCP Handbook identifies two types of take alternatives that are typically considered in HCPs: take alternatives that would result in take levels below those anticipated for the proposed actions, and take alternatives that would cause no incidental take, thereby eliminating the need for an incidental take permit.</p> <p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A, which no longer includes habitat restoration, beyond what is required to mitigate effects of constructing and operating the project. Alternative 4A would not serve as habitat conservation plans/natural community conservation plans (HCPs/NCCPs) under ESA Section 10 and the NCCPA, but rather would achieve incidental take authorization under ESA Section 7 and CESA Section 2081(b). As a result, the Alternatives to Take analysis presented in the draft BDCP and required by Section 10 of the ESA is not applicable to the new preferred alternative, 4A.</p>
1894	3	Even though the BDCP would prove a beneficial out on papers, documents, and charts, in ten years a lot could happen. Some mitigation or suggestion may be to encourage and implement southern California to conserve and recycle and reuse sewage water. Build rain	Many areas of Southern California have aggressively implemented water conservation, recycling and reuse

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>catchment system and create awareness of their water problems. Furthermore, make a law or program that would enforce low flow equipment. Also, shape an idea that California as whole depends on each other to thrive and if northern California's aquifer gets dry out like the Owen's Lake, it would only create more problems in the future.</p>	<p>programs.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.</p> <p>For more information regarding the permitting, see Master Response 45. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1895	1	<p>I am writing this letter with concerns from a Native Californian, a Miwok Native from this region and also a 22 year resident from Kings Island by the Clifton Court Forebay on the Delta out of Byron, CA. I raised my children to understand the value of land management and water resources for our Bay Area, and I would hate to think that ll that beautiful resource would be tunneled to other areas.</p> <p>If the state learned to manage its water resources we would not be destroying the precious land and habitat of the Delta areas. This becomes a tax burden that we will pass down for many generations and I do not think that there is substantial research to proceed with this plan.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1895	2	<p>I would love for my grandchildren, great grandchildren, and many generations after, to be able to see this area through the Native history of the land and, not destroyed to the States decision to proceed with this plan.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1895	3	<p>Listen to the taxpayers who will be the ones supporting this project if it is approved. I am sure there are other alternative options and I think that they should be researched to all means before concluding that this is the only option.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 for more information regarding alternatives development. The alternatives included in the FEIR/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 2013 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. Please see Master Response 5 regarding funding of the proposed 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.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
1896	1	<p>This is a terrible idea. The cost. The drought. The audacity of taking water by force.</p> <p>The governor is totally off base on this one. What is wrong with his head? Or is there some hidden reason or payoff we haven't heard about yet.</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. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation. The proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Flow criteria will be applied month by month and according to water year type. More information on the ranges of water project diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in BDCP, Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project funding, Master 5 for more information on project cost, and Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project.</p>
1896	2	<p>There is no reason why people in the southern part of the state cannot find water close to them, desalinate it, and/or just plain use less. They should stop wasting water.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7, which describes why an alternative focused on desalination is not included in the EIR/EIS. Desalination is one strategy used in California to develop new supplies, yet it is not the primary solution for the State's water shortage due to many factors, including limited capacity and technology, high costs and energy demands, and regulatory uncertainty. Refer also to Master Response 6 (Demand Management) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
1896	3	<p>No more green grass, no more swimming pools, no more watering parks. That should be true for them and for everyone.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1897	1	<p>I do not want these tunnels. I have property on the Delta and I enjoy the wildlife and peacefulness of the area. I do not want the water diverted. There has not been enough evidence that this is a good solution and it is too costly.</p> <p>NO TUNNELS IN THE DELTA!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.</p>
1898	1	<p>I do not believe the draft of the EIR for the Bay Delta project is complete. There is not enough cost versus benefit documentation provided, and the costs of graywater recovery, further conservation, and de-salinization recoveries are not provided as alternative</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 5 for an explanation of the proposed funding for proposed project.</p> <p>Although components such as desalination plants and water demand management have merit from a</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		considerations.	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. Refer to Master Response 5 (Demand Management), and Master Response 7 (Desalination).
1898	2	In consideration of the growing movement of salinity up the Sacramento River, no further water should be removed. And that growing destruction is not sufficiently ameliorated by the project's plan outlined.	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. For more information regarding water quality impacts of the proposed project please see Chapter 8 of the EIR/S.
1898	3	There is not a complete cost benefit analysis provided to measure the worst case destruction scenarios of the delta against further shipment of water needed by the San Francisco Bay and estuaries away from the bay area further south.	Please see the 2014 draft Statewide Economic Impact Report for an assessment of the costs and economic benefits of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Please note that the Statewide Economic Impact Report is not a part of this EIR/EIS. An updated cost-benefit analysis will be prepared outside of the CEQA/NEPA process.
1898	4	In consideration of the destruction and cost anticipated in building the project much broader efforts should be made at the de-salinization needed in areas of the state without sufficient rainfall.	Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination and water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component, it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level. Please see Master Response 7 for further information regarding desalination.
1898	5	The San Francisco Bay is one of the nation's greatest estuaries. The untold loss of fish hatchery environment brought on by any further removal of fresh water flow into the estuary must be correctly documented, calculated, and measured against any economic gain from such an expensive and invasive project.	The lead agencies are required to weigh the merits of the project and its potential environmental effects against the social, economic and other benefits of the project in determining whether a project would be approved. For significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR/EIS, DWR is required to prepare a Statement of Overriding Considerations that explains why the project would be approved even in light of the project impacts.
1899	1	There could be so many unknown consequences for diverting this water that have not even been researched. Wildlife in the Delta area is already under pressure to survive, and farms already take up too much ground water to be sustainable for future generations. It makes more sense in the long run, for our children and our children's children, to focus our money, energy, and time on water conservation, recycling and education of the public.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project has been 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, 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.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species -- all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage</p>