

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
200	1	The protection and restoration of the remarkable Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Bay Delta Estuary must be the prime focus in the recovery of this important ecosystem. The system must be made whole, not fragmented with water exports and water transfers.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The Proposed Project would 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. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
201	1	<p>I noticed the Western pond turtle was identified as federally threatened in your BDCP Executive summary Public Draft November 2013.</p> <p>I thought it was not federally threatened.</p> <p>(This was observed in the glossy 107 page publication with the Executive Summary).</p>	The western pond turtle was incorrectly identified as federally threatened in the BDCP Executive Summary. It is correctly identified as a California state species of concern in Appendix 12A of the EIR/EIS.
201	2	<p>I noticed the turtle will be protected by preventing disturbance in grassland habitats.</p> <p>However, without continual habitat maintenance, can you ensure prevention of vegetation succession to shrub on the grasslands (to ensure perpetuation of adequate short grassland habitat for turtle egg deposition)?</p>	See CM8 and CM11 for discussion of management techniques to be used to maintain grassland habitat structure in perpetuity. 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.
203	1	Your name of conservation is a misnomer. You are not doing any conservation plan when you are applying for take permits of endangered species. Your plan would be beneficial if you were going to increase flows of fresh water into the Delta, so the fish can spawn and reproduce.	<p>The proposed project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish.</p> <p>Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5.</p> <p>Please 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.
203	2	If you pump out all the water in the Delta, the salt water will come in and that will be the end of the Delta. You do not care anything about Conservation. All you care about is pumping water down to the Westlands Water District, so they irrigate the desert, and to the Kern County oil fields, so they use the drinking water to drill for oil.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in the EIR/S, including in Chapter 8, Water Quality, in impacts WQ-5 and WQ-6 for bromide, Impacts WQ-7 and WQ-8 for chloride, and Impacts WQ-11 and WQ-12 for electrical conductivity. Where significant impacts to uses would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
203	3	It is our right to have water as human beings. Taking our water will be death to us and the family farms, animals and fish.	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. Refer to Master Response 32 (Water Rights).
203	4	The Westlands Water District gets the water for a pittance and charges the people of Southern CA a fortune for it.	Water transfers are analyzed under separate programs than the project. The project addresses complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies.
203	5	We need to preserve the Delta just as it is for future generations, not as a conveyance. You cannot command nature to fit your conveyance.	The statements made by the commenter address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
205	1	I would like to applaud you who have put together this very vast plan to create the BDCP. After reading through the expected costs, in table 8-42, it shows a huge amount of remaining costs. I know that you are seeking a lot of federal and state money for this project. Ambitious as it is, there is a major flaw to the whole thing. No water is saved or created in this plan.	<p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefiting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
205	2	I believe the amount of money in your proposal would be best used for desalination as 100 billion without inflation or cost overruns and the BDCP still doesn't make any new water. A company called Poseidon Resources was to build a \$900 million desalination plant. They withdrew not because of finances, but because of protesters. We could build 100 desalination plants to fill reservoirs any time there is additional need for water with the costs you have proposed. If public funds are used, I believe I am with the desalination rather than these tunnels.	Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>a local/regional level.</p> <p>Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands.</p> <p>Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master response 5 for more information on project costs and on funding.</p> <p>The proposed alternative (referred to in the RDEIR/SDEIS as Alternative 4A) is estimated to cost significantly less relative to the former preferred alternative (Alternative 4 under the BDCP). The difference in cost is largely due to the reduced level of restoration specifically funded by the project, as well as other Conservation Measures that are not included under Alternative 4A. As such, the total estimated cost for Alternative 4A is \$14.9 billion in undiscounted 2014 dollars. The estimated cost to implement the former preferred alternative under BDCP is \$24.7 billion in undiscounted 2012 dollars. For additional information on</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the cost of the proposed project, please see Master Response 5.
206	1	Each part of the state needs to learn to live within its means. You can't keep a desert filled with millions of people each taking showers each day and watering lawns without causing harm to the areas that are providing the water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources 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> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
207	1	<p>We need to limit growth, we need smart growth, we need population control. Homes and businesses should not be built where there is not sufficient water. We do not need to send our water to nut farms that require water 365 days a year and are exporting the majority of their crops to China.</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>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The lead agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please see Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities. Contractors and their customers must make decisions about planning, development, and crop selection in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward.</p>
208	1	<p>This project goes against all previous attempts to mitigate the loss of Northern California water piped to Southern California. It would be extremely detrimental to the work being done currently to conserve water, prevent the continued decline in various fish species and would continue the high levels of salinity in San Francisco Bay and 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 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. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.</p>
208	2	California cannot afford to build more dams or increase the size of existing dams such as Shasta! Instead we need to educate the public in how to conserve more water, take care of our endangered species in the Bay and Delta, and preserve our existing structures.	<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 BDCP EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives.</p>
209	1	I live in Monterey, CA. We have been practicing water conservation since at least the droughts of '76 & '77. Do the people of Southern California really know how to conserve water? When I have asked friends and relatives who live there what they do to conserve water they say they do nothing. Why should people who do nothing to conserve water be given more? The first thing that needs to be done in these drought stricken times is for all of California to really address water conservation. When Southern Californians give up some lawns and pools to show they really want to conserve, I think you might find out they probably already have enough water. Your first priority should be to protect the Sacramento River Delta. You don't do that by diverting it to people that know nothing about water conservation. That water source is already overdrawn to a point that leaves the Delta in a crisis. Do the right thing and make Southern California accountable for not conserving water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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 they 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 water conservation.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 35 regarding efforts toward water conservation in southern California.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
210	1	Why are the existing diversion pumps not scheduled for removal if and when the tunnels are built? It is hard to trust the government on this issue since they can't seem to stop the fish kills by the pumps. Instead they place blame on the striped bass and the Sacramento County treatment plant. Why not send the treatment plant's water south, eliminating the high cost to upgrade the facility at a high cost to us in Sacramento County? Why was one board member fired when she went public with the truth that the diversion pumps were the main killers of fish? We are supposed to trust the government but why should we? They have been less than truthful about the decline in fish populations and went behind the public's back, not giving us the chance to vote on such a huge project. Taking care of LA at a huge cost to Northern CA seems to be the motto.	<p>As described in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, EIR/EIS, the existing pumps and Banks and Jones Pumping Plants would continue to be used under the proposed project; however, the existing intake facilities in the south Delta would be used less frequently when compared to current operations. For a visual representation of this change, see Figure 5-17 in Chapter 5, Water Supply, EIR/EIS. The alternatives that are formulated as HCPs/NCCPs include 21 conservation measures intended to alleviate a variety of environmental stressors in the Delta, including operations of existing water diversion facilities (CMs 1 and 21), as well as the effects of predators (CM15) and water quality conditions (CMs 12, 14, and 19) on covered fish species. The preferred Alternative, 4A, includes environmental commitments in order to mitigate potential adverse effects. Please note that the proposed intakes in the north Delta would be located downstream of the Sacramento County treatment facility's outfall in the Sacramento River.</p> <p>Since 2006, the project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts, and meeting materials have been posted online since 2010 in an unprecedented commitment to public access and government transparency. Please see Master Response 41 for further discussion of the process. The process led to the development of the preferred alternative, which was analyzed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Prior to construction of the proposed project, the EIR/EIS must be certified and adopted by the implementing agencies, and permits must be obtained. However, a public vote is not required to move forward. California Water Code section 12934, subdivision (d)(3), of the Burns-Porter Act and Water Code section 11260 of the Central Valley Project Act authorize DWR to build water facilities in the Delta, as part of the State Water Project, and give DWR broad discretion as to what those facilities may involve. Thus, DWR has the authority to build the proposed project without a public vote.</p>
211	1	<p>I am a resident of Antioch and, as such, I am a consumer of water from the Delta. It seems to me that the Bay Delta Conservation Plan is very vague about how much water will be taken from the Delta. This is perhaps the most important part of the entire plan for those of us who depend on local water. All clients of the Contra Costa Water District and Antioch Municipal Water District depend on various pumping stations in the delta for our drinking water. There are local farmers who depend on the Sacramento River to irrigate their crops. We all need to know that we will be able to use our local water to drink and irrigate into the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>The amount of water DWR can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process as described in the 2008 and 2009 BiOps (RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary ES.2.2). In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria (BDCA Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3)</p> <p>RDEIR/SDESIS 4.3.4 (4A) describes whether concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase or decrease with the project, relative to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. To the extent that concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase, 4.3.4 describes whether these increases are expected to result in impacts to beneficial uses of water in the Delta. For constituents for which adverse impacts were expected, mitigation and other commitments, such as additional evaluation and modeling and consultation with water purveyors to identify additional measures to avoid and minimize or offset these impacts, were introduced to address those impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, adding intakes in the North Delta will allow for operational flexibility that can improve natural flow in the Delta and avoid impacts to migratory fish based on real time data and operations.</p> <p>The proposed project aims to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same to 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>
211	2	<p>Over the years, the quality of our drinking water has lessened as more water has been pumped to southern California. Principally, the water is becoming saltier because there is lower flow in the combined Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and more tidal mixing with water from the San Francisco Bay. The Contra Costa Water District has tried to fix this by building the Los Vaqueros reservoir and subsequently increasing its capacity. In our current state of drought, Antioch city water is unpalatable because of the high level of salt. The naturalists at Big Break Regional Shoreline tell me that the salinity there has increased</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. Mitigation was introduced if the project alternative would result in a significant impact.</p> <p>The Final EIR/EIS proposes Alternative 4A as the preferred alternative. Alternative 4A would result in substantially lesser water quality impacts to salinity-related parameters, including EC and chloride, as compared to the preferred alternative in the Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4A would still have significant</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		from 1800 to 3000 ppm.	impacts to EC; however, feasible mitigation measures were introduced to reduce the identified impacts to less than significant levels to protect beneficial uses and achieve compliance with SWRCB D-1641 standards.
211	3	From what I have read, the water quality in the Sacramento River is superior to that of the San Joaquin River because the San Joaquin has higher levels of salt and selenium. If the state water project pumps Sacramento River water south before it reaches the Delta, the water remaining in the Delta will be higher in salt and selenium. I don't see how this will improve the habitat for the fish, plants or humans living in the Delta.	Because the project alternatives have the potential to change composition of Delta waters at various locations for these two parameters, changes to these constituent concentrations were modeled and differences relative to Existing Conditions were identified in Impacts WQ-5 (bromide), WQ-7 (chloride), WQ-11 (EC) and WQ-25 (selenium). Where changes would result in significant impacts, mitigation is provided.
212	1	I know of 100 striped bass fishermen and their kids who very much enjoy fishing for striped bass over the past 25 years of fishing. The bass has been part of the Delta for over 128 years, and has put millions of dollars into the economy. It would be a knife in many fishermen backs if the striped bass was destroyed. If you have never caught a striped bass you should try it some time. So you can give a real opinion. Please don't destroy my kid's future for fishing for these great fishes.	The overall recreation experience for boaters or fishermen in the vicinity of intake construction areas would be reduced during construction activities because of the elevated noise levels as well as visual setting disruptions. These temporary construction-related effects would last for up to 5 years in the vicinity of intake and barge unloading facilities and could alter fish populations such that recreational fishing opportunities in the study area would be affected. Weekday construction would reduce the amount of fish and other wildlife in recreation areas in the vicinity of the intakes, resulting in decreased recreation opportunities related to wildlife and fish, causing recreationists to experience a changed recreation setting. Chapter 15 describes potential impacts on on-water recreation and fishing. Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts on marine navigation by developing and implementing site-specific construction traffic management plans; installing visual barriers between construction work areas and sensitive receptors; applying aesthetic design treatments to all structures; and employing noise-reducing construction practices. The potential impact on covered and non-covered sport fish species from construction activities would be considered less than significant because the proposed project would include environmental commitments (Appendix 3B). Mitigation Measures would also be available to reduce construction-related underwater noise and pile driving effects, to initiate a complaint/response program, and to provide alternative bank fishing access sites. Please see Chapter 16 Socioeconomics of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP for additional information regarding economic impacts to marinas.
213	1	Has the plan proposed by John Reber in the late 1940's been reviewed by the proponents of the BDCP? The Reber Plan was rejected in 1955 but the archives of the research and findings surely still exist. Briefly stated, the plan called for two dams to make San Francisco Bay into two fresh water lakes, to prevent fresh water from flowing into the Pacific and to provide safe bay crossings for highways and rail. This plan may now be feasible with current technology and construction methods. At least, the research may be valuable for current water and transportation projects.	The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf . Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/ . Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
214	1	<p>We need to rethink this plan. I see so many problems with this, for one the cost and the push to get it done. What is the hurry? We must understand fully how this water system works before we change it and possibly destroy the system Mother Nature has employed for years. She, the Earth (we all live on), is an intelligent force with billions of year of experience on managing her waters. Let’s take our time to understand the fresh water and salt water actions and why they are important to the underwater community that hasn’t a voice.</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>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
215	1	<p>I have lived in California for almost 60 years and I have seen first hand the devastation the loss of fresh water has had on fishing, as well as the well-being of the Delta. Please stop trying to get more water from Northern California. We must find other ways to get fresh water and make those who use 80% of the state water pay more for their usage instead of having the taxpayers subsidize agriculture.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The Proposed Project 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. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.</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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.</p>
216	1	<p>The driving force behind our water problems is human overpopulation, which needs to be addressed immediately. There are already way too many people in California competing for the finite amount of water and other natural resources. The big fallacy of the tunnel idea is that it does not create any more water. The drought we are experiencing in California does not have an engineering solution.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS were raised. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
217	1	<p>I have traveled all over the United States and have seen many beautiful areas, but there is something special about where I live. I am an Antioch native, born and raised from upstanding citizens that are active in our community. I have spent my whole life on the Delta doing every recreational activity possible, starting with boating and fishing, then progressing to tubing, knee boarding and eventually wake boarding and skiing.</p> <p>In the last few years it has been obvious that the delta is changing, and not for the better. I know old guys that remember when there was little to no current in this area and brackish water was miles past Benicia. Today our brackish water sits just outside of Pittsburg, CA and fresh water is not so fresh as the water line is lower making pollution more concentrated.</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>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board. See Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p>
217	2	<p>In a perfect world we would not have to have petitions like these to stop the interests of others who are motivated to change things regardless of the result. If we were smart Californians we would build a desalination plant in L.A. County or San Diego. This would allow us to recover all the water we have been sending down south while creating industry and jobs in those regions.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level.</p> <p>Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands.</p> <p>Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California’s overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p>
217	3	I want to have a voice for the Delta as it does not have one... (Most victims don't). Let's restore the Delta region, and realize the unique terrain we have here in East Contra Costa County.	<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. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>The originally proposed BDCP 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>
218	1	It is a sad and scary day when you are a witness to the showdown of government vs. environment.... I do not understand. Horrible decisions are being made, why would we build tunnels to pull more water than we can even sustain? After looking at both sides of the story it seems that this will not even help the Delta environment, but will actually make it worse. Please don't do this!! Not only for the Delta's sake, but for the health of our rivers. We cannot afford to keep sending as much water south, It's a fact that we need to start curbing the amount, not increasing, scientist have been saying this for years.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.</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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.</p>
218	2	I make my living in fishing and it hurts me horribly to be on the river and see all the exposed salmon beds, especially after I thought the government was supposed to be protecting them.	<p>Effects on sportfish are described in Chapter 15, Recreation, EIR/EIS (see Impacts REC-4, REC-5, and REC-9). Implementation of the proposed project would not be anticipated to have an adverse population-level effect on any popular sportfishing species. Economic effects related to recreational and commercial fishing are described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS (see Section 16.3.1.6 and Impacts ECON-5 and ECON-17) as well as the Draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan Statewide Economic Impact Analysis (see Section 3.5). As described in those sections, while effects of construction could affect economic activity associated with recreational fishing, long-term effects on fish abundance and commercial salmon fisheries are anticipated to be positive overall.</p>
218	3	This year I watched as they drained 70% of Oroville Lake in about 10 months. And, now that we are in a drought, it is very obvious that that is too much water a year to be sending south. The saddest part of all of it is that I'm not sure who to stand behind; it seems that no one is on the side of the environment.	<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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>Operation of the new north Delta facilities will be guided by strict regulations that are set by the SWRCB. Adaptive management and collaborative science will aid operators in managing the pumping schedule in the presence of sensitive species. Appendix B of the RDEIR/SDEIS shows supplemental modeling results for the new alternatives. In particular Section B.2.1 Alternative 4A the modeling demonstrates that under the preferred alternative (4A) reservoir levels (e.g., Trinity Lake, Shasta Lake, Folsom Lake, and Lake Oroville) would be similar to the No Action Alternative (ELT).</p> <p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in BDCP, Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy.</p> <p>Monitoring for compliance with D-1641 requirements or any future requirements for SWP/CVP water supply operations would be conducted year-round in the future under the proposed project.</p>
219	1	<p>This letter speaks the truth. Please read it and think of the destruction that the twin tunnels will bring to the beautiful estuary of the Delta. Jerry Meral said that the building of the twin tunnels would bring much pollution, but that it would be offset by buying carbon offsets from the Bay Area. This is totally the wrong thing to do, as the pollution would still remain in this area. In other words, the offset is just a transfer of the pollution on paper! The men working on this project and those Delta residents living here would still have to breathe the toxic air, and many years from now could show the physical effects of this exposure, if these effects don't immediately show up.</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>As described in the Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 22 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gasses, Impacts AQ-1 through AQ-4), the project will implement Mitigation Measures AQ-2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b to offset construction-related nitrogen oxides (NOX) and reactive organic gases (ROG) to net zero. ROG and NOX are precursors to ozone, which is considered a regional pollutant because it does not form at the exact point where ROG and NOX are released. Rather, ozone can appear over 50 miles from the pollutant source. –Given the regional nature of ozone pollution, all ROG and NOX offsets will be achieved within the air basin in which construction emissions are generated and the year in which the emissions are generated. For example, NOX emissions generated in San Joaquin County will be offset by emissions reduction projects within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. Accordingly, only emissions generated in the San Francisco Bay Area will be offset by projects in this region.</p> <p>The project will also implement Mitigation Measure AQ-15 to offset construction-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including carbon dioxide (CO2). Since GHG are global pollutants (i.e., they become well-mixed and dispersed in the atmosphere), they do not directly contribute to localized impacts like some criteria pollutants (e.g., particulate matter). Accordingly, carbon offsets may be purchased throughout the state to achieve sufficient emissions reductions.</p> <p>The Draft EIR/EIS also evaluated construction-related carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), and diesel particulate matter (DPM), which are considered localized pollutants since they tend to accumulate in the air close to the pollutant source. Potential impacts from these pollutants, as well as mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR/EIS to reduce adverse effects are described in Letter 510, Comment 7.</p>
219	2	<p>There are other ways to deal with California's water needs besides these monstrous tunnels. Giving water from Northern California to the Kern Water Bank and their agribusiness associates is downright theft, especially since they decided to plant trees in a selenium-toxic area when their water contract said that they had junior water rights and would get water only if there was an abundance.</p>	<p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
220	1	<p>Please do not support this insanely expensive and catastrophic project. Water should stay in its own watersheds. If you live on the other side of the mountain, you need to engage in activities that do not require copious amounts of water. It simply is not fair to steal water from a wet region and unnaturally funnel/tunnel that water to a dry region.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and on funding.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p> <p>For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.</p>
221	1	<p>The underlying issue is that the transportation and distribution of water is depriving the water of oxygen, leaving it defenseless to bacteria and contaminants that are introduced to it unknowingly. It is surely doing great damage to water industries that rely on the full capabilities that water has to offer.</p> <p>The real truth is that we are getting water that has no oxygen therefore will have little to no benefits to us as humans, and will have negative effects on our bodies and vegetation rather than helping us.</p> <p>Water transportation causes friction and heat, decreasing oxygen.</p> <p>Water loses vitality, natural properties, and electrical potential, when it is being forced through pipes from high pressure turbines and 90 degree turns, this makes the water lock up in itself and oxygen is not up to full potential.</p> <p>In this generation, we have the opportunity to use a natural powerful cleansing technique to our advantage and apply it to any water industry possible to make sure water is at full potential.</p> <p>A high oxygen measurement in water definitely gives value to that water because it contains higher vitality and more capability.</p> <p>The solution to water is only halfway met with the extrication of foreign elements. Sophisticated filtration process is definitely necessary, but is only half of the solution to our water process.</p> <p>The restoration of oxygen to water is the other half of the solution. It is extremely important to water as it is to us consumers. Oxygen restoration is a more simple process than it is to filter, cause it already contains the oxygen, it's just has to be reactivated.</p> <p>Fresh running water is constantly being revitalized by a natural cleansing process.</p> <p>This natural cleansing process constantly keeps the water fully oxygenated to maintain its waste management (the counteract of bacteria and toxins). The answer to why people that</p>	<p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources 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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>live in the mountains have longer lives.</p> <p>The great solution to restoring oxygen back to our water is using the process of Implosion: the act of concentrating matter and energy into itself. The powerful force of a water vortex can and will benefit any water industry that is in need of the freshest cleanest water.</p> <p>What does a system like this look like?</p> <p>The system we work with is engineered water pipe (with your desired diameter).</p> <p>A center piece in the pipe puts water into a slow spin, while the exterior of the pipe puts water into a fast spin, creating a powerful vortex.</p> <p>Micro-Clustered Water is formed when passing through your vortex water revitalizer with the benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Superior in absorption, leading to better hydration. -Improves the taste, feel and quality of water. -Toxins and heavy gases, like chlorine, are released from the hold of the water molecules, causing them to evaporate from the water. <p>Increased and activated dissolved oxygen in the water is also the result of the Implosion process by the Water Revitalizer, With the following benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Activated dissolved oxygen aggressively interacts with pollutants and toxins in the water, eliminating, reducing, or causing them to be less harmful to the body. -Increased dissolved oxygen creates an inhospitable environment for anaerobic (bad) bacteria, like E.Coli and Coliform. -Increased dissolved oxygen in the water creates a more hospitable environment for aerobic (good) bacteria, which aid in the delivery of nutrients to the human body, the decomposing of wastes and the efficient break down of sewage. <p>Other benefits to the water that will be of your industry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Naturally softens water. -Restores the natural pH balance to water. -Significantly improves the taste and feel of water. <p>How it provides for the environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increased dissolved oxygen in the water creates a more hospitable environment for the aerobic bacteria, which aid in the efficient breakdown of sewage and wastewater. The wastewater leaving your industry after installation, will be less detrimental to our rivers, lakes and Oceans. 	

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>-Revitalized water stays revitalized and positively affects surrounding wastewater in the water source it is provided to.</p> <p>-Once a good amount of facilities starts using this water system, we would see a major transformation of our global water crisis.</p> <p>This system is the only one of its kind that uses the power of natural cleansing. The Earth has been very well capable to naturally clean its water, and in this generation we are able to harness the same engineering to our advantage.</p> <p>If this system is not used for your area you will most likely be one step behind of a cleaner water environment, depriving your area of the full potential of natural, revitalized water.</p> <p>What restructured water can do for the following issues California is presently undergoing:</p> <p>Climate change, is a natural issue California has been experiencing. It has been affecting our water source over time, but not as much as now. This arid landscape has been letting us know that we have to conserve and make sure every drop is doing its job to the fullest.</p> <p>Oxygen restoration can help our area adapt to the warmer weather with, maximum agricultural absorption and also ground water conservation. Natural structured water provides superior absorption that leads to 30%-50% less needed for irrigation.</p> <p>Water conservation is a continuously growing factor to farming and other water dependent industries. Your farm soil will definitely experience a great benefit of water conservation.</p> <p>Your new water will compensate for the reduction of fertilizers needed for efficient growth.</p> <p>Other than buying this system, there will be no need for extra maintenance. Benefits to this system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -no filtration needed for this system to clean the water -no extra energy needed for system to work -no extra machinery needed for system to work -no worries about this system not working once installed. <p>The price structure depends upon the diameter needed for your facility.</p> <p>Copper 2" diameter</p> <p>copper 3" diameter</p> <p>copper 4" diameter</p> <p>(We have diameters needed up to 10")</p> <p>We hope you enjoy your new restructured water, and thank you for going green on the</p>	

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Environment!	
222	1	<p>My comment is in reference to Modified Pipeline/Tunnel Alignment Overview (Alternative 4) which is located on page 9 of 25 labeled Figure 3-9 in the Public Draft BDCP EIR-EIS Chapter 3 Figures PDF. I have attached a scanned copy of this page for reference. I am questioning the exact location of the tunnels as they tunnel beneath the McCormack Williamson Tract. The location on the map shows the tunnels directly beneath our 2000 foot broadcast tower, guy wire anchors and building on the site. The construction of the tower, guy anchors and building required piles that were driven hundreds of feet deep to ensure a good foundation for construction. I need to know that this is known and has been considered when this alternative was surveyed and proposed. I have indicated on the attached PDF the approximate location of our tower, guy anchors and building.</p> <p>Please let me know if this is known, has been considered and the tunnels will be routed accordingly to avoid the piles at this location should this alternative be selected as the preferred path.</p>	<p>After receiving information from this commenter, DWR relocated the tunnel alignment to avoid the piles and guy wires for the commenter's towers. The Lead Agencies appreciate that the commenter brought this matter to their attention.</p> <p>Please note that Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 remains a potentially viable alternative and is being carried forward in this RDEIR/SDEIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If the Lead Agencies ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts.</p>
222	2	[ATT1]: Map of location of KCRA broadcast tower in relation to BDCP tunnel alignment for Alternative 4.	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. See response to comment 222-1.
223	1	<p>This letter is to inform you that your map of proposed changes severely misrepresents the areas in which you plan to dewater and pave the path for the Delta tunnels. Although I am [in] opposition of this movement, I believe that your map should accurately display areas that will be affected by this project in order to accurately inform the people of California. To provide you with an example, I have attached a snapshot of your map along with your original document, showing the location of King Island as drastically off, although it should be marked much closer to the Clifton Court Forebay. Furthermore, please add labels for the main waterways, such as Old River Slough and Victoria's Slough.</p> <p>Please look at a more up to date map of the channels and islands in the Bay Delta and revise your document accordingly.</p>	<p>The location of King Island (which is different from Kings Island located on Old River in the south Delta adjacent to Clifton Court Forebay) as shown on the map is correctly identified.</p> <p>The Mapbook (Volume M-3), 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS may provide the level of detail in labeling of places that the commenter is seeking. The maps throughout the EIR/EIS have been designed to provide the level of detail appropriate to depict the effects of conveyance facilities on these resource areas. Accordingly, not all maps are all the same scale; rather, the scale was selected on the basis of the nature of the effects for a given resource area. Labeling in many map figures has been minimized to be consistent with discussions in the narrative in order to maintain clarity and ease of use in the maps.</p>
223	2	ATT 1: BDCP Maps with incorrect location of King Island.	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.
223	3	ATT 2: BDCP Map with correct location of King Island inserted.	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.
225	1	It appears that there is only one email address for comments on the Draft EIR/EIS and comments on the project itself. There does not seem to be any direction on how these different categories of comments should be identified and directed. Is it correct that both comments on the project and on the EIR/EIS should be sent to this email address?	For the BDCP the address BDCP.comments@NOAA.gov was used submit comments on the Draft BDCP and the associated Draft EIR/EIS. Although comments sent to this email address were originally received by the National Marine Fisheries Service, that agency distributed all comments received to the other Federal Lead Agencies and to the California Department of Water Resources, the State Lead Agency. For the RDEIR/SDEIS, comments should be addressed to BDCPComments@icfi.com.
228	1	I just bought my first home in Discovery Bay on the Delta. I would hate to see this bill pass and ruin the environment and community of my new home. Please stand with me and oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		under the Delta.	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</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. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to 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> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
229	1	I maintain project tracking logs and was curious if there have been any updates regarding the Bay Delta Conservation Plan CM1 Tunnel Construction (advertise date, bid date, etc.)? I understand this project is a long ways out, but just wanted to put a rough date/year when this project may advertise for bid or if a delivery method has been decided.	We anticipate that the first Notice to Proceed will be issued for tunnel construction in mid-2018, with the remaining contracts being issued approximately 6 month intervals thereafter.
230	1	I have been living in Discovery Bay for over 20 years and watersports has always been a huge part of our family. I am very puzzled why no comments are posted so others can see what others are commenting. It makes me believe you have something to hide and our messages are being swept under the rug. Posting comments during an EIS process is a standard federal government process. I am requesting that you post all comments immediately and stop trying to ignore us.	<p>Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement. For comments pertaining to how comments have been considered and addressed, please refer to Master Response 42.</p> <p>The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.</p>
231	1	I recently moved to Discovery Bay a few years ago from Bakersfield, CA. The main draw for my family was the water. I couldn't believe how lush the environment was up north due to the fresh water flowing; only to find out that it was in the works to have it taken away. I believe the tunnels are an atrocity that haven't been completely thought through.	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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.
231	2	I have been to numerous BDCP meetings and have witnessed first-hand the so called spear-heads of this project completely disregard legitimate concerns about this project from the audience. From what I've seen, this seems to be a water contractor's dream project paid at the tax payer's expense. There needs to be more public involvement with a project of this	<p>Please see Master Response 5.</p> <p>The proposed project would be funded through a "beneficiary pays" principle, meaning the cost will be borne by those who receive the benefit. The beneficiaries of the water conveyance facilities (Conservation</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		caliber.	<p>Measure 1) include certain municipal, industrial, and agricultural water users served by the SWP and CVP. As such, the cost of the construction and operation of the new water facilities, as well as for mitigation necessary to address impacts to terrestrial and aquatic species associated with construction and operation of Conservation Measure 1, will be paid by participating state and federal water contractors. Because habitat restoration provides a broad public value, state and federal funding would be provided for the costs associated with habitat restoration (Conservation Measures 2-22). Additionally, portions of the cost for activities such as monitoring, research, plan administration, and other costs will be funded by state and federal funds. Initial state funding is expected to come from two future water bonds, with a total state investment estimated at \$4.1 billion dollars. Federal funding is estimated at \$3.5 billion and is anticipated to come from the same authorities used in the past to support Delta restoration and monitoring, as well as new authorities expected to be needed. Historically, federal agencies such as the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and others have received appropriations for tasks and staffing similar in nature to the BDCP/California WaterFix.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 42.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies have been and remain committed to soliciting public input and taking it into account throughout the environmental review and decision-making processes. In this Final EIR/EIS, the Lead Agencies are responding to all comments received that are relevant to both the Draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) and Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) scope, analysis, or process (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, 40 CFR 1503.4). Comment letters, emails, and verbal comments were submitted to NMFS, the agency that took the lead for receiving the comments. Comments were sorted, coded, and logged into a tracking system. Comments were then categorized by subject area, and a response to the comment was drafted. The comments were then shared with all co-lead agencies for review. In some cases, the same or similar comments were received multiple times by numerous parties. For these types of similar comments, the lead agencies prepared "master responses." Master responses are detailed responses that provide in-depth explanations of the content and analysis in the Draft BDCP or Draft EIR/EIS. The comments were assessed both individually and collectively and the Final EIR/EIS includes copies of the comments received and the responses prepared. Where the Draft EIR/EIS or Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) were changed in response to comments, these changes are referenced in the responses.</p> <p>The official public review process for the Draft BDCP and Draft EIR/EIS provided an opportunity for formal public comment on the proposed project and project alternatives. Comments on the public draft led to further refinements of the proposed project based on input from cooperating agencies, stakeholders, and the public. All comments received on the draft documents have been and will continue to be considered in the decision-making process.</p> <p>Please see Master Responses 40 and 41.</p>
232	1	<p>The BDCP is an extraordinary accomplishment in water resources planning and ecological restoration efforts, with two major shortcomings in the draft plan. The following comments are meant to be constructive in making the plan clearer and stronger.</p> <p>Lack of quantitative data on fish effects (chapter 5): over 12 billion dollars or about 50% of the total program costs are related to improving the health of the covered fishery populations. This estimate is based on a 50% share of costs for new required flow systems and 80% of the primary habitat conservation measure costs including administrative, monitoring and research costs. The BDCP quantifies the decline of plan area fisheries over</p>	<p>DWR and Project proponents strived to use the best available science throughout the effects analysis. The use of specific scientific data and findings was often vetted with fisheries managers to ensure it was the best available. A variety of data were obtained for the proposed project process: quantitative data from peer-reviewed published literature on topics specific to the Plan Area; peer-reviewed published literature outside the Plan Area but on topics relevant to the proposed project; unpublished quantitative data from within the Plan Area and from outside of the Plan Area; qualitative data or personal communication with topical experts; and expert opinion if no other sources were available.</p> <p>A full description of the methodology of the Net Effects analysis, including justification for the qualitative</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>the last 50 to 150 years showing that some species are almost decimated. Yet qualitative data are used to weakly characterize the net effect of the large BDCP investment on future fish populations. Quantitative data numbers should be used along with their statistical uncertainties. As a minimum, specific quantified numerical objectives should be included.</p>	<p>approach, can be found in Chapter 5, Section 5.2.7.10, Approach for Determining Net Effects on Covered Fish Species, and Section 5.5, Effects on Covered Fish. As indicated in Section 5.2.7.10, “The [BDCP net effects] conclusions represent qualitative judgments of the effects of the BDCP that are grounded in the detailed quantitative and qualitative analyses in the appendices... BDCP net effects conclusions are necessarily qualitative and synthesize results from the more detailed (and often quantitative) analyses found in the appendices to this chapter. While qualitative, the net effects conclusions are derived from a transparent and structured approach. This approach is based on conceptual models that describe the logic and assumptions embedded within the effects analysis.”</p> <p>The Lead Agencies (DWR for CEQA and Reclamation for NEPA) will make the final decisions regarding the selection of an alternative (and therefore, an operational scenario) for the purposes of CEQA and NEPA. USFWS and NMFS have authority under the federal Endangered Species Act to determine whether the Proposed Project meets the regulatory standard of ESA Section 7, and CDFW, a CEQA responsible agency, has authority to determine if the Proposed Project meets the regulatory standards of CESA. Please see Section 4.1.2, Description of Alternative 4A, RDEIR/SDEIS for additional information on Proposed Project operations.</p>
232	2	<p>The BDCP is an extraordinary accomplishment in water resources planning and ecological restoration efforts, with two major shortcomings in the draft plan. The following comments are meant to be constructive in making the plan clearer and stronger.</p> <p>Abstruse implementation organization (chapter 6): The administrative organization chart and governance comments are vague and perplexing and lack clear lines of project administration, financial control and progress accountability. Sideway organizations of complex projects are prone to poor communications, disputes, inefficiencies and ultimate failure. The current organization seems to try to appease all contributing parties without clear leadership and accountability. This simply won't be effective and needs restructuring.</p>	<p>For more information regarding project implementation structure please see Chapter 7 of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP.</p>
233	1	<p>As someone who has closely followed its development, I wholeheartedly support BDCP Alternative 4 as a well-structured, operationally flexible conveyance solution that, with all included conservation measures, provides the best opportunity to attain the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
233	2	<p>My comment below is intended to suggest a minor change that could lessen the impact to the Delta community of Hood during construction of CM-1.</p> <p>Construction access for the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 4) Intakes 2 & 3 construction sites, as currently proposed, will unnecessarily result in a dramatically negative impact to the community of Hood since the heavy equipment/materials transport access route would naturally be from I-5 via Hood-Franklin Road and Highway 160, passing through Hood. Of all the Delta communities along the CM-1 alignment, it appears that construction phase impacts/disruption will be most significant to the residents of Hood.</p> <p>My comment is to suggest that this impact could largely (if not entirely) be mitigated by a temporary extension of Elk Grove Blvd from the existing I-5 interchange to across the Beach Lake Canal. This additional temporary access road would tie into the already-proposed construction access road that connects the Intake 2 & 3 sites immediately west of and parallel to the Beach Lake Canal. This would be a short (approximately 1-mile long) temporary access road that could be abandoned and restored to the natural condition following CM-1 construction, preserving the long term purpose/status of the Stone Lakes NWR. Access to the Intake 5 site would be via the existing Lambert Road - already</p>	<p>DWR concurs with your suggestion that a temporary extension of Elk Grove Blvd from the existing I-5 interchange to the proposed intake sites 2 and 3 of the proposed project would minimize impacts to the Town of Hood from construction traffic. However, as you indicated the proposed extension of Elk Grove Blvd alignment would go through the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge (SLNWR). To obtain necessary right of way for this almost one mile long access road through SLNWR, we will have to go through a compatibility determination process with SLNWR. Based on our experience, it is unlikely that we would be able to satisfy the compatibility determination requirements and obtain necessary permits. We will continue to evaluate other alternatives as part of next phase of engineering to minimize impacts to Hood from construction traffic.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		avoiding Hood.	
234	1	I have been boating, skiing, and fishing on the Delta since the 1960's, and cannot believe what BDCP is trying to slip through.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For proposed project impacts to recreation and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 15 of the FEIR/EIS.
236	1	I am a 53 year old home owner who has lived in Discovery Bay on the water for 16 years. It is such a special place here. My husband and I are avid boaters throughout the Delta and love to water ski and fish. Needless to say, the tunnels project hits close to home so I am an informed and interested party in all of this. I have many concerns regarding the EIR and EIS.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
237	1	I was born in Southern California, lived there for 20 years and now have lived for 45 years in the Delta. This EIR/EIS is a joke. We were at Stockton and talked to the consultants who wrote the water quality sections. Even they could not define anything on point in the more than 800 pages of that section. "Sometimes the water quality would be worse, sometimes a little better". 800 pages to come to that conclusion? How do you expect the average person to decipher the more than 30,000 pages of government double talk? I know, I used to write proposals, RFPs and the like for government contracts. Throw this thing away, come up with concise, readable statements so it can be understood.	<p>The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</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. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to 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> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p> <p>For more information regarding the document's length and complexity please see Master Response 38.</p>
237	2	I am astounded that there is no transparency with this process. Why are comments not available for review? How do I even know you have received and processed my comments and that they are not just lying in a circular file somewhere? Posting these comments during the EIS process is a mandatory federal government procedure. This document and process as conducted here, are fatally flawed. I have attended all of your meetings. In Brentwood there was an open meeting where we were assured our questions would be answered. To date, we have not heard from BDCP. We left emails, addresses and phone numbers. We have very little faith that any of you give a damn about the true impact your meddling will do to degrade the Delta, let alone conserve it.	<p>Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement. For comments pertaining to how comments have been considered and addressed, please refer to Master Response 42.</p> <p>The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.</p>
237	3	I have lived in Discovery Bay since 1983. We are already being affected by the current pumping of water from the Delta. Discovery Bay was designed with a precision hydraulic process to circulate water through the bays that utilized the tidal action as seen in the area. The current pumping has all but eliminated high tide action reducing the quality of the water. When you pump more, and they will, our water quality will drastically be reduced. We were promised by BDCP officials that water monitoring would be part of the EIS to determine water quality issues. How can you create 800 pages on water quality and not address Discovery Bay issues, especially when you have not made any attempt to find out	Water will still be pumped from the existing South Delta pumps under the CEQA preferred alternative (Alternative 4), but less than under existing conditions, and under 7 of the 8 other alternatives pumping will still continue from the South Delta pumps as well.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>what our baseline is today, before you even start? Again, your whole report is fatally flawed in attempting to model our environment when no empirical data was obtained especially when it was promised by BDCP officials when they visited with our Reclamation District 800 engineers! Right now with the pumps in Old River, the pumping must maintain a water quality sufficient for their pumping. If they divert water from Sacramento there is no need to maintain our water quality. It is expected that it will deteriorate and this is not addressed.</p>	
237	4	<p>The BDCP charter is to protect and conserve the Delta for the future. The two tunnels do nothing to help promote this charter. The two tunnels project should be dropped as part of this EIS. Anyone with half a brain understands how and why this has been added. Anyone with half a brain understands if you divert massive amounts of fresh water in Sacramento, and not allow it to naturally flow through the Delta, it will degrade the water quality in the Delta, period! Trying to spin 800 pages in your water quality portion of the document any other way is simply political and driven by special interests who are paying the bill. This section is again, fatally flawed. Remove the two tunnels project from your EIS!</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>The amount of water DWR can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process as described in the 2008 and 2009 BiOps (RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary ES.2.2). In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3).</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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.4 (4A) describes whether concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase or decrease with the project, relative to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. To the extent that concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase, 4.3.4 describes whether these increases are expected to result in impacts to beneficial uses of water in the Delta. For constituents for which adverse impacts were expected, mitigation and other commitments, such as additional evaluation and modeling and consultation with water purveyors to identify additional</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>measures to avoid and minimize or offset these impacts, were introduced to address those impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, adding intakes in the North Delta will allow for operational flexibility that can improve natural flow in the Delta and avoid impacts to migratory fish based on real time data and operations</p>
237	5	<p>The EIS minimizes the financial impact on those living in the half dozen counties where the construction of the two tunnels (which should not even be part of the EIS) takes place. Ten years of construction, land seized under eminent domain, commerce disruptions will greatly reduce property values, incomes running in the billions of dollars. You have greatly minimized these impacts. This section needs to be reevaluated.</p>	<p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California.</p> <p>When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. Construction of water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the Draft BDCP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible and are described under each alternative in the RDEIR/SDEIS individual resource chapters and in the BDCP Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, EIR/EIS. An analysis of economic impacts of the proposed project, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are also evaluated and described in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx).</p> <p>Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the Draft EIR/EIS was revised based on the revised construction footprint for proposed water conveyance facilities, along with a refined set of construction cost and schedule assumptions developed for Alternative 4. Refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Section 16.3.3.9, in Appendix A for the revised analysis of Alternative 4. Additionally, one table from Draft EIR/EIS Appendix 16A has been incorporated into Appendix A.</p>
237	6	<p>The EIS minimizes the quality of life impacts on those living in the counties where the construction of the two tunnels will take place. We have been utilizing the Delta since 1958. It is a unique ecosystem standing apart from anything west of the Mississippi River. It has a historic value that cannot be diminished and treated as inconsequential. The EIR/EIS has not adequately treated the impact of the two tunnels project in this area. Just because you have spent close to a quarter billion dollars and over 30,000 pages of gobbly-gook does not mean you have actually looked at the issue.</p>	<p>The Lead Agencies acknowledge the discussion of community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.</p> <p>Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p> <p>The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p>
237	7	<p>This EIR/EIS is so obviously biased to support a project that adds no benefits to the Delta and whose sole purpose is to move massive amounts of water from a viable productive farming area to a desert area that will at best require twice as much water to be half as productive. There is only one answer, the desert area is owned by big buck corporations that do not give a damn about the Delta.</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. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.</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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
237	8	<p>The EIR/EIS does not adequately address water storage issues. If the two tunnels are to operate on the big gulp theory, taking massive amounts of water during flooding and sipping amounts during summer and dry periods, water storage must be considered. There has not been a major water storage facility constructed in California in over 30 years. Without new water storage, the big gulp theory cannot work. This is like farming. In a good season, the farmer has a bumper crop. But all other farmers have a bumper crop. So the market is saturated, price goes down. The farmer must have storage for his crop so it can be sold at a later date (assuming the product can be stored, otherwise it is left in the field to rot). The big gulp theory will fail because there is no place to store the extra water to be pumped. The double whammy is that the water is available at the wrong time, in the winter when demands are down. When the demand goes up in the summer, the system must be operated in the sip mode. The only way this can possibly help the Delta requires massive water storage that, to date, does not exist and is not considered as part of the EIR/EIS. You cannot work in a vacuum. This must be considered in your 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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 for additional discussion of other water storage projects being investigated at this time and Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives analyzed.</p>
237	9	<p>The EIR/EIS is committed to a two tunnels solution to the Delta. As such, there has been no analysis or consideration to utilizing the current pumping system at the Clifton Court Forebay as an adequate mitigation. It amazes me that the only solution will be a \$50+</p>	<p>T15 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. Many additional proposals by public and private</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>billion project that is government speak for a \$500 billion project with overruns. After all that investment, according to your report, no extra water will be pumped. How can you sit there with a straight face and say lets spend half a trillion dollars for no real gain? The existing infrastructure has not adequately been addressed as an alternative.</p>	<p>individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the BDCP EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The amount of water DWR can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process as described in the 2008 and 2009 BiOps (RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary ES.2.2). In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3).</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
237	10	<p>The EIS has not adequately addressed the cost/benefits of the two tunnel solution. This is an extremely costly project that does not benefit or conserve the Delta in any way.</p>	<p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs funding.</p>
237	11	<p>The benefits touted by the EIR/EIS purport to protect the levee system from earthquake damage. To date, no levee has ever failed due to earthquake activity in over 100 years (that means ever). If your people would analyze the composition of Delta soil, you would have found that it is extremely flexible, which is exactly what is needed for earthquake survivability. The study does not take this into account to minimize the benefit, if any, to this project.</p>	<p>The California Department of Water Resources' Levee Repairs and Floodplain Management Office is responsible for administering levee programs through evaluation and direct rehabilitation of structural deficiencies in California's levee system. Overall levee repairs and improvement programs administered by DWR will continue with available funding. For additional information on the relationship between the proposed project and Flood protections in the Delta, please see Appendix 6A.</p> <p>Chapter 9 of the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the geology and seismicity of the study area. Based on a review of the last 20 years of precast tunnel lining seismic performance histories, it can be concluded that little or no damage to precast tunnel lining was observed for major earthquakes around the world. Based on preliminary data, it is anticipated that the Delta tunnels can</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. Impact GEO- 1 and GEO-7 discusses the possibility of loss or damage resulting from strong seismic activity during construction and operation of water conveyance features. For more information regarding tunnel design please see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS for discussion of potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action scenario.</p> <p>For more information regarding floods and levees please see Appendix 6A.</p> <p>For more information regarding seismic activity please see Master Response 16.</p>
237	12	<p>The benefits touted by the EIR/EIS include protection from sea level rising (presumably by global warming). This benefit is bogus at best. Bogus benefits like this need to not only be minimized as to their value, but eliminated entirely as a benefit deciding factor.</p>	<p>The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness, increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the state, with or without the proposed project. The state is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the project alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>The State of California has acknowledged that sea level rise threatens coastal and near coastal resources (such as the Delta and Delta water supplies) and that adaptation and resiliency planning to protect these resources from expected levels of sea level rise is appropriate. (OPC, 2013) http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/</p> <p>(CCC, 2013) http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/SLRguidance.html</p> <p>EO S-3-05. http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861</p> <p>EO S-13-08 http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=11036</p> <p>AB 32 also mentions SLR as a threat to California.</p> <p>California Waterfix would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational scenarios, measures focused on the protection and enhancement of the Delta ecosystem and measures to reduce other stressors (Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, California WaterFix would improve habitat conditions, and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. The added flexibility by adding a new point of diversion would allow managers more options for adaptively managing the Delta so that conditions can be optimized to provide the greatest benefits across all Delta water uses and habitat conditions.</p> <p>Multiple analyses were performed in the proposed project to test the robustness of the alternatives to a range of potential future conditions. Water supply, aquatic and terrestrial resources were all analyzed with projected future conditions. The proposed project will likely remain in place and functional far into the future when salinity intrusion may require less frequent use of the south Delta pumps. Far from being stranded assets, the tunnels will be part of the state’s strategy in adapting to climate change.</p> <p>More information on ways in which the BDCP/California WaterFix proposes to improve resiliency and</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS, and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS.
237	13	Water demand is a factor in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and is not addressed. Reducing demands needed to be pumped will mitigate the entire need for pumping water from the Delta. I grew up in Southern California and have had since 1975 and currently have over a dozen rental properties in Southern California. These include Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Orange counties. There has never been a concerted effort by any of the recipients of Delta water in Southern California to conserve water. I know, I pay the water bills! Recently, there has been some activity to bring up drought issues, but still, water flows without restrictions. If the recipients made a concerted effort to conserve 15 or 20%, this would have a drastic impact on the flow requirement out of the Delta and make the two tunnels project unnecessary. The BDCP views this as not their job. But again, we do not live in a vacuum. This consideration must be included in the BDCP to remotely come up with a realistic, real life solution.	For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.
238	1	I have been a full time water front resident of Discovery Bay since 1995. My family, grown kids, grown grandkids and great grandkids, have enjoyed the delta since 1970 and we all think the Delta is the Jewel of California. We fished, water skied, swam, and raised our families in or near-by it for years and are thankful for having had that opportunity.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
238	2	What are you doing with all the comments? Will they be posted for public viewing to let everyone know what our feelings are? Will the comments be reviewed, analyzed or answered? We have a right to know the answers!	<p>The public comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS began on July 10, 2015 and continues through October 30, 2015. Public comments submitted during the official public comment period and the previous comment period for the 2013 Public Draft will be made available to the public upon the release of the Final EIR/EIS. The Final EIR/EIS will include all comments received during the official comment period and responses to substantive comments.</p> <p>The obligations of California public agencies under Article 1, section 3(b)(1), of the California Constitution and under the Public Records Act, do not include any obligation to post comments on draft environmental documents on agency websites as such comments come in from the public and interested agencies. Rather, those statutes deal with the obligation for public agencies to hold certain kinds of meetings of public bodies and public officials in public, and to make non-privileged documents of various kinds available to members of the public in response to formal requests. To date, neither the California Legislature nor Congress has required Lead Agencies for CEQA and NEPA documents to post comments on draft environmental documents on their websites during the public review periods for those draft documents.</p> <p>This is consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines §15088) and the National Environmental Policy Act (Council on Environmental Quality § 1503.4) and policies held by all Lead Agencies governing the implementation of CEQA and NEPA. Please see Master Responses 40 for additional detail on the public outreach that has been done for stakeholders and Master Response 42 regarding treatment of public comments.</p>
238	3	We were promised by previous governments experts that water monitoring devices would be provided in Discovery Bay to assure the quality of water would not be affected. This was never done! Why?? We need these monitoring stations to establish a basis of water quality before the tunnels will flow 14 million gallons of water per day out of the Delta ECO system. We all think you know why you don't want to install the monitors, but will not publish this for fear this info would harm your "Plan".	There are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
238	4	BDCP's plan is to use the sip and gulp process. Sips will be taken during dry years and gulps during wet years. The gulps during the wet years would be stored. The storing sites are not defined and where are you going to store water when all the reservoirs, lakes, etc. are already full?	<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>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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p>
238	5	Cost versus benefits. The cost of building the tunnels has been estimated to go beyond 67 billion dollars. Will there be over-runs like the Oakland Bridge? How can this be approved without a cost versus benefit analysis taking in consideration desalination, additional storage reservoirs, cost over-runs, public interest, etc.	Please see Master Response 5.
238	6	Why not restructure the Sacramento and Fremont Weirs to save the water during wet years. 67 Billion dollars is a lot of money!	<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 FEIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
238	7	Public interest should not be overshadowed by special self interest groups/money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
241	1	I was born in Southern California, lived there for 20 years and now have lived for 45 years in the Delta. This BDCP project is a joke. We were at Stockton and talked to the consultants who wrote the damn EIR/EIS. We heard them refer to some of their proposed routes as the old Peripheral Canal. Who are you kidding? This is a political ploy to build exactly what the people of California have rejected twice. Only with this ploy it will cost 10 times as much as the canal. Your entire premise is dishonest, fails any rational cost/benefit analysis and creates incredible burdens on the people living in the communities affected by the construction and effects of the pumping that will follow.	The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The project would also require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under FESA and CESA. Additionally, refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal). The project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. Refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place). Effects on community character are described in Chapter 16 (Socioeconomics) of the Draft EIR/EIS. As described in Chapter 16, where required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses associated with project implementation. The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree that the "BDCP project is a joke." Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The documentation generated by this proposed project has

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative (see Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS).</p>
241	2	<p>I am astounded that there is no transparency with this process. Like the EIR/EIS, why are comments not available for review? How do I even know you have received and processed my comments and that they are not just lying in a circular file somewhere? Why are the comments comingled between the EIR/EIS and the project? The tunnels should be removed from the BDCP as there is no way they can be considered as mitigation to the health of the Delta. Posting these comments during the EIS process is a mandatory federal government procedure. This document and process, as conducted here, are fatally flawed. I have attended all of your meetings. In Brentwood there was an open meeting where we were assured our questions would be answered. To date, we have not heard from BDCP. We left emails, addresses and phone numbers. We have very little faith that any of you give a damn about the true impact your meddling will do to degrade the Delta, let alone conserve it.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement. For information pertaining to how comments have been considered and addressed, please refer to Master Response 42.</p> <p>The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.</p>
241	3	<p>The project is dishonest on its face value. This project does nothing to improve or even leave the Delta in a status quo condition. Any legitimate habitat conservation plan must come to the conclusion that there is simply not enough water to allow Delta species (salmon, shad, smelt) to survive and meet the demands of the water contractors who are behind this project.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. 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>
241	4	<p>How can you justify taking water from a productive fertile farming area, turning it into a dead zone due to salinity intrusion, and pay \$50 billion + to transfer it to an arid, desert area that requires twice as much water to produce half the crops of the existing Delta farmlands? There is no logic to this except there are rich people who own that land and want the water at any cost ignoring the Delta and the people and businesses that live there.</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs funding.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
241	5	<p>I am against the BDCP project because it simply does not comply with the Delta Reform Act. The DRA requires that actions of the state shall reduce reliance on the Delta. The twin tunnels should not be any part of the BDCP project. There simply is no way you can take massive amounts of water out at Sacramento, thus reducing the flows through the Delta, and come to any conclusion this is competent stewardship of the Delta. The leadership in this boondoggle should be fired.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>improving 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> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p> <p>For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31.</p>
241	6	<p>The idea that you are letting the fox control the henhouse is laughable. The same people that want to destroy the Delta to get all the water they can are in too much control of this whole project. I have worked with many government programs, RFPs, studies and proposals. The idea that you are doing studies paid for by the water contractors leads to obvious bias towards your boss. There is an inherent bias to please the boss who pays the bills. Otherwise he will get someone else to give him the answers he wants to hear. This project is so obviously biased in this direction a blind person can see it.</p>	<p>Refer to the response for Comment No. 1 of this letter (Letter No. 241).</p>
241	7	<p>No alternate options have been considered. Those alternate options include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Using/modifying the existing pumping systems in Clifton Court Forebay b. Conservation (and I mean significant conservation in the southland) c. Desalination (with the real costs and overruns approaching \$500 billion, the whole process of increased drought-resistant water supplies through desalination has to be realistically looked at.) 	<p>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. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the BDCP EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
241	8	<p>This is nothing but a water grab disguised as a habitat plan. Governor Brown will pay a political price if he stays the course with this one. As more people become aware of the incredible cost for nothing, this will become a giant rabbit hole consuming our taxes that are desperately needed for projects like fixing our 48th nationally ranked highways.</p> <p>Even if this damn thing gets built, the fox again will control the flow. So the big gulp theory will turn into the big and bigger gulp theory of operation.</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. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
241	9	<p>Living in Discovery Bay, I am deeply concerned about our water quality. One of the main touts of the tunnels is that it will improve water quality of that sent south. By definition, when they pull that water out in Sacramento there will be no need for concern of the quality of the Delta waters in and around Discovery Bay. This is physics, you cannot improve our water by diverting the flow of fresh water leaving us high and dry (so to speak). This is unacceptable, destroying our whole way of life.</p>	<p>The water quality analyses presented in the EIR/EIS provide a thorough analysis of important water quality constituents of concern at multiple locations throughout the Delta to present the potential water quality effects that could result from implementing each of the project alternatives. The locations and constituents of concern assessed by hydrodynamic modeling were chosen based on locations of existing water quality monitoring stations, existing compliance points in the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan for the protection of beneficial uses throughout the Delta, and professional judgment.</p> <p>Although it would not be practical to present water quality results at every location in the Delta, for water quality constituents that were modeled, the analysis provides enough information at 11 different locations within the Delta to characterize areas near the chosen locations. For example, potential water quality changes in Discovery Bay can be approximated by evaluating the modeling results presented for Old River near Rock Slough. The modeling was conducted to evaluate potential water quality changes with project alternative implementation relative to existing conditions and the future No Action baseline conditions. For water quality constituents that were not modeled, with few exceptions, specific locations in the Delta were not discussed, but rather, the assessment addresses qualitatively the types of changes, if any, which are expected for various regions of the Delta or the Delta as a whole, including terminal/dead-end sloughs and areas such as Discovery Bay. This approach is valid for constituents whose levels or concentrations are not expected to change as a result of the project at any location throughout the Delta by a large enough magnitude that effects on beneficial uses would be expected (e.g., pathogens, dissolved oxygen, trace metals).</p> <p>Water circulation and exchange in Discovery Bay, as with other terminal/dead-end sloughs in the Delta, is expected to be dominated by tidal effects and local withdrawals and agricultural returns. Tidal effects on Discovery Bay are not expected to be substantially altered by restoration proposed under the new proposed project alternative, as effects are expected to be limited and localized to the restoration areas. The project alternatives will not have direct effects on agricultural or other water withdrawals or returns local to Discovery Bay. Reductions in pumping from the existing South Delta pumping plants will affect flows in Old River, but the effects of these changes on Discovery Bay exchange and circulation is expected to be small relative to other factors (i.e., tidal effects and local withdrawals and agricultural returns). The largest effect on water quality of Discovery Bay is expected to be the change in its source water, which is Old River, as a result of the replacement of Sacramento River water with San Joaquin River water. This change is reflected in water quality modeling results presented for Old River at Rock Slough.</p> <p>For constituents for which significant adverse effects were predicted, mitigation is presented in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and other commitments to reduce potential economic effects are included in Appendix 3B. Mitigation measures were developed considering the uncertainties regarding climate change and sea level</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>rise, the lack of specific locations of restoration areas, and uncertainties in the modeling. Specific mitigation measures for Discovery Bay were not determined to be necessary, based on the water quality analyses conducted and determinations of adverse effects. However, mitigation measures that are implemented to reduce significant water quality impacts will also be implemented, as appropriate, for impacts to Discovery Bay that are a result of project implementation.</p> <p>Monitoring is conducted in many locations throughout the Delta, and will continue to be conducted following implementation of the project, to support and inform adaptive management and mitigation activities for those constituents for which adverse effects were predicted. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.</p>
241	10	<p>It is simply a matter of physics. There is not enough water, especially in drought years like this one, to support existing much less increased exports to the south and recover the Delta. Global warming has affected the polar vortex and jet stream this year to produce devastating effects on our water supplies. The only thing we can count on in the future is that these weather extremes will increase. This project should be looking at increasing storage of water to cover the new norm rather than looking at raping the Delta environment to grow almonds in Fresno.</p>	<p>It is projected that, taking climate change into account, 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. The proposed project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness, increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the state, with or without the proposed project. The state is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the project alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.</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 FEIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
241	11	<p>There is no realistic plan or method to pay for this project. With only 8% of the project designed, the sheer estimates of cost might as well be pulled from thin air (if they are not already). With a cost that will exceed that of the Bay Bridge and the bullet train to nowhere it borders on criminal to proceed without bringing this to the people before more of our government money is spent on this disaster. For anyone to believe the water contractors will pay for even a minor part of this is unbelievable. Rate payers look for cost to soar even far worse than that of the Obamacare fiasco. Realistic estimates see yearly residential water bills to be in the \$1000/month to pay for this. Let us just start charging them that now and watch water conservation really take form.</p>	<p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$16 billion (in undiscounted 2012 dollars), an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Funding sources for the BDCP are described in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP. Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			proposed project.
242	1	<p>May I first say how deceiving this process has been from the beginning? Conservation plan? What happened to transparency in politics?</p> <p>Why do you feel it necessary to hide the real plan under a title implying conservation? Are you actually wanting this plan so badly that you lie about it, spend millions and millions of taxpayers money in half baked reports and research when the real truth is about money, legacy and control?</p>	<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.</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>
242	2	By the way, when and where will the complete, open and honest reports be published? I would like to be provided with that link when this comes about. It seems the current reports are not quite touching all the bases.	The Federal and State Lead Agencies have done their best to make the EIR/EIS as fair, objective, and complete as possible. A Final EIR/EIS is anticipated to be published in 2016 and will be made available to the public on the project website as well as at DWR's offices.
242	3	Why would you sell out northern California farmers, wineries, property owners and business owners (to name a few) in the name of conservation?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For more information regarding agricultural mitigation please see Master Response 18.
242	4	Why are you trying to hide the Kern underground water storage, which belongs to the State of California and therefore the people of California? Why is this only available to large commercial pistachio, almonds and pomegranate growers whose main customer is China? Again, we are literally being sold down the river.	The existing conditions, No Action Alternative, and all of the alternatives assume the continued use of the Kern Water Bank which is owned and operated by the Kern Water Bank Authority that includes agencies located in Kern County, as discussed in Section 7.1.13 of Chapter 7, Groundwater, of the EIR/EIS.
242	5	Why do we continue to waste our precious resource (water) to try and grow products in the desert? These orchards should have never been planted in the first place and certainly now, with droughts plaguing 11 western states should be retired immediately.	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.
242	6	<p>Jerry Brown's father already has the aqueduct, does Jerry need his own legacy so badly that he is willing to spend billions on the Obamacare of water transfer? We have been to the moon; come up with something else, like desalination. I lived on an island in the middle of the South Pacific (SAMTEC) and that is all we had for water. Why would you tear a hole through the heart of California in the name of water?</p> <p>Please, think of your parents, brother, sisters, children, grandchildren, nieces and nephews when you go to work in the morning. You could not possibly be serious about this if you did.</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> <p>See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
243	1	I have lived in Discovery Bay for many years and now currently work here. The Delta is a way of life here for many people. Spending time on the Delta is one of the best things Contra Costa County has going for it. People have built families and generations here with the activities on the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
244	1	This is a comment on the BDCP project. I oppose the construction of the twin tunnels. The entire premise of the project is dishonest. I am a home owner and tax payer of Discovery Bay. I do not see anything good with this project.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
245	1	I am a citizen of Discovery Bay, CA and this project has the potential of causing serious damage to the water quality in my back yard and causing significant negative economic	The discussion of community character in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		impact to my community.	
246	1	We have been homeowners in Discovery Bay for over 15 years. We live on a deep water channel which provides us access to the entire Delta and out to San Francisco Bay. We have enjoyed boating and fishing for all of these years but have noticed over the years a gradual lessening of all fish, particularly striped bass and salmon. One of the reasons we moved to Discovery Bay was because of the fresh water at our back door. We are from southern California where there is no such environment (all marinas are on salt water.)	<p>The discussion of community character in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
248	1	The tunnels are not a conservation measure designed to save any species. This is simply a water grab that does not comply with "The Endangered Species Act" or "The Delta Reform Act" and is a waste of taxpayer money. The residents of Bethel Island are against the construction of the twin tunnels.	<p>The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree with the general assertion by the commenter that the project is "a water grab" and does not comply with legislation already in place to protect the Delta. Refer to the following Master Responses 31, 11, 13, and 5 for information on compliance with current legislation, applicable city and county general plans, public trust doctrine and the Endangered Species Act. 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. 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. Refer to Master Response 5 for Conservation Measure 1 as a CM.</p>
248	2	Our Delta cannot support the extravagant water habits of the rest of the state. Southern California needs more storage and desalination projects of their own.	<p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			storage.
249	1	I have been a resident in Discovery Bay for over twenty years. I have been an active boater for that same amount of time. My family has enjoyed the serenity and beauty of the Delta and we do not want to see that changed by politicians and people that have other alternatives to water without pumping it from the Delta.	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p>
250	1	<p>I have concerns about the BDCP plan. While I enjoyed reading about the in-depth process followed by the scientists, I am quite concerned about the conclusions and plans presented to rectify the problematic situations described.</p> <p>The data clearly show a need to increase the protection of the Delta environment to prevent further erosion of the many communities relying on this unique and crucial environment(s). These plans fail to achieve that goal.</p> <p>How any thoughtful person could conclude that the take of an additional 10% of the fresh water flows (2.3.2.1.1) from this system and improve the (Co-Equal Goal of) health of this crucial system is beyond ludicrous.</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
250	2	Is there any doubt that the decline of the Delta has been exacerbated by the excessive take for the benefit of a small number of politically connected individuals who should not be farming in the deficient soils of the Westlands? Do the issues at Kesterson reservoir ring a bell? I am all in agreement that farmers need water and that the Delta is one source for that resource. But, there are also reservoirs in the Central Valley, built for that very	<p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		purpose.	<p>water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
250	3	Who decided to manipulate the (public receptions) poster boards to include deceptive data? How could anyone claim the Chinook Salmon will benefit from an increase in quantity and quality of habitat when DWR will be allowed to, at a minimum, Take an additional 10% of their crucial habitat, which is water?!	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. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.
250	4	Who manipulated the data to include grasslands near Byron (CM6, 8, 9) as an area needing government intervention? Have you ever driven through the Byron area? Grasslands is virtually all there is in those communities.	Some Conservation Measures that were originally described in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP are included in the new proposed project as Environmental Commitments. Natural Communities Restoration and Channel Margin Enhancement in the Byron area are included in these new Environmental Commitments. Mitigation under the Proposed Project calls for the protection of grasslands, vernal pool, and alkali seasonal wetland communities near Byron. This is in recognition of the high value these lands serve as part of the larger, contiguous, undeveloped lands to the west (e.g., Los Vaqueros watershed). The protection of grassland and vernal mesic communities in this region have potential to benefit a number of covered and native species, including: Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, California red-legged frog, California tiger salamander, alkali milk-vetch, legenera, etc. For more information please see Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
250	5	Who decided that taking 30% (Draft 2.3.2.1) of the fresh water flows to support lawns and car washes in the Los Angeles Basin is a great use of this resource? Again, I am in favor of sharing this Delta resource, but not at the expense of the Delta. Los Angeles, et al, can spend some of their money on developing desalination plants if they want to continually expand.	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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.
250	6	Political muscle is not an excuse to strip the environment bare. Get rid of the Twin Tunnels project. You already have pumps that can be dialed back to save fish from the reverse	As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions,

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		flows. Governor Moonie, Dianne Feinstein, et al can build their legacy (and bank accounts) doing something less disastrous to the communities involved.	including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
251	1	I have lived in Contra Costa County since 1984. I moved from Danville to Discovery Bay just for the beautiful water of the Delta. Now you want to go & destroy all that!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Please refer to and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
251	2	You're sneaking around like a spineless snake and trying to pull a "fast one" by refusing to post all comments online. By what right do you think you are exempt from Standard Operating Procedures regarding comments on any project especially something as costly and controversial as this one? We (your organization and I) both know your project has nothing to do with conservation, at least not conservation of what I would call natural resources or water. As a tax paying voter, I demand you immediately open up the comment section of your site.	Far from violating Standard Operating Procedures, the Lead Agencies conducted the formal public review process for the proposed project consistent with historic practices under both NEPA and CEQA. 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; refer to Master Response 43 for more information on the transparency of the process. It bears mentioning, though, that the Lead Agencies' earlier willingness to post on-line and receive comments on their administrative draft environmental documents was an unprecedented attempt to seek public input during the process of formulating draft impact analyses. 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.
252	1	I understand your representatives promised Discovery Bay representatives that special monitoring equipment and adaptive management would be provided to our town. Please provide me with the locations of the monitoring equipment you placed in Discovery Bay. I expect you won't be able to provide me with the locations as the equipment has not been installed; however, I want to see how you answer this e-mail request. I look forward to your prompt and honest reply,	There are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.
253	1	Why have you refused to post all comments online? Are you afraid of the truth -- that projects are shoved through before considering what else could be done to address the problems being faced?	Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement. For information pertaining to how comments have been considered and addressed, please refer to Master Response 42. The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.
253	2	Could graft and corruption have anything to do with all of the government waste, especially in California and at the federal level? Almost always, cheaper and more effective	The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		alternatives are not considered!	<p>to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state’s water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources 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>
253	3	<p>I cannot understand how moving water in Northern California addresses a water shortage in Southern California. No new water is being created. No new storage is being created. No conservation efforts are being considered. In fact, highly productive agriculture areas are being disrupted and in many cases destroyed. How does this conserve? Certainly, adding agricultural land in the desert is not conservation.</p> <p>Frankly, we both know your project name was chosen due to the political power of the name rather than any true conservation. How disappointing for children and grandchildren!</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. This process has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses in the desert). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Water Use in Southern California). Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not part of the project, they are important tools in managing California’s water resources. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts.</p>
254	1	<p>As a long time Contra Costa resident and current Discovery Bay resident, I am very disturbed by the tremendous waste of money on a project that is unnecessary, extremely harmful to the environment and not well thought out. The final cost on this project will far exceed any (if there is any) economic benefit. You have fudged the numbers to make it look like this project is cost effective.</p> <p>If you were asked to put your money into this project, would you? We both know the answer. We also know why no business would ever consider any project as ludicrous as this tremendous waste of money.</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. 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 proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the proposed project funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
254	2	Please stop immediately before you do serious environmental harm to the fragile delta region and the many animal species that live here (including the human animals).	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS or the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS. Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
255	1	<p>Since my family has lived in Discovery Bay for 14 years, I am very concerned about the water quality impact on Discovery Bay waters. I ask that specific analysis of the projects water quality impacts be included in the Draft EIR/EIS -as they have not been included.</p> <p>Discovery Bay is different than the rest of the Delta. Discovery Bay consists of sixteen shallow bays. There is little circulation in the bays. The impacts on water quality in nearby open water sloughs and channels are not the same as the shallow bays.</p> <p>This is my request that the site specific analysis be conducted to determine water quality impacts on the bays of Discovery Bay.</p>	The water quality analysis presented in the RDIER/RDEIS sections covering the new proposed Alternatives and Appendix A provide a thorough analysis of important water quality constituents of concern at multiple locations throughout the Delta to present the potential water quality effects that could result from implementing the project alternative.
257	1	<p>I spoke with the engineer that did all the modeling for the changes in salinity of the water. As he stated, his numbers are based on a set flow. As soon as the flow is increased all salinity data is useless.</p> <p>The salinity will increase in the river. This will in turn increase the salinity of irrigated land.</p>	Salinity-related parameters, including bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity, were analyzed in detail for all alternatives in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including effects relative to objectives for protection of agricultural beneficial uses. Mitigation was introduced if the project alternative would result in a significant impact. The assessment was based on hydrologic and hydrodynamic modeling for a 16-year period of record, and accounts for climate change and sea level rise, as described in Section 8.3.1.1., Models Used and Their Linkages, in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/S. With this approach, the assessment accounted for variable flows both on short-term (e.g., daily) and long-term (annual) time scales and different water year types (e.g., wet, dry, critical).
258	1	Simply put, we need more water. This plan spends a lot of money without creating more water. Money needs to be spent on water storage facilities, desalination plants, [and] anything that creates more usable water.	Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS, describes the process used to consider and screen alternatives, including proposals with aspects of desalination and storage. 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 they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
259	1	Any work to restore the Delta can be done without building tunnels, these are two quite separate items. You can actually do well without having to cause harm first.	<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 south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, EIR/EIS.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
260	1	If construction were to proceed, just the fact that there was a massive construction project in the Delta will keep people away, no matter what mitigation, there will be a massive loss to the economy of the Delta. What compensation do you plan for Delta businesses?	Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the proposed project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>the State of California.</p> <p>When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. Construction of water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the Draft BDCP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible and are described under each alternative in the RDEIR/SDEIS individual resource chapters and in the BDCP Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, EIR/EIS. An analysis of economic impacts of the proposed project, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are also evaluated and described in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx).</p> <p>Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the Draft EIR/EIS was revised based on the revised construction footprint for proposed water conveyance facilities, along with a refined set of construction cost and schedule assumptions developed for Alternative 4. Refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Section 16.3.3.9, in Appendix A for the revised analysis of Alternative 4. Additionally, one table from Draft EIR/EIS Appendix 16A has been incorporated into Appendix A.</p>
261	1	<p>What is going to be done to compensate for decreased real estate values due to the threat of building tunnels? Home sales and local realtor income have suffered due to the threat of tearing up the Delta. It is not possible to get a fair price for property in an area that will be plagued by a massive construction project for the next 5-10 years.</p> <p>This is a problem that Delta communities are already facing, and may need to be mitigated by the communities through legal action.</p>	<p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the proposed project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California.</p> <p>When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. Construction of water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the Draft BDCP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible and are described under each alternative in the RDEIR/SDEIS individual resource chapters and in the BDCP Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, EIR/EIS. An analysis of economic impacts of the proposed project, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are also evaluated and described in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx).</p> <p>Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the Draft EIR/EIS was revised based on the revised construction footprint for proposed water conveyance facilities, along with a refined set of construction cost and schedule assumptions developed for Alternative 4. Refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Section 16.3.3.9, in Appendix A for the revised analysis of Alternative 4. Additionally, one table from Draft EIR/EIS Appendix 16A has been incorporated into Appendix A.</p>
262	1	<p>I am astounded. I have lived in California since 1984 after serving in the US Air Force for many years including several assignments in California. Since 1993, I have lived in Discovery Bay. I am active in our schools, youth groups and community. By what right do you think you are exempt from standard operating procedures regarding comments on</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement. For information pertaining to how comments have been considered and addressed, please refer to Master Response 42.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>any project especially something as costly and controversial as this one? We (your organization and I) both know your project has nothing to do with conservation, at least not conservation of what I would call natural resources or water.</p> <p>As a tax paying voter, I demand you immediately open up the comment section of your site.</p>	<p>The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.</p>
263	1	<p>As a long time California resident and current Discovery Bay resident, I am very disturbed by the tremendous waste of money on a project that is unnecessary, extremely harmful to the environment and not well thought out. The final cost on this project will far exceed any (if there is any) economic benefit. You have fudged the numbers to make it look like this project is cost effective. If you were asked to put your money into this project, would you? We both know the answer. We also know why no business would ever consider any project as ludicrous as this tremendous waste of money.</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</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>
263	2	<p>Please stop immediately before you do serious environmental harm to the fragile delta region and the many animal species that live here (including the human animals).</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS or the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS. Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
264	1	<p>Please provide me with a detailed analysis comparing your proposed project to alternatives. I have been around quite a few government projects that are shoved through before considering what else could be done to address the problems being faced. Almost always, cheaper and more effective alternatives are not considered. Could graft and corruption have anything to do with all of the government waste especially in California and at the federal level?</p>	<p>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. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the BDCP EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.
264	2	<p>I cannot understand how moving water in northern California addresses a water shortage in southern California. No new water is being created. No new storage is being created. No conservation efforts are being considered. In fact, highly productive agriculture areas are being disrupted and in many cases destroyed. How does this conserve? Certainly, adding agricultural land in the desert is not conservation.</p> <p>Frankly, we both know your project name was chosen due to the political power of the name rather than any true conservation. How disappointing for children and grandchildren!</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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California’s water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p> <p>Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.</p>
265	1	<p>I understand your representatives promised Discovery Bay representatives that special monitoring equipment and adaptive management would be provided to our town. Please provide me with the locations of the monitoring equipment you placed in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>I expect you won’t be able to provide me with the locations as the equipment has not been installed; however, I want to see how you answer this e-mail request.</p>	<p>There are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.</p> <p>The water quality analysis presented in the RDIER/RDEIS sections covering the new proposed Alternatives and Appendix A provide a thorough analysis of important water quality constituents of concern at multiple locations throughout the Delta to present the potential water quality effects that could result from implementing the project alternative.</p> <p>For more information regarding potential impacts to Discovery Bay please see Master Response [55].</p>
266	1	<p>I feel that the Bay Delta Conservation Plan for taking millions of acre-feet of water directly from the Sacramento River is of dubious value. The plan is estimated to cost \$24 billion without including the financing costs of paying interest on the bonds. For \$24 billion, the state should expect to increase our water supply, not merely transport Delta water in a</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		more acceptable fashion.	<p>fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>The proposed alternative (referred to in the RDEIR/SDEIS as Alternative 4A) is estimated to cost significantly less relative to the former preferred alternative (Alternative 4 under the BDCP). The difference in cost is largely due to the reduced level of restoration specifically funded by the project, as well as other Conservation Measures that are not included under Alternative 4A. As such, the total estimated cost for Alternative 4A is \$14.9 billion in undiscounted 2014 dollars. The estimated cost to implement the former preferred alternative under BDCP is \$24.7 billion in undiscounted 2012 dollars. For additional information on the cost of the proposed project, please see Master Response 5.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
266	2	I have a second reason for disliking the plan and that is I live in Antioch, California. We get most of our water from the Contra Costa Water District, which pumps from various sites in the Delta. As more water is pumped into the Delta Mendota Canal and California Aqueduct, the water quality in Antioch decreases. Our water tastes saltier this year than it has in the past due to the drought and Delta pumping. I have been told that the Bay Delta Conservation Plan will not remove more water from the Delta, so our water situation will not change. However, it seems to me that if the best source of fresh water in the Delta, that is the Sacramento River, is drained before it reaches the Delta, our water quality will decline.	The water quality assessment of the diversion of Sacramento River water under the project alternatives addresses effects on salinity-related parameters in the Delta, including electrical conductivity (EC) and chloride, and compliance with related agricultural, fish and wildlife, and municipal and industrial use objectives in the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and degradation relative to these uses in Impacts WQ-7 (chloride) and WQ-11 (EC) in Chapter 8, Water Quality. 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 impacts is provided. Further, the proposed project has been modified since publication of the Draft EIR/EIS to Alternative 4A, which would have less than significant impacts on salinity-related parameters at Antioch and CCWD diversion locations.
266	3	I attended the public meeting in Clarksburg on February 12, 2014. I talked with a number of people involved with the plan. Someone said they recognized that Antioch might receive higher levels of chloride in the water if the plan were to be implemented. They told me to look at chapter 8 and the appendix on chloride. I am puzzled when looking at the data table CI-61 on page 77. The title of the table states the units are micrograms per liter. The left column on the table states the units are milligrams per liter. I compared the numbers with those reported by Contra Costa Water District for Martinez and that did not help. Contra Costa Water District reported that chloride levels at Martinez for 2012	<p>Chapter 8 does indicate that for some alternatives, chloride levels at Antioch are expected to increase, relative to existing conditions or the No Action alternative. Additionally, the modeling indicates that there would be more exceedances of the 150 mg/L objective in the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan.</p> <p>The units of µg/L in the caption for Table CI-61 is in error and should read mg/L. This change has been made in the Final EIR/EIS. We assume that the 64-90 mg/L chloride data from Contra Costa Water District that the commenter is referring to is actually drinking water data for the City of Martinez, which comes from the annual water quality report. The source of this water is Contra Costa Water District which withdraws water</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>were between 64 mg/L and 90 mg/L. The data on table CI-61 shows that monthly chloride levels average 3757 mg/L to 9414 mg/L. If the levels were actually this high, they would surpass the 150 mg/L guideline by 25-62 times.</p>	<p>from several locations in the Delta. Table CI-61 is summarizing long-term monthly average chloride concentrations at the western edge of Suisun Bay near the City of Martinez. This water is considerably more saline than the water that CCWD diverts from the Delta. Water in Suisun Bay near Martinez is not subject to water quality objectives for salinity, including the 150 mg/L objective in the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan.</p>
266	4	<p>I also looked through the appendix on the effect of climate change. On pages 29-A2 and 29-A3, it is stated that the salinity at Martinez could be as high as 20 psu. A practical salinity unit is described as being approximately 1g/L. If salinity levels at Martinez were 20 g/L, most of the Delta water would be unfit for drinking, agricultural use or freshwater fish.</p>	<p>RDEIR/SDESIS 4.3.4 (4A) describes whether concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase or decrease with the project, relative to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. To the extent that concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase, 4.3.4 describes whether these increases are expected to result in impacts to beneficial uses of water in the Delta. For constituents for which adverse impacts were expected, mitigation and other commitments, such as additional evaluation and modeling and consultation with water purveyors to identify additional measures to avoid and minimize or offset these impacts, were introduced to address those impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, adding intakes in the North Delta will allow for operational flexibility that can improve natural flow in the Delta and avoid impacts to migratory fish based on real time data and operations</p> <p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
266	5	<p>Appendix 8G describes how chloride levels in the river are expected to change. Page 8G-78 states that the number of years where the salinity levels in the simulation exceeded the 150 mg/L increased from 6.25% for existing conditions to 25% for alternative #7. The people I talked to in Clarksburg said that alternative #4 was currently the preferred alternative. That option would just double the number of years where the salinity levels exceeded the 150 mg/L limit from 6.25% to 12.5%. This plan would clearly not improve the water quality of people living in my community.</p>	<p>The proposed project has been modified since publication of the Draft EIR/EIS to Alternative 4A, which would have less than significant impacts on salinity-related parameters at Delta assessment locations. Regarding the specific objectives exceedance noted in the comment, the number of years the 150 mg/L chloride objective would be exceeded under Alternative 4A would be 0%.</p>
266	6	<p>This is not to criticize the people coming up with the plan. Given the constraints, I think they have done an admirable job. It is very difficult to see how one could continue to take copious amounts of water from the Delta in a future where you expect a 55 inch increase in sea level without encountering insurmountable problems. Due to subsidence, much of the Delta is already below the mean higher high water mark (figure 29-1). If a major levee was</p>	<p>Please see Appendix A, Section 5, FEIR/EIS, for more information on potential effects from climate change and sea level rise in the future.</p> <p>As a point of clarification, while a 55 inch sea level rise is discussed and considered in Chapter 29, Climate Change, FEIR/EIS, as required by the Delta Reform Act, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan assumes only 45 cm</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		to fail, it could cause a strong upstream current that could pull a huge amount of saltwater upstream. I live close to Big Break, a site where a levee failed in 1928 and the land is still underwater.	of sea level rise by 2060. A sea level rise of 55 inches is expected no sooner than the year 2100. Additional information can be found in the following two locations: 1) under the "Climate Adaptation" information at http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/AboutBDCP/YourQuestionsAnswered.aspx and 2) in the FEIR-EIS Appendix 5A Modeling Technical Appendix - Sections A & B (Section A.7 "Climate Change and Sea Level Rise Scenarios") - http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Public_Draft_BDCP_EIR-EIS_Appendix_5A_-_EIR-EIS_Modeling_Technical_Appendix_-_Sections_A_B.sflb.ashx
266	7	If we have \$24 billion to spend on improving California's water supply, I think we have engineers capable of coming up with a far more robust plan than building new tunnels and pumps to more efficiently drain the Delta.	As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
266	8	There are other options that could be considered, such as recycling water or desalination plants. While these are more costly per quantity of water, they would increase the water supply. The largest water users of the state are mainly agriculture, and many of these users could use technologies to decrease the amount of water they lose to evaporation. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is not the only source of water in the state.	The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf . Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/ . Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
267	1	How will the farmers of the Delta benefit from these water transfers?	For more information regarding agricultural mitigation please see Master Response 18.
267	2	What additional water reservoirs will be added to the system both above ground and below ground?	<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 BDCP EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state’s water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources 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>
267	3	What is the process of levee integrity monitoring?	<p>The BDCP/CWF doesn’t propose any changes to the process of levee integrity monitoring. Local reclamation and levee maintenance districts would remain responsible for maintaining the levees.</p> <p>Please see Section 6A.1.2 in Appendix 6A for a discussion on levees modified by construction of the California WaterFix (CWF), including responsibilities of the project proponents.</p> <p>Before and/or during construction of the CWF water conveyance facilities, project proponents will explore opportunities with local reclamation districts and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) to</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			address potential conflicts regarding levee maintenance, inspection, and flood fighting activities on project and non-project levees. DWR will look to enter into agreements with local reclamation districts with jurisdiction in the Delta to ensure levee management activities by both government and local agencies are not interrupted during construction of the water conveyance facilities. In addition, DWR will comply with all applicable flood protection requirements and regulations to ensure flood neutrality during construction and operations of the CWF.
267	4	Will core samples be taken from both levees and land sight of intakes?	Yes, borings will be performed and soil samples will be collected along the existing levee crown and levee landside toe, as well as at varying distances away from the existing levee landside toe, based on the proposed layout of each intake site of conveyance alternatives. The type, number, depth, and spacing of borings will be in accordance with published agency guidelines, including USACE Sacramento District - Geotechnical Levee Practice, and USACE - Geotechnical Investigations.
267	5	What vegetation will be put on levees to preserve integrity of levees?	For the proposed construction of Conservation Measure 1 (CM 1) levee modifications, slope protections would be provided in accordance with state and federal levee design and construction requirements. Slope protection type and material will be selected as part of next engineering phases based on site specific geotechnical data and analyses. Additionally, if BDCP/CWF makes any modification to a levee that is part of the federal flood control system, the BDCP proponents must secure approval from USACE through the Section 408 permitting process.
267	6	Where will the soil come from to build/modify the levee system?	For the proposed construction of Conservation Measure 1 (CM1) levee modifications, materials excavated from the tunnels and other conveyance facility footprints would be used as fill material to the greatest extent feasible. Depending on the final construction schedule of individual construction facilities, fill materials will also have to be imported from other sources. California Department of Water Resources (DWR) completed a preliminary laboratory testing program to evaluate the feasibility of excavated tunnel materials (also known as reusable tunnel material, RTM) for potential reuses including construction fill. The laboratory test results indicate that the RTM would comply with requirements of Title 23 of California Code of Regulations (Title 23) for levee fill materials. A copy of the RTM testing report is available on the BDCP website: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Reusable_Tunnel_Material_Testing_Report.sflb.ashx
267	7	Will farm equipment transferring to and from fields need escorts to be sure they get into and out of the field they work in?	As part of the mitigation for the proposed project, the proponents commit to design projects so as to optimize contiguous parcels of agricultural land of a size sufficient to support their efficient use for continued agricultural production. Additionally, where the construction or operation of a facility could limit access to ongoing agricultural operations, the proponents propose maintaining a means of convenient access to these agricultural properties as part of project design, construction, and implementation. Finally, the proponents propose consulting with landowners and agricultural operators to develop appropriate construction practices to minimize construction-related impairment of agricultural productivity. Practices may include coordinating the movement of heavy equipment and implementing traffic control measures. See Mitigation Measure AG-1 in Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
267	8	How will fish be affected during the construction at the intake areas?	For the EIR/EIS, readers can find a discussion of effects of construction of water conveyance facilities, including effects at new north Delta intake areas, on covered fish species in EIR/EIS Chapter 11 in the following Impact statements under each Alternative (1a through 9): AQUA-1 (delta smelt), AQUA-19 (longfin smelt), AQUA-37 (winter-run Chinook salmon), AQUA-55 (spring-run Chinook salmon), AQUA-73 (fall-/late fall-run Chinook salmon), AQUA-91 (steelhead), AQUA-109 (Sacramento splittail), AQUA-127 (green sturgeon), AQUA-145 (white sturgeon), AQUA-163 (Pacific lamprey), and AQUA-181 (river lamprey). Readers can find a discussion of effects of construction of water conveyance facilities, including effects at

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>new north Delta intake areas, on non-covered fish species in EIR/EIS Chapter 11 in Impact AQUA-199 under each Alternative (1a through 9).</p> <p>Readers can find a discussion of cumulative effects of constructing the proposed project and other projects in Section 11.3.5, Cumulative Effects on Fish and Aquatic Resources, under Impact AQUA-CUM1 (for covered fish species) and Impact AQUA-CUM7 (for non-covered fish species).</p>
267	9	What are the quantities of muck that will be excavated?	Under Alternative 4 and 4a (the proposed project), the revised estimates of Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM) can be found in the recirculated documents in Table 3C-1 "Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities" starting on page 3C-40 of Appendix 3C in Appendix A, which details the revised estimates for RTM storage acreage, volume, and potential reuses. Mapbook figures M3-4 and M14-7 show potential RTM storage locations. Final locations for storage of RTM would be selected based on guidelines presented in Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, section 3B.2.18 "Disposal and Reuse of Spoils, Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM), and Dredged Material" starting on page 3B-50, also in Appendix A.
267	10	Where will muck be taken?	Under Alternative 4 and 4a (the proposed project), the revised estimates of Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM) can be found in the recirculated documents in Table 3C-1 "Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities" starting on page 3C-40 of Appendix 3C in Appendix A, which details the revised estimates for RTM storage acreage, volume, and potential reuses. Mapbook figures M3-4 and M14-7 show potential RTM storage locations. Final locations for storage of RTM would be selected based on guidelines presented in Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, section 3B.2.18 "Disposal and Reuse of Spoils, Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM), and Dredged Material" starting on page 3B-50, also in Appendix A.
267	11	<p>Will water monitoring during the process be tested for germs, diseases any and all pollution threats to humans, insects, wildlife, and the air?</p> <p>How often will the water be tested?</p> <p>Where will water be tested?</p> <p>Will water be tested in the tunnel as it is being drilled?</p> <p>Where will this water in the tunnels be pumped to?</p> <p>Will it be tested and filtered?</p> <p>Will any be hauled away to toxic waste dumps if contaminated?</p> <p>What are the plans that should be prepared to address toxic or contaminated water?</p> <p>Will any water be pumped into any canals or ditches during the process?</p> <p>What steps have been taken to address the concerns of contamination to our crops from contaminated water brought forth from any part of this project?</p>	<p>RDEIR/SDESIS 4.3.4 (4A) describes whether concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase or decrease with the project, relative to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. To the extent that concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase, 4.3.4 describes whether these increases are expected to result in impacts to beneficial uses of water in the Delta. For constituents for which adverse impacts were expected, mitigation and other commitments, such as additional evaluation and modeling and consultation with water purveyors to identify additional measures to avoid and minimize or offset these impacts, were introduced to address those impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, adding intakes in the North Delta will allow for operational flexibility that can improve natural flow in the Delta and avoid impacts to migratory fish based on real time data and operations</p> <p>There are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.</p> <p>Construction of the proposed California WaterFix water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>As part of the planning and environmental assessment process, the project proponents will incorporate environmental commitments and best management practices (BMPs) into the action alternatives to avoid or</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			minimize potential adverse effects (a NEPA term) and potential significant impacts (a CEQA term). The project proponents will implement these environmental commitments as part of the project construction activities. In other words, these commitments will be satisfied even if not separately imposed by the permitting agencies. If permitting agencies impose additional measures or modifications, those will also be adhered to as part of the permit(s). The project proponents will coordinate planning, engineering, design and construction, operation, and maintenance phases of the alternative with the appropriate agencies. For more information regarding Environmental Commitments please see Appendix 3B of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
267	12	How many trucks per day will be at the work site? Where will they be coming from and where will they go with empties and muck? What else will the trucks be hauling? Has all this trucking been okayed by the environmental community?	There would be a number of construction sites for the conveyance alternatives of CM1. The estimated number of equipment at a construction site at a given time would vary based on the means and methods, and material sources that contractors choose, and the sequencing of construction activities. For example, the estimated number of trucks at an intake site per day for the Alternative 4 of CM1 as follows: Approximately 15 End Dump Type (16-20 Cubic Yards, Highway) trucks per day would be used for about 14 days and another five flatbed (2 ton, Highway) trucks per day would be used for about 120 days. These trucks would be used to haul concrete and excavated materials to and from the site. However, at other facilities, up to 300 maximum daily trips could occur for delivery of materials to construction areas.
267	13	What environmental groups have been involved with your communications? Have you reached out to as many as has been requested by all those that have been requesting such contacts? Have you named all the environmental groups that you have consulted? Have there been any deals made with any environmental groups in exchange for their support of this project? What are they? Has there been any collusion with any environmental groups where those in leadership role, be it people, agencies, or bureaus, where something such as promised wetlands or real estate of any kind was promised to them` in exchange for their support? If so which agencies, bureaus and people and which environmental groups? Do you have individual names responsible for this correspondence of any of these groups or people? Has Phil Isenberg had any dealings with the project? If so, what did he say? Who did he talk to?	The Proposed Project is the result of more than seven years' collaboration and consultation with numerous stakeholders, agencies, public water agencies and environmental organizations. The organizations that have participated in the Steering Committee, public meetings or written letters to provide input on the Plan include: American Rivers, Bay Institute, Defenders of Wildlife, The Endangered Species Coalition, Environmental Defense Fund, The Golden Gate Salmon Association, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, the Nature Conservancy, and Planning and Conservation League. The feedback was used to guide the development and subsequent revisions of the Proposed Project and its associated EIR/EIS to reflect concerns addressed from the various groups. All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts, and meeting materials have been posted online since 2010 in an unprecedented commitment to provide public access and government transparency. Although the RDEIR/SDEIS, EIR/EIS and much of the proposed project has been drafted by scientists working for a private consulting firm (ICF) working for the Lead Agencies, the Agencies' scientists have been intimately involved, and their judgments are reflected throughout the EIR/EIS and the proposed project itself. The State is most interested in putting forth the best project that meets the goals of ecosystem improvement and water supply reliability. To the degree that the current Plan is endorsed by some environmental organizations serves as confirmation that the proposed Plan protects species, habitats and the Delta ecosystem in a way that is compatible with their goals. The website includes correspondence from agencies and NGOs received prior to the start of the formal comment period. Comments received during the comment period are to be included in the Final EIR/EIS.
267	14	Will the farmers around this project have to irrigate with more water after the aftermath of starting as well as ending the project?	The proposed project would not significantly impact local water supplies. While groundwater levels could be temporarily lowered in localized areas during the dewatering phases of construction, groundwater would return to pre-pumping levels over the course of several months following the dewatering phase. Mitigation has been proposed to maintain water supplies in areas affected by construction dewatering. Additionally, the project proponents would relocate and/or replace wells, pipelines, power lines, drainage systems, and other infrastructure that are needed for ongoing agricultural uses and would be adversely affected by project construction or operation. For additional information regarding proposed agricultural mitigation, please see Master Response 18. Construction of BDCP facilities will occur in a manner specifically designed to avoid adverse effects on groundwater. As described in Appendix 3C, Table 3C-7, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, ponds to store reusable tunnel materials and spoils material would be designed with the invert at least 5 feet above seasonally high groundwater and impervious liners along the invert and interior slopes of the ponds to avoid contamination. The tunneling operation would use biodegradable polymers that would be combined with

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>the excavated soil to allow conveyance of the soil slurry, or reusable tunnel material. The polymers would decompose over time.</p> <p>In some locations within the State, groundwater is regulated through judicial review related to adjudication proceedings in the court system. Many counties and regional agencies, or groups of agencies, have adopted groundwater management plans and/or ordinances. Governor Brown recently signed into law three bills that address groundwater management in California. These bills direct local agencies to develop groundwater management plans and allows the state to monitor and intervene if local agencies fail to do so.</p> <p>For more information regarding groundwater impacts and their associated mitigation of the proposed project please see Section 4.3.3 Groundwater of Section 4 in the RDEIR/SDIES. Updated information on groundwater effects of proposed water conveyance alternatives can be found in Appendix A Chapter 7 of the RDEIR/SDIES.</p>
268	1	I find it very concerning that you decided not to post comments online so everyone can read what others are commenting about the project.	The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.
268	2	I am very concerned about the effects this project will have on the Delta and the future generations to come. Not to mention the outrageous cost to the tax payers. There are other, less expensive, and better options to divert water to Southern California.	<p>Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p>
269	1	<p>We join together to request a 90-day extension of time to provide written comments on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and associated Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Study. Due to the complexity of the BDCP modeling analysis, the quantity of data that has been generated, and our urgent need to focus immediate attention on addressing drought conditions in our service areas, this additional time is needed to provide meaningful comments on an environmental analysis that is of critical long-term importance to water providers throughout California, and the residents, businesses and farms we serve.</p> <p>Our agencies are making every attempt to understand the potential effects of the BDCP, and to ensure those effects are disclosed and mitigated. Collectively, the following water providers have retained Daniel B. Steiner and MBK Engineers to prepare an independent review of the BDCP water supply and water quality modeling analysis:</p>	<p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now 2015, RDEIR/SDEIS, Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP or Conservation Measures. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 39 regarding public review.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>-Contra Costa Water District, -East Bay Municipal Utility District, -Friant Water Authority, -Northern California Water Association, -North Delta Water Agency, -San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, -San Joaquin Tributaries Authority, and -Tehama Colusa Canal Authority.</p> <p>We are committed to undertaking a transparent process, improving the BDCP EIR/EIS analysis, and completing our work as quickly and efficiently as possible. Already, on January 17, 2014, MBK provided preliminary results of its modeling analysis to the Delta Independent Science Board. The presentation sparked extensive discussion and interest by the ISB. In addition, the work has proven to be highly important to our ability to understand how the BDCP could affect our agencies and customers.</p> <p>MBK estimates that several more weeks will be needed to deliver a full report to our agencies. After that, our staffs will need substantial additional time to apply those results to each of our individual circumstances and draft our detailed comments.</p> <p>While we understood it would be difficult to complete all of these steps within the 120-day period initially provided for comments on the BDCP EIR/EIS, we now know it will be impossible. Like other agencies throughout California, our time is consumed with addressing statewide emergency drought conditions. The Bureau itself has cancelled at least two BDCP- related meetings with water agencies in order to focus its attention on its drought plans. We too are developing and implementing our plans to address extraordinarily dry conditions affecting those who depend on our agencies for their water supplies, while also coordinating efforts with the State Water Resources Control Board and others to address potential changes in our water quality and supplies. We anticipate this work will continue over the next several months.</p> <p>Because our staff resources are stretched thin and the deadline for providing our comments soon will be upon us, we ask that you respond to our request as quickly as possible. We appreciate your courtesy and cooperation.</p>	
270	1	<p>In a November 21 letter to you, prior to the December 13 release of the BDCP Draft Plan and EIR/EIS, the Environmental Water Caucus and other organizations - including the Planning and Conservation League - requested that the public review and comment period be extended beyond the planned 120 days, based on the anticipated 25,000 page estimate of the BDCP documents. We have now determined that there are 40,214 actual pages of the released documents and we request that you extend the public review and comment period for at least 120 additional days, due to the extraordinary size of the documents to be</p>	<p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now 2015, RDEIR/SDEIS, Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP or Conservation Measures. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 39 regarding public review.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		reviewed. This would make August 15, 2014 the revised deadline for public comments.	
270	2	<p>Based on the dictated 120 day review time period, the public is being asked to review 473 pages of technical and scientific material per day during the 85 working days that are available during the public review and comment period. Additional time would be required to understand, research, and prepare comments on the voluminous documents. The BDCP web site provides instructions that: "Comments should identify the specific part of the document at issue and should include supporting evidence and facts."</p> <p>As we pointed out in our previous request, NEPA regulation 40 CFR 1502.7 declares that the text of an EIS for "proposals of unusual scope or complexity shall normally be less than 300 pages." As was also stated in that previous letter, it is impossible for organizations interested in thoughtfully responding to these BDCP documents to be staffed for a thorough NEPA/CEQA review based on the outlandish size of the documents to be reviewed. Moreover, individual members of the public attempting to comprehend and comment on the BDCP documents would be overwhelmed. It is worthwhile noting that these documents represent 20% more pages than the 32 volumes of the last printed edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica.</p> <p>Therefore, the Planning and Conservation League respectfully requests that the public review and comment period be extended for an additional 120 days, until August 15, 2014, based on the size of the actual documents you released on December 13. Without such additional time, the public's essential role in the NEPA process of commenting on the agencies' findings contained in the BDCP's environmental review documents will be severely constrained.</p>	<p>For a more concise summary of the impact conclusions made in the documents, the BDCP Executive Summary and the EIR/EIS Executive Summary are available on the project website. Additionally, lay-friendly Highlight documents for both the BDCP and the EIR/EIS were published to provide summary information about the documents and to help readers get acquainted with the documents. The BDCP Highlights and the EIR/EIS Highlights are posted online at http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/AboutBDCP/InformationalMaterials.aspx. Short one-page factsheets on the BDCP and EIR/EIS are also provided online and by request. In addition, 17 narrated informational webinar episodes have been posted to the website for both the BDCP and EIR/EIS. These webinars were developed to provide short, easy to understand summaries of key elements of the BDCP and EIR/EIS. Background documents, additional factsheets, and FAQs continue to be available on-line.</p> <p>For more information, please see Master Response 6 regarding the length and complexity of the document.</p> <p>The public comment period for the BDCP, EIR/EIS, and IA was extended to July 29, 2014. Please see Master Response 57 for more information about the public review period.</p>
271	1	As home owners in Discovery Bay since 1981 we have seen our waterways and water quality decline since your inception of the pumps in Tracy that sent our water south. The pumps have killed our fish fingerings to the point that we have no substantial fish left in the Southern Delta and now you want to pump more water to the south. The river leading to the pumps has a current that demonstrates the tremendous amount of water that is currently shipped south and now you want more ? We are tired of this and will not stand by to watch Governor Brown complete a project that his father tried many years ago.	<p>The proposed project has many components that address improving habitat and conditions for salmon and other fish species and these are evaluated in the EIS/EIR by means of several alternatives so as to identify the impacts of the proposed project and alternative means of restoration. The project alternatives evaluate a range of flow conditions that include varying water export volumes. These export volumes range from +23% to -30% (see Executive Summary Table ES-11). The impacts of these varying export volumes and associated flow changes are addressed for each species in the different areas of the Delta and associated river systems.</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>
271	2	<p>It is totally frustrating that you have decided not to post all comments online as you receive them, so that everyone can see what others are commenting regarding this ridiculous project that our politically based governor is proposing. My interpretation of this decision is solely aimed at your desire to keep the public from being informed, because there is no legitimate purpose by keeping everyone "in the dark" about what others are saying.</p> <p>In case you have had a mental lapse, posting comments in an on-line docket during an EIS process is standard federal government procedure. Why has this highly controversial project been selected for special treatment? We demand that all comments be posted on-line in an easily accessible format and the comment period be extended for the length of time that comments were not posted online.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement. For information pertaining to how comments have been considered and addressed, please refer to Master Response 42.</p> <p>The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
272	1	My son and I are homeowners and landlords in Discovery Bay, CA and this BDCP is the most outrageous thing I have ever heard of in the 15 years that we have lived here. This project is a horrible idea for us. These tunnels are a disaster for our delta. This would destroy our delta to get water down south.	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. Please refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
272	2	It is also totally outrageous that I am not able to see comments from others as should be done.	For information pertaining to how comments have been considered and addressed, please refer to Master Response 42. The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.
272	3	These tunnels will totally ruin our water supply.	As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
272	4	Environmental reports are not sufficient.	For more information regarding the document's length and complexity please see Master Response 38.
272	5	There are no monitoring waterway stations as was said would be done.	There are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.
272	6	My son and myself regarding this totally absurd and preposterous proposal: These tunnels will totally ruin our water supply. BDCP has no storage.	The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving 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.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the proposed project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p> <p>For more information regarding water exports please see Master Response 26 and for information regarding water supply please see Master Response 35.</p> <p>For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.</p>
272	7	These tunnels are not a conservation measure.	<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. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
272	8	My son and myself regarding this totally absurd and preposterous proposal: These tunnels will totally ruin our water supply. There would be no way to keep salt water away from us.	<p>The water quality assessment of the diversion of Sacramento River water under the project alternatives addresses effects on salinity-related parameters in the Delta, including electrical conductivity (EC) and chloride, and compliance with related agricultural, fish and wildlife, and municipal and industrial use objectives in the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and degradation relative to these uses in Impact WQ-11 in Chapter 8, Water Quality. 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 impacts is provided. Further, the proposed project has been modified since publication of the Draft EIR/EIS to Alternative 4A, which would have less than significant impacts on salinity-related parameters.</p>
272	9	Environmentally this would destroy our Delta.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS documentation were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, and as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
272	10	Economically, there is no plan and the cost would be enormous.	<p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the proposed project funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
272	11	My son and myself regarding this totally absurd and preposterous proposal: These tunnels will totally ruin our water supply. There is no accountability.	<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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>The design details for Alternative 4A are explained in DWR's Conceptual Engineering Report (July 2015). The size of each tunnel reach is dictated by the required hydraulic capacity and flow velocities to suspend sediment and minimize sediment buildup in the downstream end of the tunnels (DWR Conceptual Engineering Report 2015 Section 11.1.1). Each of the three intake facilities is sized to divert up to 3,000 cfs. As a complete system, the water conveyance facilities are designed to move up to 9,000 cfs and cannot be operated at higher levels without significant changes to the physical facilities, and modifications to the operational permits.</p> <p>Operations would be consistent with criteria set by the FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process as described in the 2008 and 2009 BiOps. Detailed limitations and operational criteria can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits.</p> <p>In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, the proposed project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
272	12	In dry years, there is no measuring. The tunnels keep pumping.	<p>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.</p> <p>Monitoring for compliance with D-1641 requirements or any future requirements for SWP/CVP water supply operations would be conducted year-round in the future under the proposed project.</p>
272	13	Diverting our water would drastically affect our ecosystem.	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
272	14	My son and myself regarding this totally absurd and preposterous proposal: These tunnels	<p>The amount of water DWR can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		will totally ruin our water supply. Flows have not been reviewed.	<p>proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process as described in the 2008 and 2009 BiOps (RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary ES.2.2). In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3).</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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
272	15	My son and myself regarding this totally absurd and preposterous proposal: These tunnels will totally ruin our water supply. Not all endangered species have been accounted for.	<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. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to 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> <p>The proposed project is going to mitigate for impacts and restore habitat for fish and wildlife listed in Section 4.3.7 and 4.3.8 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The RDEIR/SDEIS addresses effects on special-status species, including non-listed species. Impacts that are going to potentially occur during the implementation timeline are fully disclosed with its associated mitigation measure to decrease the severity of said impact to covered species. Please see Appendix 1A Evaluation of Species Considered for Coverage of the BDCP for additional information on screening criteria of fish and wildlife species that were selected for the other 15 conveyance alternatives.</p> <p>Chapters 11 and 12 of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS include in-depth, comprehensive analyses of potential effects on all endangered fish and wildlife known or expected to occur in the BDCP Plan Area.</p>
272	16	My son and myself regarding this totally absurd and preposterous proposal: These tunnels will totally ruin our water supply. Levees should be repaired, which is not done.	As described in Section 5.3.1 of Chapter 5, Water Supply, the action alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS only would affect SWP and CVP water operations and would not affect water available to other surface water rights holders in the Delta and other parts of California. However, some action alternatives would affect water quality in portions of the Delta, as described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Master Response 14. These changes in water quality under some alternatives could affect beneficial uses, including municipal and agricultural water supplies. Under some of the alternatives, groundwater in the Delta near constructed

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>facilities also could be affected, as described in Chapter 7, Groundwater.</p> <p>As described in Appendix 6A, flood management is not a project purpose of the BDCP; however, it recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests.</p>
272	17	My son and myself regarding this totally absurd and preposterous proposal: These tunnels will totally ruin our water supply. The cost is enormous at over 67 billion dollars.	For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.
272	18	No accurate cost benefit analysis has been done.	The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.
272	19	It does not create water; it just moves water away from us.	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
272	20	The muck is massive and that alone would destroy the environment.	In December 2014, the administration of Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., and its federal partners announced several substantial changes to the proposed water conveyance portion of the proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP). One of the changes made was to refine the footprint to reduce the acres of RTM storage areas. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. As part of an environmental commitment in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, sediments collected at the intake facilities and reusable tunnel material (RTM) excavated during construction activities could be reintroduced into the Delta at proposed restoration sites. Consequently, the overall effect in the Plan Area/Delta was determined to be only a minor degradation. Based on comments received from the public and additional study of the likely characteristics of RTM material, this environmental commitment and its parallel AMM have been revised to describe the anticipated feasibility of reuse of this material, as well as the applicable regulatory standards that any such material would be required to meet prior to its beneficial reuse. Overall, the amount of excavated soil would be substantially less with the California WaterFix than with the BDCP. Additionally, refer to Master Response 12 (Reusable Tunnel Material).
272	21	Natural features would be destroyed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS documentation were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, and as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			flexibility.
272	22	It destroys our farmland to water farmland down south.	<p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <p>Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.</p>
272	23	Our economy would totally be harmed to move our water to benefit the south.	<p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California.</p> <p>When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. Construction of water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the Draft BDCP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible and are described under each alternative in the RDEIR/SDEIS individual resource chapters and in the BDCP Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, EIR/EIS. An analysis of economic impacts of the proposed project, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are also evaluated and described in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx).</p> <p>Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the Draft EIR/EIS was revised based on the revised construction footprint for proposed water conveyance facilities, along with a refined set of construction cost and schedule assumptions developed for Alternative 4. Refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Section 16.3.3.9, in Appendix A for the revised analysis of Alternative 4. Additionally, one table from Draft EIR/EIS Appendix 16A has been incorporated into Appendix A.</p>
272	24	It is a total waste of time and energy to figure out how to destroy the Sacramento River and our Delta to benefit another area!	Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS documentation were raised.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
272	25	The idiocy just enrages my son and I. Do not go any further on this project!	Refer to the response for Comment No. 24 of this letter (Letter No. 272).
273	1	I currently live in Discovery Bay, CA. We have been involved in boating, living and using the Delta for over 40 years. Our kids grew up on the Delta and enjoyed the area and life they had.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
274	1	I am writing you this email to let you know that as a resident of California I am against the tunnels. As a child I got to fish and play in the water near Sacramento. The delta has been a playground for my nieces and nephews for years. The proposed tunnel will cause a total change to our ecosystem and environment, not to mention property values.	The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The proposed project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. 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. Additionally, the commenter does not offer any further evidence on how the project would result in “change to our ecosystem and environment, not to mention property values” that hasn’t already been addressed in the environmental documentation.
274	2	I find it outrageous that a project this size has no budget and that the tax payers or the water rate payers are expected to pay for the bill.	The proposed project is costly, but lead agencies have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.
274	3	The change to the eco system due to the saline increase, impact on the fresh water fish, and not to mention the disposal issues with the muck make this project totally unfeasible. I ask that you take whatever steps are necessary to cancel, destroy, and get rid of, in other words any term that is appropriate but at the end of the day make this go away.	Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. In December 2014, the administration of Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., and its federal partners announced several substantial changes to the proposed water conveyance portion of the proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP). One of the changes made was to refine the footprint to reduce the acres of RTM storage areas. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. As part of an environmental commitment in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, sediments collected at the intake facilities and reusable tunnel material (RTM) excavated during construction activities could be reintroduced into the Delta at proposed restoration sites. Consequently, the overall effect in the Plan Area/Delta was determined to be only a minor degradation. Based on comments received from the public and additional study of the likely characteristics of RTM material, this environmental commitment and its parallel AMM have been revised to describe the anticipated feasibility of reuse of this material, as well as the applicable regulatory standards that any such material would be required to meet prior to its beneficial reuse. Overall, the amount of excavated soil would be substantially less with the California WaterFix than with the BDCP. Additionally, refer to Master Response

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			12 (Reusable Tunnel Material). Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project and Master Response 14 regarding salinity.
275	1	I am a concerned citizen of California writing you on this bad idea of installing tunnels to suck the water from Northern California to Southern California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
275	2	Where the tunnels need to be is above ground coming from our neighboring states and Canada where there is an abundant supply of water. Similar to the Alaskan pipeline - only for water.	<p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources 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>
275	3	<p>Sucking the water from Northern California to Southern California during droughts doesn't make any sense. This is a very short sighted approach to solving a water problem that the state has faced for many years. Our fore fathers in the 30's understood the need to bring water south but nothing has been done since that makes sense. Think globally to solve this problem.</p> <p>Please do not destroy our delta!!! The delta is an awesome place that many people rely on and have invested in.</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>Monitoring for compliance with D-1641 requirements or any future requirements for SWP/CVP water supply operations would be conducted year-round in the future under the proposed project.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state’s water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources 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>
276	1	I respectfully demand that all emails, pro or con, be posted on your website.	For more information regarding the transparency of the project and communications please see Master Response 41.
277	1	My wife and have lived in Discovery Bay on the water for 25 years. We enjoy wildlife, fishing, swimming and boating. We are very interested in saving the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
278	1	<p>First of all I must say that I am appalled that a project of this magnitude is being covered up. What happened to the transparency that is supposed to govern our government?</p> <p>Not only is the name (conservation) in the BDCP a misnomer, the idea of hiding comments of others is a violation of federal government procedure. It is very important to me, and others to be able to view others opinions. Without the ability to read others thoughts, you are taking away a constitutional right, freedom of the press.</p>	<p>For information pertaining to the length of the comment period, please refer to Master Response 39. Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Therefore I am very adamant in requesting my rights, to reclaim all comments be posted on line. In a simple enough format for all of us to access, and the comment period be retroactive.	
280	1	As a resident of Discovery Bay since 1975 and a Real Estate Broker active in our local market for over 36 years, I have grave concerns with the proposed legislation and thoughts about our precious commodity...our water.	<p>The proposed project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding development of alternatives for the EIR/EIS, and a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives.</p>
280	2	<p>The negative economic impact on our area, both to marine and agriculture communities, is a primary concern to all residents of this area.</p> <p>This project must be stopped to insure a healthy future for the entire Northern California Delta Region.</p>	Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14 of the FEIR/EIS. Socioeconomic impacts are identified and discussed in Chapter 16 of the FEIR/EIS and in the Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report. Chapter 15 discusses impacts to recreation.
281	1	I oppose this plan. It is an expensive and irresponsible water grab designed to primarily benefit land in the Central Valley that should be retired from farming.	<p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 26 (Area of Origin).</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the lead agencies have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
282	1	No to the Delta Tunnel. There is no conservation in this plan for the Delta. No no no!	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.
283	1	I would like to comment on the upcoming BDCP, but first should include a little of my family's California history. I have been living in California since 1975, my wife born and raised here. Our son was born in 1986. We have been enjoying the California delta for recreational purposes, agricultural products (Brentwood corn is fabulous!), and relying on it as a source of fresh drinking water for over 35 years. We also have a waterfront home in Discovery Bay, entertain guests and even enlighten some to the nuances of the Delta itself. It is interesting to note that some of them do not realize their home tap water comes from these same tributaries. What a shame it would be if this area were to be irreparably changed due to antiquated thinking in regards to the states future water needs. Pumps and pipes are so 1950's.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.
284	1	We have lived in Brentwood near the delta since 1977. We enjoy fishing and boating with our children and grandchildren. We also enjoy the abundance of fruits and vegetables that grow in this region, getting their water from the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
284	2	At the heart of this project is the monitoring and reporting on environmental issues such as water quality in the 16 bays of Discovery Bay. Yet no Discovery Bay monitoring stations have been included in the EIR/EIS draft. This is unreasonable and unhealthy. Conditions such as water circulation in the bays of Discovery Bay are different than in other open water locations. Adequate monitoring stations in Discovery Bay are not only necessary but should be required to establish an adequate mitigation and monitoring program.	There are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas. Please also refer to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for additional information regarding how impacts would be mitigated.
285	1	The Bay Delta Conservation Plan was intended as a measure to maintain the Delta as it is now -- a waterway for many flora and fauna and humans to exist. CM#1- the tunnels project is not a conservation measure. It is a piece of water supply infrastructure designed to export more water to other regions, not to save fish or help the Delta.	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. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.
285	2	If we are to help the Delta and species recover, we need to reduce exports through efforts such as desalination, conservation, developing local supplies and storage, and banning wasteful agricultural practices such as cotton, almond and pistachio harvesting in areas not suitable for farming.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Although 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>
285	3	<p>My family and I, and many others whose livelihood depends on the Delta, ask you to rethink the BDCP project and recognize that there is simply not enough water to allow the Delta species to survive, and meet the demands of the water contractors who are behind this 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>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 roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
285	4	<p>Quite possibly we can direct our energies and resources to CM projects 3-22, that truly conserve and restore the Delta first, then look to new ways of water conveyance. Is this not a true conservation policy? Please consider it.</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and is being carried forward in this RDEIR/SDEIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If the Lead Agencies ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts.</p> <p>Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state’s long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation.</p> <p>Proposition 1 funds and other state and public dollars will be directed exclusively for public benefits unassociated with any regulatory compliance responsibilities.</p> <p>Additional priority restoration projects will be identified through regional and locally-led planning processes facilitated by the Delta Conservancy. Plans will be completed for the Cache Slough, West Delta, Cosumnes, and South Delta. Planning for the Suisun Marsh region is already complete and a process for integrated planning in the Yolo Bypass is underway. The Delta Conservancy will lead the implementation of identified restoration projects, in collaboration with local governments and with a priority on using public lands in the Delta.</p>
286	1	My wife and have lived in Discovery Bay on the water for 25 years. We enjoy wildlife, fishing, swimming and boating. We are very interested in saving the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. See Chapter 15, Recreation, for a description of potential impacts on recreation. Additionally, the commenter is referred to the purpose and need of the proposed project (Master Response 3).
286	2	This is my comment on the Draft EIR/EIS. I would like to see a good problem statement with a list of alternatives for solving the problem. For instance, a series of reservoirs down the state, desalinization units in the southern part of the state, mandatory rationing for all.	<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>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state’s water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <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, Water Demand Management, 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>
289	1	My wife and have lived in Discovery Bay on the water for 25 years. We enjoy wildlife, fishing, swimming and boating. We are very interested in saving the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
291	1	My family moved to California from Illinois in the mid sixties. At that point my parents bought their first boat and the family tradition has continued. We live in Discovery Bay, on the water, we moved here because of our appreciation of wildlife, water fowl and the natural beauty of the Delta.	The EIR/EIS 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. Chapter 17 addresses aesthetic and visual resources, and mitigation measures and environmental commitments designed to reduce effects.
292	1	<p>One of the goals of the BDCP is to make more water available for distribution through SWP. A long term action that can insure that the water, all water, is used wisely is to require:</p> <p>All water customers are metered.</p> <p>All water bills have a progressive rate structure where the marginal cost increases as consumption increases.</p> <p>Making this a requirement of all those receiving SWP water will insure the BDCP contributes to a solution and not just a delay of a catastrophe. This will allow market forces to determine usage at the margin and even if some commercial use is economically viable at all within the SWP service area.</p>	<p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</p> <p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state’s water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, 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> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
293	1	<p>My grandfather left Kansas wheat fields in 1920 before the regional dust bowl, largely from its poor long range planning. He searched for fertile soil, amidst the best in the world. My late father said we had increased salt, already. Compared to unending fixits estimates, surely desalination of East Bay is more productive than impressions of transporting any extra water, 250 miles away to Bakersfield. Pismo Beach areas is more direct for desalination. Southern California has desalination. Please differentiate Yosemite to Mojave Desert and former sage brush and tule elk near the Grapevine/ Gorman which is South Central and different counties. That is 250 miles from the Delta county rivers. When will Northern California save the Delta by a desalination legacy practiced in over 100 countries, including research from Australia, Kuwait, and Southern California?</p>	<p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
294	1	<p>Where is the leadership for Northern California desalination, not Delta Destruction with salt backup and fixit costs (or man-made dust bowl like 1930's in Kansas). How about desalination for Bakersfield Basin from Pismo Beach areas? or East Bay before Antioch Bridge? Lodi Zins are only 24 miles from Rio Vista, heart of the Delta Sacramento-North San Joaquin river estuary. How do we search individual studies like Wagner-Tyack? Where is clear research into 15 Alternatives required by EIR, Environmental Impact Report?</p>	<p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p>
295	1	<p>I am a Discovery Bay resident. My husband and I just moved here 1 year ago from Tracy.</p> <p>Please consider cancellation of the Delta Tunnel project.</p> <p>We enjoy boating, are members of the Discovery Bay yacht club, and have children who swim in the waters of the Delta.</p> <p>Your project will devastate our new lifestyle and environment.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The proposed project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. Refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place). The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted upon by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the CEQA and NEPA processes.</p>
295	2	<p>We know many people are against these tunnels and have tried to read the pros and cons</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		voiced by other citizens on your website. These other comments are nowhere to be found. You seem to be hiding information from the public.	planning process and stakeholder engagement. The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.
295	3	Our water quality issue doesn't seem to be addressed. Nowhere do we find the facts regarding the actual effect your tunnels will have on our water.	RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.4 (4A) describes whether concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase or decrease with the project, relative to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. To the extent that concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase, 4.3.4 describes whether these increases are expected to result in impacts to beneficial uses of water in the Delta. For constituents for which adverse impacts were expected, mitigation and other commitments, such as additional evaluation and modeling and consultation with water purveyors to identify additional measures to avoid and minimize or offset these impacts, were introduced to address those impacts. Additionally, adding intakes in the North Delta will allow for operational flexibility that can improve natural flow in the Delta and avoid impacts to migratory fish based on real time data and operations.
295	4	I am a dentist who deals with ranchers, boaters, the general public. I talk to folks all day who oppose your project. We ask that you seek other alternative measures and give our voice an open ear and consideration. The local farmers will be devastated with less water to irrigate. Our food will cost more. Our air will stink from the muck you pile up when creating these tunnels. We matter, our lifestyle matters, and our voice should be heard. Thank you for your attention to my complaint.	The proposed project does not include any regulatory actions that would affect water right holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors. More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. The plan proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which ecological goals and objectives would be fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 12 regarding the characteristics of reusable tunnel material (i.e., "tunnel muck").
296	1	As a long-time resident of Discovery Bay we've been boating in the Delta for over 30 years, so it was imperative that I attend as many of your open public house meetings as possible. In these meeting we were promised that you would post all comments online, so everyone could see what others are commenting. Unfortunately, I find it disgraceful that you have decided not to post all comments.	Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement. The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.
296	2	To state that the BDCP project is a conservation measure is deceptive. It is designed to funnel more water to Southern California, not save fish or help the Delta. If we truly want to help the Delta and provide water to the Central Valley farmers and Southern California cities it will have to be through conservation, desalination, developing local supplies, and banning wasteful agricultural practices of planting water-sucking crops such as almonds, pistachios and citrus that require year around irrigation.	The BDCP is a comprehensive plan intended to fulfill Delta Plan goals to achieve a reliable water supply and ecosystem health. California law (Water Code Section 85002) treats the Delta as the "hub of the California water system" and the most "most valuable estuary and wetland ecosystem on the west coast of North and South America." By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, along with other conservation measures, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and habitat conditions and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</p> <p>The proposed project proposes to improve water supply reliability and improve the Delta ecosystem by constructing a 9,000 cfs water diversion point in the north Delta, where its operations will provide for improved flows and operational flexibility. As planned, the project will better protect water supplies for two-thirds of California’s population, support local farming and improve the Delta ecosystem through habitat restoration and other conservation measures designed for these benefits.</p> <p>The plan proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which ecological goals and objectives would be fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. For more information on how Conservation Measure 1 would benefit fish and wildlife and does serve as a conservation measure, please see Master Response 5.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 on desalination, and Master Response 6 regarding water demand management.</p>
297	1	<p>3 years ago we retired and bought a house in Discovery Bay. We are far from many needy things, such as department stores, hospitals, some services, etc. We live here because we love our beautiful environment: water, birds, swimming, fishing, stunning orchids and fields around, where farmers work hard feeding their families and all our country. Our kids and grandkids come here for recreation after hard work in the city, and now somebody (government, governor?) is going to make our retirement just miserable with 10 years of heavy construction! The result for all Discovery Bay residents will be loosing value of houses, quality of life, and maybe water too.</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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
297	2	<p>I think we, the people, deserve to know the real names of real people who are responsible for this idiotic project named Bay Delta Conservation Plan. We do not want words like they, some committees, or water company. There are people like Mr. or Mrs. Smith who are behind such words. I hope their neighbors, relatives, friends, media and strangers will ask them the same question: why do you name this plan Bay Delta Conservation Plan and not Delta Destruction Plan? Are you crazy to destroy this beautiful and unique area?</p> <p>Because this project promises something good in 50 years, it always means somebody knows they are doing harm to people and the environment. I want the next generation to know the names of these pushers.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to 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> <p>The BDCP process was initiated by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was twice elected by a majority of California voters. The process has continued under the administration of his successor, Edmund G. Brown, Jr., who has publicly stated his tentative support for Alternative 4 as set forth in the EIR/EIS, though he has acknowledged the need to complete environmental review and to obtain additional public input prior to making any final decisions on the project. The BDCP, then, was initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 11 of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP for a List of Preparers.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics,</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
297	3	<p>This is a comment on Draft EIR/EIS.</p> <p>There is no specific analysis done about project's water quality impact on Discovery Bay. I respectfully request that site analysis be conducted to determine water quality impact on the bays of Discovery Bay.</p> <p>The monitoring stations should be included to mitigate the water quality impact on Discovery Bay.</p>	<p>The water quality analysis presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS sections covering the new proposed Alternatives and Appendix A provide a thorough analysis of important water quality constituents of concern at multiple locations throughout the Delta to present the potential water quality effects that could result from implementing the project alternative.</p> <p>There are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.</p> <p>The water quality analysis presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS sections covering the new proposed Alternatives and Appendix A provide a thorough analysis of important water quality constituents of concern at multiple locations throughout the Delta to present the potential water quality effects that could result from implementing the project alternative.</p>
297	4	Because we all here in Discovery Bay contact water by sports and recreation it should be scientific assurance that people's health would not be affected by high levels of bacteria during the construction or operation of the project.	<p>The water quality analysis presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS sections covering the new proposed Alternatives and Appendix A provide a thorough analysis of important water quality constituents of concern at multiple locations throughout the Delta to present the potential water quality effects that could result from implementing the project alternative.</p> <p>For more information regarding potential water quality impacts to Discovery Bay please see Master Response 55.</p>
297	5	Why not to find another way to produce more water for California by desalination? It could be in the long run much less expensive and less harmful for the environment.	<p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level.</p> <p>Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands.</p> <p>Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California’s overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p>
297	6	The Delta area never was affected by earthquakes. Was the study done that if Earth be excavated for such a huge degree, this area could be affected by the earthquake?	<p>Chapter 9 of the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the geology and seismicity of the study area. Based on a review of the last 20 years of precast tunnel lining seismic performance histories, it can be concluded that little or no damage to precast tunnel lining was observed for major earthquakes around the world. Based on preliminary data, it is anticipated that the Delta tunnels can be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. Impact GEO- 1 and GEO-7 discusses the possibility of loss or damage resulting from strong seismic activity during construction and operation of water conveyance features. For more information regarding tunnel design please see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS for discussion of potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action scenario.</p> <p>Excavation activities are not expected to trigger an earthquake. Section 9.3 Environmental Consequences, Chapter 9 of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS describes the potential effects that could result from project construction, operation and maintenance, and restoration due to geologic and seismic-related conditions and hazards. As described in Section 9.3, all the proposed facilities would be designed and managed during and after construction to meet the safety and collapse-prevention requirements of the relevant state codes and standards listed in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, of the RDEIR/SDEIS for the anticipated seismic loads.</p> <p>An earthquake is what happens when two blocks of the earth suddenly slip past one another. The surface where they slip is called the fault or fault plane. Based on the proposed tunnel alignments, depths, tunneling method, and the energy involved in boring, the construction of BDCP tunnels is not expected to increase the chance of an earthquake.</p> <p>For more information regarding floods and levees please see Appendix 6A.</p> <p>For more information regarding seismic activity please see Master Response 16.</p>
297	7	We demand that all comments be posted online and the comment period be extended for the length of time that comments were not posted online, so everybody can see what others are commenting. We need more public notification. There is no legitimate purpose served by keeping everyone in the dark.	Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for comments related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement. The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.
298	1	We have owned our water front home in Discovery Bay since the year 2000. We care about our community. People from Discovery Bay have requested, at public meetings, that Discovery Bay monitoring stations be included to monitor water quality impacts on the 16.	There are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Bay's of Discovery Bay. To no avail - no monitoring stations for our area have been included.	<p>Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.</p> <p>The water quality analysis presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS sections covering the new proposed Alternatives and Appendix A provide a thorough analysis of important water quality constituents of concern at multiple locations throughout the Delta to present the potential water quality effects that could result from implementing the project alternative.</p>
298	2	The bays of Discovery Bay have been and are being heavily used for water contact sports, i.e., swimming by our children and grandchildren, sail and paddle boarding. To exclude us is unreasonable!	<p>The proposed project may impact recreational opportunities including impacts on hunting, fishing, swimming, and boating. Mitigation is proposed to reduce these impacts; however some impacts may remain significant due to the long-term nature of the temporary construction related impacts. Please see Chapter 15, Recreation, and Section 4.3.11 for more detail on the impacts of the proposed project on recreational opportunities and the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>To compensate for the loss of access as a result of constructing the river intakes, the proponents will work with the California Department of Parks and Recreation to help insure the elements of the proposed project would not conflict with the elements proposed in DPR's Recreation Proposal for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh (California Department of Parks and Recreation 2011d) that would enhance bicycle and foot access to the Delta. This would include the helping to fund or construct elements of the American Discovery Trail and the potential conversion of the abandoned Southern Pacific Railroad rail line that formerly connected Sacramento to Walnut Grove.</p> <p>DWR staff has made best efforts to try to maintain contact with interested citizens. In 2013, DWR staff and the public outreach team conducted a series of "Delta Office Hours" in communities throughout the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The proposed project raised the standard for proactive outreach and engagement with communities and the public overall by efforts such as establishing a multilingual toll-free phone line for questions which includes information in Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese and Chinese (Mandarin) in addition to English.</p>
298	3	There is much less circulation in the bays of Discovery Bay. Adequate monitoring stations in Discovery Bay are required to establish an adequate mitigation and monitoring program.	<p>There are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity (including both chloride and electrical conductivity) and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.</p> <p>The water quality analysis presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS sections covering the new proposed Alternatives and Appendix A provide a thorough analysis of important water quality constituents of concern at multiple locations throughout the Delta to present the potential water quality effects that could result from implementing the project alternative.</p>
299	1	My family and I have been boating and enjoying all aspects of the Delta for over 20 years. As a resident of Discovery Bay and a former rear commodore, I am opposed to a plan to install tunnels diverting water from the Delta. It is unfair that you do not post all comments online. I feel that the Delta is like a precious historic jewel that holds information for future	<p>For information pertaining to how the BDCP/California WaterFix has been developed in an open and transparent manner, please refer to Master Response 41.</p> <p>The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		generations to enjoy. Thank you for considering my point of view.	standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.